



Research of Phraseological Units of the Concept «Beverages Consumption Culture» in the Linguistic Worldview of English, Tatar and Turkish Languages

 Diana F. Kajumova¹,
 Aida Sadykova²,
 Diana Davletbaeva³,
 Liliya Shafigullina⁴,
 Elmira Vildanova⁵,
 Nailya Gafiatullina⁶,
 Diana Khripkova⁷

^{1,2,3,4}Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University

⁵Naberezhnye Chelny Branch of Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University

⁶Kazan National Research Technical University named after A.N. Tupolev - KAI

⁷Gymnasium №12 Named After F.G. Aitova

Corresponding Author: Diana F. Kajumova

E-mail: missdiana7@mail.ru

Article citation: Sadykova, A. & Davletbaeva, D. & Shafigullina, L. & Vildanova, E. & Gafiatullina, N. & Khripkova, D. (2021). Research of Phraseological Units of the Concept «Beverages Consumption Culture» in the Linguistic Worldview of English, Tatar and Turkish Languages, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 5 (5): 152–153.

Received Date: March 7, 2021

Accepted Date: April 18, 2021

Online Date: May 5, 2021

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2021 Applied Linguistics Research Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons, Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to a comparative analysis of the concept of the beverages consumption culture in English, Tatar and Turkish phraseological units (PhUs). PhUs with this concept are interesting for studying the linguistics worldview of English, Tatar and Turkish languages. The relevance of the research is determined by the fact that PhUs are one of the most complex and contradictory concepts in linguistics. The topic of this research is relevant for modern linguistics to identify the features and structure of PhUs of English, Turkish and Tatar languages. The article examines the points of view of Soviet and modern linguists on the origin and features of the concepts of the beverage's consumption culture, its relevance in the scientific world of linguistics. The article deals with the structural - grammatical and structural - lexical features of the expression of PhUs of the compared languages. The general and particular types using the concept in the linguistic worldview are highlighted, as well as their classification. The research results presented in the article are of interest to scientists studying the concepts of PhUs in English, Turkish and Tatar languages. The results can be used both in the study and analysis of cultural and research problems and language learning processes.

Keywords: concepts, linguistics, phraseological units, culture, worldview.

1. Introduction

In recent decades, the focus of linguistic research has shifted to the field of cognitive and, in particular, conceptual research, which focuses on such fundamental problems as the structures of knowledge representation about the world and the ways of their conceptualization in language.

In modern linguistics, there is a great interest in the comparative analysis of languages, an anthropocentric paradigm is being formed, language is considered not only within the framework of its communicative and cognitive function but also as a kind of cultural code of individual linguistic and cultural communities.

The concept of "linguistic worldview" first appeared in the works of L. Wittgenstein (1994), devoted to research in the field of philosophy and logic. In the future, this term began to be used in other sciences, the center of which is the study of man and his interaction with the surrounding world. Modern linguists such as Yu.D. Apresyan (1995), N.D. Arutyunova (1993), A.P. Babushkin (1998), Yu.M. Lotman (1987), G.V. Kolshansky (1961) consider the picture of the world as an ideal formation consisting of structurally organized components, having certain properties, performing its inherent functions, which develop naturally.

Methods

Despite a large number of works on the problems of studying the concept, many researchers note that the term "concept" is interpreted in different ways. V.A. Maslova (2004) believes that this fact is due to the complexity, multidimensional structure of the concept, which is not only thought of by a native speaker but also experienced by them, since it includes associations, emotions, assessments, national images and connotations peculiar to this culture.

As V.A. Maslova (1997) notes, "in all probability, the totality of subject-image-reference ideas about objects, phenomena, with which a person meets more often than with others, generally forms a stable linguistic picture of the reflection of objective reality". Knowledge of this type, according to V.A. Maslova (1997), can deviate as much as necessary from what traditional science would consider objective truth.

By influencing the surrounding world, a person himself is influenced by this world. P.S. Gurevich (1998), for example, believes that the basis of human behavior is a picture of the world, "including, in particular, ideas about the individual and his attitude to society, about freedom, equality, honor, good and evil, about law and work, about the family, about the course of history and the value of time, about the relationship of the new and the old, about death and the soul (the picture of the world is in principle inexhaustible), ... inherited from previous generations and necessarily changing in the process of social practice".

The linguistic worldview, according to V.N. Teliya (1996), is a system of images, concepts, standards, stereotypes, and symbols that represent the knowledge of certain people about the surrounding world.

At the present stage of the development of the science of language, no one doubts the statement that language is a storehouse of science, culture and history. Each nation represents the world through its language in its own way, which is reflected, in particular, in the methods of nomination, predication, attribution and other means peculiar to the language of this ethnic group. However, as noted by linguists, the role of the human factor in language has not yet been sufficiently studied, while the anthropocentric approach to the study of language processes allows us to identify the national specifics of language mechanisms, to determine how a person affects language and how language affects a person and his culture, and, what is especially important, - studies of this kind allow us to study the people, their mentality through language. F.F. Fortunatov (1956-1957), A.A. Shakhmatov (1915), later B.A. Serebrennikov (1998) and many others thought about this in the XIX century. In the works of these scientists, it is convincingly shown that various phenomena from the history of the people are imprinted in their memory and find their linguistic consolidation. Language becomes "a living testimony of the peoples" (Popova & Sternin, 2000).

Results and Discussion

In order to have an idea of the specifics of the figurative vision of the world of the compared peoples, it seems logical to analyze the conceptualization of the world as such in the English, Turkish and Tatar language pictures of the world. In our work, we have combined FE according to key concepts, since this association reflects objectively existing groupings of objects and phenomena of the objective world. The analysis showed that the organization of everyday life, way of life, cultural and moral values, the ability to behave in society are of particular interest for the study of the national-language personality. In this regard, the conceptual field of the culture of alcohol consumption is interesting in our opinion. We consider such lexemes included in the above-mentioned conceptual field as a drink, alcoholic beverage, alcohol.

In Turkish: *içki*, *içkici*, *sarhoş*, *alkolik* and their derivatives.

In English: *drunk*, *alcoholic*, *alcohol* and existing derivatives.

In Tatar – *исерек*, *аракы*, *исерткеч*, *эчәргә* and other derivatives.

Undoubtedly, the PHUs of this concept are a means of reflecting objective reality and contain information about the life of a person in space and time, his pastime, so in English: *be the worse for a drink* – to get drunk, to have too much, to be more cheerful; *blind drunk* – dead drunk, drunk to the point of insanity; *go on a bend* – to drink, to lay for a tie. To tell you the open truth, your Highness, I was the worse of drink. (Stevenson, 2001) - to tell you the truth, Your Highness, I've had too much.

In Turkish: *içkiye vurmak* – to get drunk, to drink; *kendini içkiye kaptırmak* – to indulge in drunkenness; *çamur bir alkolik* – an incorrigible alcoholic, a drunkard.

Let's give an example from the Tatar language: *сәләм бирсән, акылын белән саубуллаш* – if you drink vodka, then say goodbye to your brain; *исереккә диңгез тубыктан* – the sea is knee – deep for a drunken man.

Popular wisdom and the studied examples prove that excessive alcohol consumption and tobacco smoking cause public discontent, hangovers, decreased performance in the short term; in the long term, it causes irreversible damage to internal organs, memory loss, deterioration of mental functioning, insomnia, deterioration of sanity, emotional control. All these characteristics are reflected in the phraseological system of the compared languages. PHUs are extremely negative, carrying a share of sarcasm in Turkish, Tatar and English. For example, in the Tatar language: *аракы аш булмас, бавырга таш булып* – vodka is not a food, but a stone in the liver; *тәмәке белән бергә*

тартучы да яна – along with the cigarette, the smoker also burns it; берәүләр кайгыдан саргая, берәүләр – тәмәкедән – someone turns yellow from grief, and someone from smoking; арагы стаканында батучылар диңгездә батучылардан күбрәк – drowned in a glass of vodka is much more than drowned in the sea; исергәнне төртәсе юк – үзе авар – you should not push a drunk-he will fall down.

There are also a huge number of examples in the phraseology of the Turkish language: içkici - a drinker; bazı insanlar dertlerden sararıyorlar, bazıları sigara içmekten - some people turn yellow from grief, some from smoking; ayakta duramıyacak kadar sarhoş - drunk to the point that he can not stand on his feet; sarhoş edici - intoxicating; sarhoş olmak - drunk, get drunk.

Some examples are interested for researchers of the English language: moisten (wet) one's clay – drink, wet your throat; far gone – in heavy drinking; full as a boot (as an egg as a good as a tick) – shattered, dead drunk, drunk to the point of insanity; full to the gills - drunk to the point of insanity, dead drunk; hit the booze - get drunk, drink deadly; under the influence (of alcohol) – in a state of intoxication; drunkenness reveals what soberness conceals (what soberness conceals, drunkenness reveals) – what is on the mind of a sober person, then on the tongue of a drunk.

The hangover syndrome is also reflected in the phraseology of the matched languages. Symptoms of a hangover, as can be seen from the examples, can include headache, upset stomach, thirst, irritability, dizziness, for example, in the Tatar language: төнлә исерек, көндөз мәлжәрек – the wine-drugged hero is a weak-willed blockhead in the morning; әчтем шәраб, булдым харап - I drank wine and what happened to me; арагы авызга черки булып керә, аждаһа булып чыга – vodka enters the throat like a mosquito, and comes out like a dragon.

Consider examples of the English language: the morning after the morning after a drink, hangover, disappointment; take a hair of the dog that bit you-get drunk; the bruised, the treated, the wedge is kicked out by a wedge; have ahead (on one) – the head hurts from a hangover.

Pronouns, interjections, adverbs, and affixes of belonging in English and Turkish should be considered as means of intensifying the assessment within the framework of word combinations in the anthropocentric aspect in the languages under consideration.

Given the fact that a fairly effective system of anti-alcohol education for schoolchildren has developed all over the world, it is advisable to introduce FE in foreign language lessons that reflect the realities when describing the use of alcoholic beverages, and give examples that prove their extremely negative impact on people.

Conclusion

The linguistic worldview includes a special worldview and worldview of an ethnic group, fixed in the semantics of language units and the conceptual and categorical composition of the language. Categorization allows you to reduce the diversity of a phenomenon to a certain classification. Thus, the linguistic picture of the world is formed not only by the nomenclature of nominative units but to a large extent by the rules of their formation and functioning.

The national linguistic personality, expressed in the phraseological units of Tatar, Turkish, and English, is diverse in verbal-semantic and cognitive-anthropological terms. Showing the external characteristics of a person, phraseological units convey the main features of his inner (spiritual and moral) life. They contain assessments and characteristics of the behavior and actions of a person as an individual, and at the same time reflect the experience and attitude of members of society to each other.

Acknowledgment

This paper has been supported by the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

References

- Apresyan, Yu.D. (1995). *Integral description of the language and system lexicography*. Moscow: School "Languages of Russian culture".
- Arutyunova, N.D. (1993). *Logical analysis of the language. Mental actions*. Moscow: Science.
- Babushkin, A.P. (1998). *Types of concepts in the lexical and phraseological semantics of the language, their personal and national specifics: Abstract of the dissertation of the Doctor of Philology*. Voronezh: Voronezh University Press.
- Fortunatov, F.F. (1956-1957). *Izbrannye trudy*. Moscow: n/a.
- Gurevich, P.S. (1998). *Cultural studies*. Moscow: Gardariki.
- Kolshansky, G.V. (1961). On the question of the content of the language category of modality. *Questions of Linguistics*, 1, 106-112.
- Lotman, Yu.M. (1987). *Several thoughts on the typology of cultures. Languages of culture and problems of translatability: collection of scientific works*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Maslova, V.A. (1997). *Introduction to linguoculturology*. Moscow: Heritage.
- Maslova, V.A. (2004). *Linguoculturology: a textbook for students of higher educational institutions*. Moscow: Publishing Center "Academy".

- Popova, Z.D. & Sternin, I.A. (2000). *The term "concept" in linguistic research*. Voronezh: Voronezh University Press.
- Serebrennikov, B.A. (1988). *The role of the human factor in language: Language and thinking*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shakhmatov, A.A. (1915). *Encyclopedia of Slavic Philology / Department of Russian Language and Literature*. St. Petersburg: An essay on the oldest period of the history of the Russian language.
- Stevenson, R.L. (2001). *Prince Otto*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Teliya, V.N. (1996). *The role of figurative means of language in the cultural and national coloring of the worldview: Ethnopsycholinguistic aspects of teaching foreign languages*. Moscow: I.M. Sechenov MMA; Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1994). *Philosophical works*. Moscow: Publishing House "Gnosis".