Содержание

ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ

Общая педагогика, история педагогики и образования

Теория и методика обучения и воспитания

Физическое воспитание и физическая культура

Организация социально-культурной деятельности

Профессиональное образование

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ

Германские языки

Сравнительно-историческое, типологическое и сопоставительное языкознание

ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ

Экономика и управление

УДК 811.11-112

G.T. GILFANOVA, T.V. LYUBOVA, D.A. SALIMZANOVA, I.R. KHUZIN

Naberezhnye Chelny Institute of Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Naberezhnye Chelny

EVALUATIVE COMPONENT OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS CHARACTERIZING WEDDING CEREMONIES IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND TATAR LANGUAGES

Keywords: ameliorative meaning; evaluation; pejorative meaning; phraseological units; phraseological meaning; phraseologism; wedding rituals.

Abstract: The aim of the study is to reveal the peculiarities of evaluative components of connotations of phraseological units expressing wedding traditions in languages under discussion. A selection of phraseological units describing the wedding ceremonies of three languages mentioned above was chosen as the material for study. The objectives of scientific research are to study the semantics of phraseological units denoting wedding traditions of the languages studied and the analysis of their evaluative component. The study was based on the comparative method and the phraseological description method of wedding traditions of described languages. As a result, it was concluded that evaluation component of phraseological units has the predominance of phraseological units with a rationally positive or neutral evaluative meaning, which does not confirm the widespread point of view of scientists about asymmetry in phraseology and a significant shift towards a negative evaluation.

Both lexical and phraseological meanings have evaluative components. As V.P. Zhukov notes, "The evaluative meaning conveys either positive or negative characteristic of an individual or an object regarding their permanent properties, rather than random and temporary ones" [3]. Exactly the constant nature of evaluation, i.e. the presence of this connotative component as part of the meaning of phraseological units (**PUs**) is constantly emphasized by researchers, who distinguish between PUs with the evaluative meaning (i.e., in the language system) and those with evaluative usage (i.e., in speech).

Linguistic fixation of evaluation is made on the basis of the generally accepted point of view on the concepts of good and evil, i.e. positive and negative. At the same time, the dual nature of evaluation is obvious since it "...on the one hand, refers to the "idealized model of the world" formed by universal human values and norms, and on the other hand, it focuses on the existing reality, since the motives and evaluation criteria are set by the actual properties of items. Evaluation is objective from the point of view that it is caused by those qualities that are inherent in objects – the realities of extra-linguistic conception, which are reflected in the human mind and are represented in a phraseological meaning. On the other hand, evaluation depends on the subject, on the nominee of the reality, on their relation to it, and its subjective character follows from this" [1]. Let us note that, as a rule, the nominee of evaluation in phraseological units is a native speaker.

Thus, A.V. Kunin mentions two types of evaluation – intellectual and connotative, while intellectual evaluations are included in the corresponding concepts (for example, positive or negative result), while connotative evaluations are determined by the character of connotation itself (for example, rude-disrespectful in PE "kick the bucket" – "give the oak, play in the box, die") [4]. According to E.E. Arsentieva, two types of evaluation are distinguished – intellectual-emotional and emotional, noting that the phraseological units, as products of a special phraseological nomination, combine rational assessment with emotional and the evaluation component is most closely and inextricably linked to the significative-denotative component of phraseological meaning [1].

The phraseological units we study also demonstrate the inextricable link between these

two components. The verbal English PU “have a good (long) innings” – “live a long and happy life” combines in itself a purely rational evaluation (to live such a life very well, regardless of the speech community), and emotional (long-term happiness, especially with a loved one, always evoke positive emotions). The absence of a marriage was assessed negatively and from an objective point of view as a non-compliance (rational evaluation), for example, in PU “собачья сбеглим” with the meaning “no marriage”. The Tatar people have always valued hardworking and skillful girls as future mistresses of the house. Negative attitudes towards inept future wives bore both a rational evaluation (taking such a girl as a wife meant ruining the household system and later on a poor life) and emotionally scornful, which is reflected in the semantics of the Tatar PU “ак кул” – “crappy”.

Three types of evaluation are distinguished: positive (ameliorative), negative (pejorative) and neutral depending on pronounced approval or denial (or lack thereof) as a statement of the socially established assessment of any phenomenon of the surrounding reality.

In all three languages PUs with a rationally positive or neutral evaluative value prevail. Probably, this fact is explained by the stereotypes of organising the wedding ceremony that have developed among all three peoples of native languages, since a significant part of the PUs characterizes the peculiarities of various ceremonies or names the participants in the wedding ceremony, objects and phenomena associated with them. So, a number of English phraseological units call the participants of the celebration or relatives: “bridal party” – “relatives of the bride”, “bride’s man” – “witness from the groom's side”, “just married” – “newlyweds”, “fresh (new) blood” – “new family members”. In Russian the phraseological units are distinguished, calling individual actions of a pre-wedding or wedding ceremony: “окрутить молодуху” – “tie up a marrying girl's head with a shawl like woman does”, “каравай сажать” – a round bread, baked before the bride is sent to church and is eaten by the bride's girlfriends while she is in the church”, “мылами кидать” – “divination of girls on the eve of one of the girls wedding".In the Tatar language this group includes PUs with different semantics: “килен сорап бару” – “go to ask in marriage”, “кияу келәте” – “pantry for the young”, “максама эчәргә” – “to drink quass in front of the bride’s gate”, “аулак өй” – “gatherings, which were usually held in autumn and winter evenings in their free time from work” (as a place for young people to meet).

The presence of this group of phraseological units in all three languages can, from our point of view, be explained as follows. For peoples who are mother-tongue speakers (as in other societies), the creation of a family and the continuation of a clan was considered mandatory, and therefore a positive event. At the same time, in all three languages one can find a very limited number of phraseological units with the so-called ambivalent neutral rating. i.e. PU with a two-digit estimated charge, which depending on the situation, can realize a positive or negative estimated potential. Thus, marriage with a royal offspring or a member of an aristocratic family (PU “marry into the purple”), on the one hand, gives wealth and status, on the other hand, can be forced and lead to great suffering. The wedding without parental permission (PU “уходом уходить”) from the point of view of public morality in Russia was evaluated negatively, but at the same time, there was no other way for lovers, especially if the bride was made to marry another person, whom she didn't love, or she was already expecting a child from her beloved. Mixed marriages (PU “катнаш никахлар”) cause different attitudes of people and can be happy and unhappy.

Also of interest are English PUs with the sentence structure “marriage makes or mars a man” – “a person marries a fortune or on a trouble” and “marriage is a lottery” – “a wedding is a lottery”, the phraseological meaning of which is neutral and in the first case a combination of positive and negative gives a neutral result.

The group of phraseological units with ameliorative evaluation will be significant in all three languages. Meanwhile, the semantics of these PUs will be diverse. For example, in English, the beloved boy or girl is called “sweeter pie”, beloved, sweet girl “one’s best girl”, enviable bridegroom, girls dream “the answer to a maiden's prayer ” and the happiness of being inseparable is denoted as “go (hunt, run) in couples. In the Russian language we found a large number of PUs associated with the description of gifts to young people: “вывести из-за стола”, “выговаривать выговор” – “wedding ceremony, during which the groom gives gifts to the bride”, “класть на косу” – “give the bride gifts, money”, “бросать на пирог” – “giving something to the bride and groom during the wedding”, “продавать блины” means “folding gifts for young

people on an empty dish, which was held in the hands of the bride's matchmaker. Everyone who gave it, received for this pancake and a glass of wine". The ameliorative assessment of such actions is determined by the need for the material basis of the newly created family, recognized by the members of the language community, which was especially important in the pre-revolutionary period, when a woman after the wedding, as a rule, was engaged only in housekeeping.

The bright expressed positive evaluation of the girl, the future skillful and hard-working wife, was found in the Tatar phraseological unit "куллынан килмәгән эше юк" – "jack of all trades, the golden hands". The description of the beautiful bride is also reflected in the phraseological fund of the Tatar language. The PU "агы ап-ак карасы кап-кара" is used to praise the bride when they talk about her white face and black eyebrows. The Tatar people valued the purity and innocence of the girl very highly, therefore, the positive evaluation of the PU "кул тимәгән яр" – "the innocent girl" is obvious.

Despite the fact that a wedding, connection of destinies and hearts is regarded by society as a positive phenomenon, our material contains a number of PUs with pejorative assessment, which is not an accidental phenomenon, but due to extra-linguistic factors. Marriage is not always concluded by mutual consent, unfortunately, marriages of convenience are not rare and family life after the wedding can turn into a bitter disappointment. All these ''features'' of human existence are vividly reflected in the phraseology of the English, Russian and Tatar languages.

So, for example, forced marriage, forced marriage is indicated by the English PU "shot-gun marriage (wedding)" and PU "catch (marry) smb on the rebound" both mean "to marry from grief". A rupture of a promise to marry (PU "a breach of promise") was sharply negatively evaluated in English society and a marriage of convenience (PU is the same, "a marriage of convenience") literally means "marriage of (material) benefit".

The archaic Russian expression "венчать с проклятья" with an explicitly expressed estimated meaning "to marry distant relatives after a curse of a priest" is based on an extra-linguistic factor – the desire to protect one's family from sick children who may be born married to relatives. The shameful custom of tying to the feet of girls and boys, who did not marry the last carnivore, "shoes" (splinters, logs, etc.) was "caused" by the need to provide a future generation in Russia, when child mortality was very high. This custom, which was reflected in the PU "dragging a deck", was considered as an opposition to honoring young people: they publicly noted those who did not fulfill their duty. The marriage of convenience found an accurate and vivid expression in Russian phraseological phrase "to marry money".

In the Tatar language we found a PU with pejorative evaluation and unusual semantics: "кыз елату" – "make the young girl cry"; "йөрәк ятмау" – "the heart does not lie" and "җан ятмау (тартмау)" – "the soul does not lie".

In conclusion, it is noteworthy that the peculiarity of the evaluative component of phraseological units in all three studied languages is manifested in the predominance of phraseological units with rationally positive or neutral evaluative meanings, in contrast to the overwhelming majority of other phraseological units with pejorative evaluation. Thus, our material does not confirm the widespread point of view of scientists about asymmetry in phraseology and a significant shift towards negative evaluation. This fact can be explained by the general positive or neutral orientation of the phraseological nomination of extra-linguistic denotations – wedding traditions and realities, since the creation of a new family has a universal value. At the same time, a significant part of the studied phraseological units characterizes the peculiarities of conducting various ceremonies or rituals, or names the participants in the wedding ceremony, objects and phenomena associated with them.

Список литературы

1. Арсентьева, Е.Ф. Фразеология и фразеография в сопоставительном аспекте (на материале русского и английского языков) / Е.Ф. Арсентьева. – Казань : Казанский гос. ун-т, 2006. – 171 с.

2. Гильфанова, Г.Т. Образная коннотация в семантике индивидуально-авторских неологизмов / Г.Т. Гильфанова, Э.Н. Гилязева // Глобальный научный потенциал. – Санкт-Петербург : ТМБпринт. – 2019. – № 2(95). – С. 77–79.

3. Жуков, В.П. Семантика фразеологических оборотов : учеб. пособие для пед. ин-тов /

В.П. Жуков. – Москва : Просвещение, 1978. – 160 с.

4. Кунин, А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка : учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / А.В. Кунин. – М. : Высшая школа, Дубна: Феникс, 1996. – 381 с.

References

1. Arsenteva, E.F. Frazeologiya i frazeografiya v sopostavitelnom aspekte (na materiale russkogo i angliyskogo yazykov) / E.F. Arsenteva. – Kazan : Kazanskiy gos. un-t, 2006. – 171 s.

2. Gilfanova, G.T. Obraznaya konnotatsiya v semantike individualno-avtorskih neologizmov / G.T. Gilfanova, E.N. Gilyazeva // Globalnyy nauchnyy potentsial. – Sankt-Peterburg : TMBprint. – 2019. – № 2(95). – S. 77–79.

3. Zhukov, V.P. Semantika frazeologicheskih oborotov : ucheb. posobie dlya ped. in-tov / V.P. Zhukov. – Moskva : Prosveshchenie, 1978. – 160 s.

4. Kunin, A.V. Kurs frazeologii sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka : ucheb. dlya in-tov i fak. inostr. yaz. / A.V. Kunin. – M. : Vysshaya shkola, Dubna: Feniks, 1996. – 381 s.