

Evaluation Component in the Phraseological Units of the English and Tatar Languages¹

Olesya A. Yarullina², Fanuza H. Tarasova³, Elena V. Varlamova³, & Elena V. Polhovskaya⁴

Abstract

Adjectival phraseological units with the component of evaluation are studied in the article. Semantic peculiarities are basically taken into referred to. General linguistic methods and special linguistic methods were used for investigation. The purpose of the article is to find out the peculiarities of the adjectival phraseological units with the component of evaluation in the English and Tatar Languages. The material is borrowed from English and Tatar monolingual and polylingual dictionaries. The comparative analysis of the adjectival phraseological units with the evaluation component in the English and Tatar languages has not been realized before. Adjectival phraseological units with the evaluation component have been analysed in the article. Semantically the adjectival phraseological units with the evaluation component may express negative or positive attitude to reality, spheres of life, communicative process or to a person. Common and unique features have been found out in the two languages. The conclusions on structure and semantics of the adjectival phraseological units with the quality evaluation component are presented in the article.

Keywords: Adjectival Phraseological Units; Evaluation Component; Comparative Units; Non-Comparative Units.

1. Introduction

The perception and interpretation of the realia surrounding us is different among the representatives of different nations of the world. It manifests itself very clearly in phraseological units of the language as idioms accumulate the knowledge of the people and reflect culture, history, wisdom, beliefs, customs and traditions of the certain ethnic group (<http://rulb.org/en>).

¹ Please cite this paper as follows:

Yarullina, O. A., Tarasova, F. H., Varlamova, E. V., & Polhovskaya, E. V. (2019). Evaluation component in the phraseological units of the English and Tatar languages. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(SP), 1132-1138.

² Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; o.a.yarullina@mail.ru

³ Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia.

⁴ Krimea Federal University

The functional classification of phraseological units, suggested by professor I.V. Arnold is based on the ability to perform the same syntactical function as words. According to this approach the following principal groups of phraseological units are distinguishable:

- a) substantive phraseological units or noun equivalents, e.g. a thorn in the flesh;
- b) verbal phraseological units or verb equivalents, e.g. to catch red-handed;
- c) adjectival phraseological units or adjective equivalents, e.g. penny wise and pound foolish;
- d) adverbial phraseological units or adverb equivalents, e.g. by fair means or foul;
- e) interjectional phraseological units or interjection equivalents, e.g. Well, I never!;
- f) conjunctive phraseological units or conjunction equivalents, e.g. *as long as, on the other hand*;
- g) prepositional phraseological units or prepositions equivalents, e.g. *in the course of, on the stroke of*.

In I.V. Arnold's classification there are also sentence equivalents: proverbs, sayings and quotations, e.g. *The sky is the limit, What makes him tick, I am easy* (<https://studopedia.ru>).

Different types of phraseological units modifications have been widely used by a lot of prominent writers and poets, and even general public however, only the second half of the 20th century witnessed the appearance of the first researches proving the fact that PUs are not completely frozen expressions (Arsenteva & Kayumova, 2014; Eisvandi, et al, (2015).

A phraseological unit is a source of background knowledge connected with history, geography and the way of living of the nation. In the range of contemporary linguistic paradigms, the comparative research of different languages phraseological systems is given a special role (Fedulenkova, 2014; Osman et al., 2018).

Phraseological system (as any other subsystem of language) is characterized by unity of the general and special, and from this point of view its research in the field of theory of language universals is very relevant and opens new perspectives both for linguistics of universals and for phraseological theory (Arsenteva & Nurullova, 2014). Phraseology is one of the sources of vocabulary enlargement and enrichment. It is the most colourful part of vocabulary system, and it describes the peculiar vision of the world by this speaking community. It reflects the history of the nation, the customs and traditions of the people speaking the language. Phraseology forms a special subsystem in the vocabulary system. The units of the subsystem are called differently: phraseological units, phraseologisms, set expressions, idioms.

The group of adjectival phraseological units is selected for the study in the article and primarily the evaluation component is accentuated.

2. Materials and Methods

To realize the study, the researchers selected material from the monolingual and polylingual dictionaries and other literary sources in the Tatar and Russian languages. Among the methods of data analysis are the following ones: descriptive method, based on observation, oppositional analysis of the English and Tatar proverbs, etymological analysis, method of comparative analyses (used to identify and to distinguish main peculiarities and differences of the studied object in the compared languages), statistical method, method of generalization.

3. Results and Discussion

People tend to classify their accumulated experience, then draw some conclusions and generalize this experience (Diaz et al., 2018). In our study after E. F. Arsentyeva we refer to the classical definition of the adjectival phraseological unit: Adjectival phraseological units are those in which attributes are presented by adjectives or predicatives (Byiyk et al., 2017).

The definition of the adjectival phraseological unit is given, it is necessary to consider what an evaluation component is. Adjectives connected with evaluation are rather widely spread in both of the languages – English and Tatar. They are rarely represented by antonymic pairs. Quality evaluation adjectives may characterize the way something is done, appearance, attitude to another person, character of a person. These adjective components are peculiar to adjectival phraseological units. The basic antonymic pairs of the adjective components may be as follows: good – bad/ aybyat, yakhshy – nachar, yaman. These are the most frequently used adjectives for evaluation. But there are also other adjectives characterizing quality, though they are not in antonymic relations to one another. For example, rot, wretched, perfect, ideal, brilliant, great, nice. In the Tatar language such adjectives as almaz may be used. But they are not so common as good/bad/ aybyat, yakhshy – nachar, yaman. As we see evaluation adjectives are of greater variety in the English language than in the Tatar one, their usage is not of the same frequency as well.

There is a standard structural division into comparative and non-comparative adjectival phraseological units. Proverbs and sayings are described as the third structural group. These groups may be found in both of the studied languages, but the frequency of adjectival phraseological units in those groups is not the same.

Within the group of comparative adjectival phraseological units comparative conjunctions as/like and kyebek/shikelle/syiman are used in the English and Tatar languages respectively. The examples of the comparative adjectival phraseological units with evaluation component in the English language are as follows: as good as gold (Kunin, 1984; 324), as good as (Kunin, 1984; 325), as bright as a button (Kunin,

1984; 110). The comparative group of adjectival phraseological units with quality evaluation component is not found in the Tatar language. As we see quality evaluation component is not so widely spread in the structural group of comparative phraseological unit.

The non-comparative group is divided into phraseological units with subordinate and coordinate structure. The examples of non-comparative adjectival phraseological units with evaluation component of subordinate structure are: go from bad to worse (Kunin, 1984; 59), nicer than wise (Kunin, 1984; 533), for the good of (Kunin, 1984; 325), to the good (Kunin, 1984; 325), go to the bad (Kunin, 1984; 59). The same structural group is presented by the following examples in the Tatar language: yaman kerngya kalu (Isyanbyat, 1990; 295), yaman syuzneng yakhshysy (Isyanbyat, 1990; 295), yakhshy kyuz belyan karau (Isyanbyat, 1990; 301). The non-comparative adjectival phraseological units with evaluation component of coordinate structure are: for good (Kunin, 1984; 325), good and good (Kunin, 1984; 325), tommy rot (Kunin, 1984; 643), rough and ready (Kunin, 1984; 643), beau ideal (Kunin, 1984; 407), a bad character (Kunin, 1984; 59) nice and (Kunin, 1984, 533), all very fine and large (Kunin, 1984; 274), fine and dandy (Kunin, 1984; 274). The same structural group is presented by the following examples in the Tatar language: yaman kyuz (Isyanbyat, 1990; 295), yaman yachshy (Isyanbyat, 1990; 295), yakhshy yale (Isyanbyat, 1990; 301), yakhshy syuz (Saphiullina, 2001; 331), ing yachshysy (Isyanbyat, 1989; 310), nachar avyru (Saphiullina, 2001; 188).

To the third structural group we refer proverbs and sayings. That is a rather rich structural group in the English and Tatar languages: he that spares the bad injures the good (Kunin, 1984; 59), he knows best what good is that has endured evil (Kunin, 1984; 325), we know not what is good until we have lost it (Kunin, 1984; 325). In the Tatar language there are numerous examples of proverbs and sayings with evaluation component as well: yakhshy kerngya tyuzmyagyan yaman kerngya tyuzmyaz (Nadirov, 1987; 64), yakhshy kern irtadyan uk kyurenya (Nadirov, 1987; 64), nachar – yokingny achar (Nadirov, 1987; 54), yakhshy eiber kyup bulmas (Saphiullina, 2001; 331), almaz tash tufrakta yatsa da, kyurgyan keshe almiy kalmas (Nadirov, 1987; 45).

In the Tatar language rather curious examples can be met when both positive and negative adjectives as the components of adjectival phraseological units: yaman yakhshy (Saphiullina, 2001; 327). Here the negative adjective is used just to intensify the degree of the positive adjective and the meaning of this phraseological unit is “too good”. In the English language we can also observe such an unusual phraseological unit as: bad is the best (Kunin, 1984; 59), where we can see an adjective component with negative connotation and the superlative degree of the adjective with positive connotation, meaning that there is nothing good ahead. In the proverb yakhshy kyongya tyuzmyagyan yaman kerngya tyuzmyaz (Nadirov, 1987; 64) of the Tatar language we see both of the positive and negative adjectives as well, but here they don't intensify each other but function in antonymic relations.

4. Summary

Phraseological units with evaluation adjective component may have these components in positive, comparative or superlative degree. That is the characteristic of evaluation component in comparison with the adjective components of palatability or parametric components of the adjectival phraseological units.

As we can see according to the results the superlative degree is rather common for the evaluation adjective components in the phraseological units of the English languages: be on one's best behavior (Kunin, 1984; 78), the best of British luck to you (Kunin, 1984; 78), make the best of both worlds (Kunin, 1984; 78), at one's worst (Kunin, 1984; 842), get the worst of smth (Kunin, 1984; 842), make the worst of both worlds (Kunin, 1984; 842). The superlative degrees of these adjectives are also used in the proverbs of the English language: the best is the enemy of the good (Kunin, 1984; 78), if you cannot have the best, make the best of what you have. The comparative degree of the evaluation component is more rarely found: a bit in the morning is better than nothing all day. In the Tatar language the superlative degree of the evaluation component is not used.

The perception of evaluation adjectives coincides in the adjectival phraseological units of the studied languages, that is why it makes no difficulty to guess whether positive or negative notions are meant, it can be clearly seen from the results of the investigation. This is common for both of the languages.

5. Conclusions

- 1) Among adjectival phraseological units with evaluation component those with negative adjectives predominate in the Tatar language and those with positive adjectives predominate in the English language.
- 2) In adjectival phraseological units adjectives in the comparative or superlative degree prevail in the English language, while positive degree is more characteristic of the Tatar language, comparative degree is also used in the English language though not so often.
- 3) Evaluation component is not so widely spread in the structural group of comparative phraseological unit
- 4) In the Tatar language there are examples of both adjective components of negative and positive connotation to be found in one and the same adjectival phraseological unit.
- 5) In the Tatar proverbs with evaluative adjective component the idea is expressed that good things cannot be numerous. We observe the peculiarities of mentality here.
- 6) The basic antonymic pair in the adjectival phraseological units with evaluation component in the English and Tatar languages is good – bad/ aybyat, yakhshy – nachar, yaman.

- 7) In both of the Tatar and English languages we can observe that the number of evaluation components of more emotional characteristic are not so great. Such adjectives as brilliant, perfect, ideal, great, wrecking are not so common for adjectival phraseological unit.

Acknowledgments

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

References

- Arsenteva, E. F., & Kayumova, A. R. (2014). Complex modifications of phraseological units and the ways of their translation. *Life Science Journal*, 11(6), 502-506.
- Arsenteva, E. F., & Nurullova, A. A. (2014). Phraseological units with onomatopoeic components in English and German. *Life Science Journal*, 11(5), 465-468.
- Byiyk, I., Arsenteva, E., & Ayupova, R. (2017). Motivated meaning of phraseological units with colorative components in English and Turkish. *The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication Tojdac April*, 946-951.
- Diaz, Y. D. V., Arsenteva, E. F., & Nikulina, E. A. (2018). phraseological units designating mature age in the English and Russian languages. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 8(10), 423-426.
- Eisvandi, M., Gorji, Y., & Niknejadi, F. (2015). Effectiveness of emotional intelligence on increasing the psychological dimension of quality of life of mothers of educable mentally retarded children in Esfahan in Iran. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 29-31.
- Fedulenkova, T. N. (2014). *Phraseologic area of the national vocabulary in the comparative aspect*. Moscow: Academia Estestvoznaniya.
- Isyanbyat, N. S. (1989). *Tatar tyeleneng phraseologic syuzlege* (Volume I). Kazan: Tatar Kitap Nyashriyate.
- Isyanbyat, N. S. (1990). *Tatar tyeleneng phraseologic syuzlege* (Volume II). Kazan: Tatar Kitap Nyashriyate.
- Kunin, A. V. (1984). *English-Russian phraseological dictionary*. Moscow: Prosveschenye.
- Nadirov, I. N. (1987). *Tatar halyik izhati*. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe isdadelstvo.
- Osman, S., Che Yang, C. N. A., Abu, M. S., Ismail, N., Jambari, H., & Kumar, J. A. (2018). Enhancing students' Mathematical problem-solving skills through bar

model visualisation technique. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(3), 273-279

Saphiullina, F. S. (2001). *Tatarcha-Ruscha phraseologic syzlec*. Kazan: Myagari.