Albina R. Kayumova, Liliya R. Mukharlyamova, Natalya V. Konopleva,
Irina F. Berezhnaya

GENDER-MARKED IDIOMS DEFINING A MALE PERSON IN TATAR AND ENGLISH

Albina R. Kayumova
Kazan Federal University
Liliya R. Mukharlyamova
Kazan Federal University
Natalya V. Konopleva
Kazan Federal University
Irina F. Berezhnaya
Voronezh State University

Abstract. Gender studies represent an intensively developing field of knowledge. Gender means a set of concepts and norms of behavior, usually associated with persons of male and female gender. Gender issues are at the center of a new interdisciplinary field of human sciences, called "gender studies". The main concept of the categorical apparatus of this direction is "gender" (sociocultural sex), which involves the study of male and female behavior, thinking, and communication. Gender has an all-pervasive ability, which determines its arrangement in the collective and individual consciousness. Phraseological units are a vivid example of the embodiment in the language of characterological features of the worldview of representatives of a particular linguistic community and the means of historical translation of the cultural attitudes of the native speaker of a language. Being stereotypes of the people's consciousness, they serve as a valuable source of information about the people's perceptions, behavior and attitude to this or that phenomenon of culture and represent a fragment of the language picture of the world. This article, firstly, seeks to outline the main steps that gender studies have taken in the field of Tatar and English phraseology. Secondly, it shows the general criteria of selecting gender-specific phraseological units from lexicographic sources. Thirdly, it analyses gender-specific phraseological units nominating a male person in the Tatar and English languages in the comparative aspect..

Keywords: gender marked phraseology, phraseological unit, male gender, Tatar, English, comparative study.

1. Introduction

 "Gender is based on the idea that not only biological and physical differences between men and women are important, but also the social and cultural significance that society attaches to these differences" [1: 148]. The works by Voronina O.A., Goroshko E.I., Kirillina A.B., Malishevskaya D.C., Pushkareva N.L., Tomskaya M.V., Validi J., Bayazitova F.S., Ramazanova D.B., Zamaletdinov R.R. are devoted to the research of gender in the linguistics. "Gender studies of phraseological units are considered important and relevant, since the main problems to which they are directed are the cultural and social factors that shape the public attitude towards women and men <…>. The main component of such studies is the study of various aspects that form (considering the history of the people, national-cultural and etymological features) the main gender concepts" [2: 82].

One of the first works on the gender issue in the field of Tatar linguistics is the notes of Mata-oglu. His article "A Look at a Woman Based on Folk Songs of the Tatars of the Kamsk-Volzhsky Region" (1896) is devoted to the study of the language of Tatar songs and features of the reflection of gender relations in the Tatar language.

As for the social aspect of gender issues, in Tatar society the men-educators were the first to start talking about the social status of women and their equal rights with men. The work of E. S. Khuzina is devoted to the study of gender stereotypes in the Tatar language. The author using provebs and author's aphorisms reveals the dynamics of the development of ideas about a man and a woman in the Tatar language consciousness [3].

Of considerable interest is the research of I.E. Gerasimenko "Language representation of the concept" man "by means of a biomorphic code". The author notes that the assignment of a man to a class animal is a stereotype representation. Numerous internal forms of the metaphors of Leo Tolstoy and F.M. Dostoevsky testify to this fact [4].

In a comparative aspect, the gender metaphors of Russian and English are studied by A.L. Khlebnikov. The linguist comes to the conclusion that the core of the value linguistic picture of the world in both Russian and English is aesthetic and ethical assessments, on the periphery are intellectual, normative and emotional assessments [5].

2. Methodology

The instrument used in this study was a compilation of 103 English and 117 Tatar phraseological units (PUs) denoting a male person. The PUs were selected from English [6, 7, 8] and Tatar mono- and bilingual phraseological dictionaries [9, 10]. The selection was conducted following a semantic criterion put forward by I. Zykova's [11]: PUs with a lexeme indicating a male person in their definition were chosen for the analysis.

Explicit gender-markedness is illustrated in the following examples:

English: **sugar daddy** a rich and usually older <u>man</u> who buys presents for or gives money to a younger person, especially a   woman,   usually   so   that   the younger person will spend time   with   him   and   have a sexual relationship with him

Tatar: **хатын-кыз йө рә ген (башын) ашаучы** lit. the one who eats women's hearts (heads); <u>Don Juan, a lady-killer</u>

The lexemes 'man', 'Don Juan' and 'lady-killer' obtain explicit gender-markedness.[12].

Albina R. Kayumova, Liliya R. Mukharlyamova, Natalya V. Konopleva,
Irina F. Berezhnaya

3. Results

Comparative phraseosemantic analysis of the selected PUs enabled us to classify gender-marked PUs defining a male person into 11 groups (Table 1).

	Phraseosemantic groups	English	Tatar
	Phraseological units nominating mankind generally	2	
	Phraseological units nominating a male with age identification	6	
	Phraseological units nominating kinship relations	3	
	Phraseological units nominating marital status	2	
	Phraseological units characterizing male personality (qualities)	20	5
	Phraseological units characterizing male appearance	10	
	Phraseological units characterizing male behavior	15	1
	Phraseological units characterizing male intelligence/lack of intelligence	6	
	Phraseological units nominating male occupations	27	1
0	Phraseological units nominating male social class	2	
1	Phraseological units characterizing the process of getting engaged, married, divorced and re-married	10	8

4. Discussion

The results presented in Table 1 show that PUs nominating mankind generally are not common; for instance:

English: **son of Adam** – any man or boy; **lord of creation** – any man

Tatar: **ир-ат арасы** – males; **кө чле женес** – *lit.* strong sex, males

PUs nominating a male with age identification are present in both languages; however, English PUs, unlike Tatar, mostly obtain additional phraseological meaning. For example:

English: **old codger** – eccentric old man

Tatar: **ир бала** – a boy; **ир уртасы** – a middle-aged man.

The number of PUs which characterize men according to their kinship relations and marital status are more numerous in Tatar:

English: **lord and master** *humorous* someone's husband

Tatar: **нә сел башы** – *lit.* the head of family; **бала атасы** – *lit.* the father of children, the head of family; **тол ә тә ч** – *lit.* unmarried rooster, a widower

PUs characterizing male personality (qualities) have positive, negative or neutral connotation. PUs with positive connotation define men as having or showing courage and skill in both languages:

English: **the man of iron** – a man of great physical endurance; **a man of his hands** – a man of great ability or skill

Tatar: **ут ашау** – *lit.* to eat fire, to be a courageous man; **егетлек күрсә тү** – *lit.* to show courage (about a man)

PUs with negative connotation define men as being cruel, mean and arrogant in English and boastful, undetermined and arrogant in Tatar; for example:

English: **a wise guy** – a man who speaks or behaves as if he knows much more than other people; **the man of blood and iron** – a cruel man; **a dirty dog** – a low and sneaky person

Tatar: **йон батыр** – *lit.* hero made of wool, a boaster; **ә нисенең итә генә ябышып йө рү** – *lit.* to walk hugging your mother's boot, to be completely under the control of, and fully dependent on mother

PUs with initial neutral connotation can acquire a different one in discourse; for example, English PU '**a Peter Pan**' can stand either for 'a youthful man' or 'an immature man'.

The number of PUs describing men's pleasant appearance is insignificant in both languages. Here are several examples:

English: **tall, dark, and handsome** – an extremely attractive man

Tatar: **чибәр егет** – *lit.* a good-looking young man

There are PUs which characterize height and built; for example:

English: **beer belly** – a man's protruding stomach, caused by excessive consumption of beer

Tatar: **мәhабәт гәүдәле (буйлы)** – of athletic build

The most numerous subgroup in both languages is represented by PUs which characterize men's style or clothes:

English: **Teddy boy** – in Britain, especially during the 1950s, a tough youth wearing a modified style of Edwardian clothes.

Tatar: **пудыр җиңги** – a man who applies cosmetics as much as a woman

The group of PUs characterizing male behavior consists of PUs which define men as being fond of women; for example:

English: **ladies' man** – a man who strives to please women and to attract their attention and admiration; **sugar daddy** – *slang* a wealthy, usually older man who gives money or gifts to a younger person in return for sexual favors or companionship

Tatar: **хатын пәрәст булу** – to be a lady-killer; **эте юкка бүре** – a lover of other men's wives

In addition, this group includes PUs which expose men's bad (sometimes antisocial) behaviour; for example:

English: **lounge lizard** – a man who frequents bars and clubs in an attempt to meet women.

Tatar: **калай этәч** – *lit.* iron cockerel, a man who loves fighting

Both English and Tatar phraseological stocks contain PUs which define men as being completely controlled by a woman:

English: **mama's boy** – *American English* a boy or man who lets his mother look after him and protect him too much, so that people think he is weak

Tatar: **хатын типкесендә булу** – to be henpecked

The vast majority of the PUs of this group are of negative connotation; still several PUs with positive connotation are present:

English: **Prince Charming** – *humorous* a woman's perfect partner

Tatar: **хак мөселман** – *lit.* a true Muslim

PUs characterizing male intelligence/lack of intelligence are not present in Tatar phraseology and uncommon in English:

English: **a half-baked boy** – *slang* a foolish, stupid boy; **boy wonder** – an extremely talented or accomplished boy or young man

The group of PUs nominating male occupations is the most abundant and varied. It includes 27 English and 41 Tatar PUs.

A marked difference is that English phraseological stock contains more PUs denoting soldiers and sailors than Tatar; for example:

English: **red coat** – a British soldier, especially one serving during the American Revolution; **old salt** – an experienced sailor

Tatar: **канатлы җайдак** – *lit.* winged horseman, *archaic* horse warrior

In addition, only English phraseology contains PUs referring to politicians; for example:

English: **Mr. Clean** – a man with power or influence, especially in politics, who is completely incorrupt or adheres to the rules and standards of propriety

PUs defining clergymen are present in phraseology of both languages; still, the phraseological fund of the English language has a small numerical advantage:

English: **black coat** – a clergyman, a parson; **man of the cloth** – a clergyman; **a man of God** – a clergyman

Tatar: **дин әһелләре** – clergymen; **кара тун** – lit. black coat, a monk

Equal amount of PUs defining 'medicine men' and 'best man' are present in the two languages:

English: **medicine man** – (especially among some North American Indian peoples) a person believed to have magical powers of healing, a shaman

Tatar: **ырым-шырым итү** – to be a medicine man

The following list enumerates occupations which have phraseological equivalents only in one of the languages under analysis:

English: a statistician ('a walking gentleman'); a lawyer ('gentleman of the (long) robe'); an innkeeper ('brother of the spigot'); a driver ('knight of the road'); an elevator boy ('a boy in buttons'); a detective, disguised as a police officer ('a plain-clothes man')

Tatar: a coachman ('дилбегә тотучы'); a bodyguard ('җан сакчысы'); a magician ('сихер (тылсым) иясе'); a learned man ('белем (гыйлем) иясе'); a eunuch ('хәрәм ага (агасы)'); a landowner ('җир хуҗасы (биләүче)'); a toastmaster at a wedding ('туй атасы'); an executioner ('үлем балчысы'); an aksakal or a village elder ('ил агасы')

PUs nominating men's social class are exemplified with the following word combinations:

English: **the old man** – the boss, a high-ranking officer

Tatar: **чабаталы морзалар** – *lit.* mirzas wearing bast shoes, *i.e.* Tatar mirzas (princes) who lost social privileges because of their refusal to accept Christianity

PUs characterizing the process of getting engaged, married, divorced and re-married shed light on customs and traditions of the two cultures; for example:

English: **lead (one) to the altar** – to marry someone; **stag party** – a celebration held for a man shortly before his wedding, attended by his male friends only; **a shotgun wedding/marriage** – *old-fashioned* a marriage which takes place because the woman is pregnant (this expression probably refers to the father of a woman, who threatens to shoot the man unless he marries her)

Tatar: **кулын тә къдим итү** – *lit.* to offer one's hand, to propose; **түшә к яңарту** – *lit.* to renew the feather-bed, to re-marry; **кияү пилмә не** – *lit.* pelmeni (dumplings) for a bridegroom and **кияү пә рә мә че** – *lit.* peremech (a round-shaped minced meat pie) for a bridegroom (these expressions refer to Tatar dishes hand-made by brides specially for their husbands-to-be).

5. Conclusion

Thus, it can be concluded that 11 groups of phraseological units defining a male person in English and 10 groups in Tatar were identified. The group nominating male occupations is the most numerous group in both languages. The groups nominating mankind generally and male social class are the smallest in both languages. It is interesting that there is no group characterizing male intelligence/lack of intelligence in Tatar. This fact can be the basis for further research of the material from the culturological point of view.

6.Acknowledgements

References

1. Khuzina E.S. Gender stereotypes in the Tatar language consciousness / Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University. Philology. Art History. Issue. 54. 2011. № 13 (228). P. 147-149

2. Dolgova T.V., Safronova A.I. Gender stereotypes in English phraseological units // In the world of science and art: questions of philology, art criticism and culturology: Coll. artby mater. LXVII Intern. scientific-practical. conf. No. 12 (67). – Novosibirsk: SibAK, 2016. – P. 79-83

3. Khuzina E.S. Representation of gender stereotypes in the Tatar language (on the examples of proverbs and author's aphorisms : the dissertation author's abstract on scientific degree competition k.filol.n .: specialty 10.02.02

4. Gerasimenko I.Y. Linguistic representation of the concept 'man' by means of biomorphous code// Questions of cognitive linquistics. -2008.-No. 3. - P.22-26

5. Khlebnikova A.N. Gender mataphors of the Russian and English languages: metaphorical fragments of the axiological worldview//Tomsk State University Journal, 2017, 415, 16-31.

6. Cambridge Dictionaries Online. http://dictionary.cambridge.org/ (accessed 15 May 2018).

7. Collins. http://www.collinsdictionary.com/ (accessed 15 May 2018).

8. TheFreeDictionary by Farlex Inc. http://www.thefreedictionary.com/ (accessed 15 May 2018).

9. Isanbet, N. (1989). Frazeologicheskiy slovar' tatarskogo yazyka v dvykh tomakh.Phraseological Dictionary of the Tatar language in 2 vol. – Kazan: Tatar publishing house.

10. Salman, M. A., & Borkar, V. C. (2016). New Method to Calculate the Matrix Exponential. International Journal of Engineering, Science and Mathematics, 5(1), 210-218.

11. Zykova, I. V. (2003). Methods of constructing gender in English phraseology. Moscow: Editorial URSS.

12. Tarasova, F.H., Kormiltseva, A.L. The gender marked phraseological units coding female intelligence in the Russian and English languages // Mathematics Education Volume 11, Issue 7, 2016, Pages 2015-2024.

13. Bochina, T.G., Miftachova, A.N. Gender interpretation of the image of a man in a runet // XLinguae. Volume 7, Issue 1, 2014, Pages 2-14.

14. Leysan R. Sharafutdinova ,   Zubayda A. Biktagirova ,   Natalya A. Deputatova , Olimjon H Kasimov Experimental Data On English And French Colour Associations And Some Gender Differences In Their Perception // Revista Publicando, 4 No 13. (1). 2017, 751-762.

15. Auhadeeva L.A. Gender competence of the modern teacher/L.A.Auhadeeva, I.E.Yarmakeev, A.E. Aukhadeev //International Education Studies; Vol. 8, No. 2; 2015.p.32

16. Waldman, David Horacio García, Gerardo Tamez González, and Oswaldo Leyva Cordero. "Factores que determinan la selección de la universidad destino en el ámbito internacional." Opción 34.86 (2018): 235-258.