



National and Cultural Specificity of Phraseological Units with a Phytonym Component in English Language

Oksana Vladimirovna Shemshurenko^{1*}, Raushaniya Razulovna Mingazova², Raima Khakimovna Shirinova³

¹ Department of Theory and Practice of Teaching Foreign Languages, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; oksanashemshurenko@gmail.com

² Department of Theory and Practice of Teaching Foreign Languages, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; rushaniyam@mail.ru

³ Department of Uzbek linguistics, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan; Shirinova.raima@gmail.com

Abstract

The focus of the article is on phraseological units in languages with various structural variations and their national and cultural peculiarities. The study's data consisted of English phraseological units with a phytonym component that were collected from works of fiction and phraseological dictionaries of explanatory dictionaries in the language. The evaluative aspect of phraseological units' meaning in the languages under study was the study's primary goal. The authors examine how the category of evaluation is applied to phraseological units in English that have a phytonym component, as well as the positive, negative, and neutral evaluative implications of phraseological units in languages with different structural arrangements. This study uses English phytonymic phraseology to describe mental phenomena that are specific to certain ethnic groups. The paper offers a comparative study of the structural and semantic aspects of phraseological units in the English languages, identifies common and particular characteristics of the cultural meanings associated with phytonyms, as well as common and particular characteristics of the way abstract concepts are conceptualized and the internal and external characteristics of an individual in the languages under study. The analysis of the chosen phraseosemantic groups showed that a sizable portion of English phraseological units with phytonym components are stylistically reduced units. Since more vivid emotional experiences are brought about by negative phenomena in the surrounding reality, the majority of these phraseological units have both the semantic feature of expressiveness and a negative evaluative semantic feature.

Keywords: English Language; Phraseological Unit; Phytonym Component.

1. Introduction

This article's goal is to examine the evaluative aspect of phraseological units in languages with varying structural complexity using English phraseological units with a phytonym component as a model. A stable set of lexemes with a fully or partially rethought meaning is called a phraseological unit. According to Gafiyatova et al. (2016), linguistic stability, semantic integrity, and distinct arrangement are the most typical characteristics of a phraseological unit. It is possible to substitute a phraseological unit within phraseological variability through the relative stability of the lexical composition; morphological stability, or the presence of components with a zero or incomplete paradigm; and syntactic stability, which is linked to the stability of word order in a phraseological unit. The phenomenon of phraseological unit stability is a complex one. It encompasses stability of use, stability at the structural-semantic level, stability of a completely or partially rethought meaning, and variability in phraseological variability. Lexemes that represent plants, their components (stem, root, leaf, etc.), and species (tree, grass, bush) are referred to as phytonyms. Plants can serve as symbols for cultural languages; the names of various plants convey information about the characteristics that are associated with them in various nations. People's cultures and the unique characteristics of national consciousness are reflected in the lexis that represents the plant world and its national specificity. The contrastive analysis provides support for the conclusion that varying degrees of significance of a single culturally specific concept in the consciousness of different individuals mirror people's inner worlds, which are full of judgments, emotions, and a variety of social relationships (Telia, 1977). The role of floristic language units as constituents of phraseological units is equally significant from a cultural perspective. The structure of phraseological meaning, the proportions of its elements, and the position and function of evaluativeness in the operation of the phraseological sign were the topics of the analysis.

2. Literature Review

Phraseology, a serial science concerning fixed expressions with full or partial rethinking of meaning, emerged as a distinct field of study in linguistics only about 40 years ago. Polivanov (1968) emphasized the genesis and causes of this discipline's distinction as a stand-alone scientific field in the latter half of the 20th century. Later, these concepts were developed further in the lectures of eminent linguists like. The fruitful efforts of Markelova (1993) and others helped Phraseology overcome a stage of juvenile development after ten years, and by the middle of the twentieth century, a new subdiscipline about languages had emerged, with its own problems in functional, semantic, and structural aspects as well as its own study object and research methods. Russian phraseology starts to be recognized as a linguistic reality in the West by the end of the 1970s and early 1980s. The Russian School of phraseological analysis dominates global linguistics and achieves unassailable success (Häusermann, 1997). "Recognition of phraseology as an academic discipline within linguistics is evident not only from vigorous and widespread research activity, but also from the publication of several specialized dictionaries reflecting one theoretical perspective or another," states Cowie, an eminent British lexicographer of modern times and the author of a well-known Oxford dictionary of modern English idioms. The influence of "classical" Russian theory, along with its subsequent modifications and extensions, is arguably the most prevalent in contemporary phraseological studies. Its application to the creation and arrangement of dictionaries is unparalleled (Cowie, 1998).

Studies that align with phraseological comparativistics started to emerge towards the end of the 1960s, as evidenced by Teliya (1996) and other studies. A researcher in the field of linguistic typology and the successor to Smirnova et al. (2016) is professor Konopleva & Kayumova (2015), a distinguished linguist. Fundamental studies of comparative phraseology are found in the dissertations of the following linguists: Timergaleeva (2010) for Russian language, Bazarova (2011) for English, and others in the 70th and early 80th centuries. The PU of two long-distance related languages are compared in these dissertations: Russian, a language belonging to the Slavic family, and English, a language belonging to the Germanic group.

3. Methodology

The contextual, word-formation, and component analysis techniques were employed by the writers. Dictionary definitions of phraseological units and their labels were analyzed in order to determine evaluativeness. A comparative-typological method and a method based on a comparative analysis of the seme organization of phraseological units' meaning in various languages were used to determine the types of interlingual semantic correspondences as well as phraseological correspondences between languages. The study's methodology was based on the works of Kunin et al. (2005).

4. Results

Assessments are traditionally classified into three categories: situational, negative, and positive. The negative evaluation part of the meaning of phraseological units correlates with a negative kind of evaluation, a socially fixed negative reaction to an event, fact, or phenomenon (condemnation, contempt, fear, shame). It is noteworthy that the phraseological fund of the languages under study is dominated by the total volume of negative-evaluative phraseological units. Between values of the same lexeme, the negative connotation is maintained (Davletbaeva & Smirnova, 2015). Facts and events that fall between the extremes of the rating scale receive negative ratings; exceptions to the rule are noted and labeled as such ("very large," "very small," "very cold," "too hot," etc.). The existence of a positive, negative, or neutral evaluation in the case of an extralinguistic criterion is linked to some extralinguistic phenomenon (a custom, superstition, legend, fairy tale, nursery rhyme, etc.). Etymological dictionaries are a useful tool for determining this requirement. Phraseological units that register a socially fixed positive reaction to the phenomena of the surrounding reality (approval, admiration, sympathy) are phraseological units with a positive type of evaluation. Within the situational meaning of phraseological units, the evaluative aspect does not express explicit disapproval or endorsement. Phenomenological units that are ambivalent (two-valued) have the ability to contain both positive and negative semes. Different evaluative signs are updated in different contexts. An approach to determining evaluativeness is to examine dictionary definitions and labels for phraseological units. The stylistic coloring of phraseological units in the English language that contain a phytonym component is undoubtedly influenced by their figurative basis. Apart from stylistic labels, we also encounter expressive and emotional labels like accepted, rejected, ignored, hated, and degraded. Phrasmatic units are more often emotionally charged and are denoted in dictionaries by the terms "disparagingly" and "pejoratively." In addition to being emotive, colloquial phraseological units can convey a wide spectrum of emotions. Examples of phraseological units in use include playfulness, irony, dismissal, contempt, and more.

Figurativeness is one of the extralinguistic phenomena that contributes to a phraseological unit's estimated value. Man learns from the natural world by studying flora and fauna. He "tries on" the characteristics and traits of flora and fauna. An association, a "bridge" between a person and a plant or an animal - a signified thing and a signifier - is created by the semantics of approval or disapproval.

A standard is when the attributes of one person or thing are figuratively substituted for those of another person, thing, etc. In this instance, the denoting becomes a symbol of the expressed manifestation of a particular quality or property. The language forms the framework of national culture, which is then transmitted from one generation to the next. While standards may be shared by speakers of various languages, each country has its own unique system of standards. When reality serves as a model or standard, it turns into a cultural "taxon." Many images, symbols, and stereotypes based on values are innate to many different peoples rather than just one. Nonetheless, there is no denying the ethno-national specificity of the figurative-metaphorical reflection of reality.

Depending on how figurativeness is formed, phraseological units can be categorized into two groups: those whose semantics are based on component incompatibility and those whose semantics are based on rethinking free combinations. In the first instance, the entire phraseological complex serves as the carrier of the denotative and connotative components of meaning rather than individual lexemes, which are parts of phraseological units. The internal form is a linguistic combination that has the situation-prototype ingrained in the language. We believe that phraseological units with a basis in the logical incompatibility of components have a richer visual representation. In this instance, the opposition of the connotative elements of the original lexemes' meaning forms the semantics of the phraseological unit. This describes comparative phraseological units more or less. The theory of nominative (substantive, adjective, adverbial, and prepositional) and verbal phraseological units reflects the criterion of syntactic solidarity of phraseological units. Within the framework of phrasal unity, the phraseological unit is syntactically indivisible; it expresses a single sentence element, but because each of its constituent parts is grammatically distinct, the syntactic relationships within it remain intact. Adjective and adverbial phrases convey quality, substantive phrases convey objectivity, and verbal phraseological units convey action. The syntactic functions in which these units are employed fix the relationship to parts of speech.

The denominative function of phraseological units decreases as the evaluative function becomes stronger. Verbal phraseological units are likewise converging with nominal ones in this regard, and their procedural characteristics are becoming less pronounced. Nominal and adjectival phraseological units have the most intrinsic evaluative value. As a result, the estimated value can represent adverbial and nominal phraseological units (subjective and adjective).

5. Discussion

Human existence, social development, and interaction with the outside world all inherently require the evaluative function of human consciousness. Evaluation is a socially constructed phenomenon that is linguistically fixed. This is a universal phenomenon: a person's reflection of the world is always up for interpretation. However, the way that reality is divided into categories can vary greatly amongst societies and civilizations. This is especially true of the way that language refraction, or the semantics of language structures, is evaluated. Logically speaking, evaluation is a complicated construct made up of the subject, object, basis, and type of evaluation. The assessment's modal framework, which represents the speaker's value attitude, is formed by the semantics of these constituents. "The desire to influence the world around us by knowing one's place in it and determining the systemic nature of its objects from the point of view of the social standard of the team and one's own opinion" (Zamaletdinov & Faizullina, 2015) is expressed by this modal frame when superimposed on a statement. The fundamental characteristic of evaluativeness is its resistance to the naming function of language units; in this regard, the examination of phraseological units within the national language appears to be the most fascinating, as their primary function is not nominative or naming, but rather evaluative and reference. The achievement of the speakers' pragmatic goals of effective communication is related to secondary nomination (Sadykova & Mingazova, 2013). As a result, the evaluation is expressed in language as unique linguistic evaluative signs. Due to the multilayered nature of this sign, it is necessary to examine language units at various levels as well as the interactions between different components. Phytonyms, or floral language units, take on the role of symbols for shards of the surrounding world and its attributes. The biological or actual attributes attached to plants play a part in the symbolization mechanism of plants. The cultural vector of symbolization found in myths, folktales, and fiction is equally significant and unquestionably worthy of study.

6. Conclusion

Phraseological features that are allomorphic and isomorphic, variations in how positive and negative semes are implemented, and variations in how concepts are implemented through phraseology are all discernible when comparing the phraseological units of the English languages. Culture, customs, history, and way of life of peoples are extralinguistic factors that explain variations in phraseological unit representation in the studied languages. We believe that a comparative analysis of phraseology across languages is crucial because phraseology is the most reliable source of knowledge about culture, mental stereotypes, and how people perceive the outside world. Comparative analysis of the idioms in various languages can be helpful for creating dictionaries and grammars, spotting oddities in language structure, and developing language teaching methods. Promising field for future research is the analysis of phraseological funds of languages with different structures, which allows one to find ways to evaluate extralinguistic reality and identify the system of correspondences to the value system that has emerged in society.

Acknowledgements

This paper is performed as part of the implementation of the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

References

- Bazarova, L. V. (2011). «Bog» vo frazeologicheskikh edinicah anglijskogo, russkogo, tatarskogo i tureckogo jazykov: dis. ... kand. filol. Nauk, Kazan.
- Cowie, A. P. (1998). *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Application*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Davletbaeva, D. N., & Smirnova, E. A. (2015). Conceptual knowledge in the interpretation of IDIOMS. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 6(1), 240-243.
- Gafiyatova, E. V., Samarkina, N. O., & Shelestova, O. V. (2016). Phytonyms in the Tatar and English languages: comparative analysis. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2), 146-149.
- Häusermann, J. (1997). *Phraseologie: Hauptprobleme der deutschen Phraseologie auf der Basis sowjetischer Forschungsergebnisse*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Konopleva, N. V., & Kayumova, A. R. (2015). Phraseological units semantically oriented to a male person in the English language. *Asian Social Science*, 11(19), 120-127.
- Kunin, A.V. (2005). *Phraseology Course of Modern English*. Dubna: Phoenix. 488 p.
- Markelova, T. V. (1993). *Semantics of evaluation and means of its expression: a textbook for a special course*. M.: MPU, 125 p.
- Polivanov, E. D. (1968). *Stat'i po obshhemu jazykoznaniju*. Moscow.
- Sadykova, A. G., & Mingazova, R. R. (2013). Functioning of phytomorphic metaphor in the artistic discourse of the French and Tatar languages [Electronic resource]. *Modern problems of science and education*, 6. URL: www.science-education.ru/113-11366 (date of access: 04/05/2022).
- Smirnova, E. A., Biktemirova, E. I., & Davletbaeva, D. N. (2016). Semantics vs pragmatics of a compound word. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(14), 6663-6674.
- Telia, V. N. (1977). Secondary Nomination and its Types. *Language nomination. Types of names*. M.: Nauka, 129-221.
- Teliya, V. N. (1996). *Russian Phraseology. Semantic, Pragmatic and Linguoculturological Aspects*. - M.: Languages of Russian culture, - 288 p.
- Timergaleeva, E. R. (2010). Evaluative nature of phraseological units with components of vertical space in Russian. *English and French: dis. Ph.D. Philol. Sciences*, Ekaterinburg.
- Zamaletdinov, R. R., & Faizullina, G. C. (2015). Metaphorization of mythonyms as the way of a person secondary nomination in the Siberian dialects of tatar language. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 6(2), 59-63.

