

## **The Comparative Analysis of Anthropocentric Phraseological Units in Russian, English and Tatar Languages**

Marat Aidarovich Yahin, Liliya Radikovna Sakaeva and Burenkova Olga Mikhailovna  
Kazan Federal University, Pushkin. 1 Tatarstan, Kazan, Russia

---

**Abstract:** Anthropocentricity of modern linguistics is expressed in its focus on the human factor in language in defining and solving such problems as the interrelation of language and human thinking, the relationship between language and society, the relationship between language and spiritual culture, national mentality and folk art, etc. In linguistics anthropocentric principle is related to the study of problems concerning the relationship of man and his language such as: language and the spiritual activity of man; language, human thinking and consciousness; language and human physiology; language and culture; language and communication; language and values of a person. Thus, modern linguistics has concentrated their focus on the human factor in language. And this study is a typical example. The research topic is beyond the scope of anthropocentric actual directions developed in modern linguistics. The study is devoted to the allocation of microspheres to identify allomorphy and isomorphism of phraseological units of anthropocentric orientation with the somatic component in Russian, English and Tatar languages at the semantic level. The researchers give a quantitative characteristic of each group and noted the particulars of individual languages.

**Key words:** Language, linguistic, study, analysis, phraseology.

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

The relevance of the problem is due to the use of material of Russian, English and Tatar languages that belong to different linguistic groups of the Indo-European family of languages (Russian, English) and Altaic families (Tatar) in comparative phraseological study. The growth of intercultural contacts and the dominance of the principles of anthropocentrism in many sciences promotes the study of this problem. The dominance of the anthropocentrism principles makes linguistics common with many other fields of knowledge, because the interest in a person as the center of the universe, and human needs, that determines different types of human activities are, marks the shift, observed in many basic sciences. It is necessary to identify allomorphy and isomorphism of investigated Phraseological Units (PU) at the semantic level.

Somatic code as one of the key codes of Russian, English and Tatar cultures is actualized during categorization of reality, participating in phraseological description of many areas of human life. Its specificity is implemented both in the selectivity of the nomination of separate spheres of human life and quantity of filling phrase-semantic spheres of phraseological units with anthropocentric orientation of the investigated languages.

The similarity in the phraseology of studied languages is manifested in the coincidence of the most characteristic somatic head components and main thematic and semantic categories.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

During the research the following tasks were solved: identification of phraseological units of anthropocentric orientation from phraseological composition of Russian, English and Tatar languages; the allocation and conduction a comparative analysis of anthropocentric oriented phraseological units with the somatic component in Russian, English and Tatar languages. To test the hypothesis, the study is based on the fundamental works of A.V. Kunin, A. D., Reichstein, M. V. Makienko, E. F. Arsentieva, R. A. Yusupova, Z. Z. Gafiatullina, L. K. Bayramova, Y. Dolgoplov, and many other scientists in the field of comparative phraseology. The solution of the assigned tasks will require the use of complex scientific theoretical (the theoretical analysis, specification, modeling) and empirical (the study of literature, manuals, dictionaries) methods of research. During the process of comparative study of PU with antropocentric direction comparative method was implemented, A.V. Kunin's method of phraseological identification and phraseological analysis, component analysis in

combination with the method of vocabulary definitions, the method of synchronous comparison of PU developed by Reichstein (1980). In some cases a statistical method was used as an auxiliary method to clarify the scope of the phraseological units use in the respondents survey. The research base was a phraseological corpus extracted by the method of continuous sampling of anthropocentrically oriented PU from Russian-English-Tatar dictionary by L. R. Sakaeva [Näëääää 2009]. In the selection process more than 17 thousand Russian, English and Tatar PU were subjected to comparative analysis. All somatic vocabulary, depending on the nature of the object category, are distributed in the following layers and their ranks in the research:

**Somonimical vocabulary:** Somonime is the largest section of somatic vocabulary. It is used to denote parts and areas of the human body. The totality of somonimical vocabulary depending on the belonging to the respective area of marked objects is distributed as follows: the names, which are system-wide symbols (lexemes denoting human body); names of head and its parts; name of neck and torso of a person; names of upper and lower extremities.

**Osteon vocabulary:** Osteon vocabulary is used for the nomination of the bones of a human body and their connections. Depending on the belonging to the respective area of marked objects it is distributed as follows: the names of the skeletal system of the human body as a whole; the bones of the head, trunk, upper and lower extremities.

**Splanchna vocabulary:** Splanchna vocabulary is used to name the internal organs of the human body. The totality of splanchna vocabulary of languages under consideration depending on the belonging to the respective area of marked objects is distributed as follows: the names of the internal organs in General; the names of the digestive, respiratory, urinary organs. Angeion vocabulary which is used to name the circulatory system of the human body. This lexical-thematic group constitutes the smallest part in the system of somatic vocabulary.

Sensus vocabulary used to refer to the senses of a human body. Along with Angeion Sensus vocabulary is one of the smallest groups of languages in the system and depending on the belonging to a corresponding denotative sphere of marked objects is distributed as follows: the names of the organs of sight, hearing, organs of smell and taste, organs of touch.

Vocabulary, denoting illnesses, diseases and manifestations of the human body: the names of human diseases and ailments; the names of the manifestations of the human body [Näëääää 2009]. In our study, we focused on three characteristic groups: Phraseological units with somonimical component (“đóëà”-“hand”-“éóë”, “äïëîää”-“head”-“ääø”, “íîää”-“foot”-“äÿê”), with Phraseological units with ñîëäîíîíëè÷äñëè component (“ñ ä ð ä ö ä” - “heart” - “é ? ð ? ê” and “íä÷äíü”-“liver”-“ääâüð/á?âüðü”) and Phraseological units with sensonetics component (“äëàç”-“eye”-“é?ç”, “óöî”-“ear”-“êíëäê”, “ðîò”-“mouth”-“ääûç”, “ÿçûê”-“tongue”-“öäë”).

## RESULTS

Somatic PU are a universal tool of nomination of different objects and events of the real world, demonstrating the principle of anthroposophous worldview, corresponding the surrounding reality with an image of a human. Some functions universal for all the nations were assigned to somatic organs. That led to the fact that some symbolic meaning was assigned to the lexemes denoting these organs: “ðîò/mouth/ääûç” is the symbol of speech; “íîää/foot/äÿê” – the symbol of walking, moving; “äïëîää/head/ääø” – the symbol of wit, intellect, thinking; “đóëà/hand/éóë” – the symbol of action, power; “äëàç/eye/é?ç” – the symbol of sight etc. Somatological PU include all learned components, denoting illnesses, diseases and manifestations of a human organism. Within the frames of the research 3 characteristic groups are examined: PU with somonimical components “đóëà/hand/éóë”, “äïëîää/head/ääø”, “íîää/foot/äÿê”; PU with components “ñ ä ð ä ö ä/heart/é?ð?ê” “äëàç/eye/é?ç”, “óöî/ear/êíëäê”, “ðîò/mouth/ääûç”, “ÿçûê/tongue/öäë” and PU sensonymical components. As the research showed, most of these components are included into quite a lot of PU, what is attributed to the lucidity of the organs' functions that are named by these words, easiness of their allegorical comprehension, branching of their figurative and allegorical meanings system. The analysis of the “MD of PU” showed that there are 3338 PU, what makes up approximately 18% of all the composition - 16% (921 PU in Russian), 18% (1129 PU) in English, 20% (1288 PU) in Tatar from the total number of PU of antropocentric direction in all the languages under consideration. In the dictionary there are also 88 proverbs and sayings with a somatic component. In the “MD of PU” there are 1720 PU with somonimical components “đóëà/hand/éóë”, “äïëîää/head/ääø”, “íîää/foot/äÿê” (478 – in Russian, 574

– in English, 668 – in Tatar languages). Almost all human actions in all spheres of life are connected exactly with hands, this fact has defined the active participation of this word in different PU. In the “MD of PU” there are 574 PU (210 PU in Russian, 183 in English, 181 - in Tatar) with this component. The study of PU with the (ñîàòèçì) «hand» allowed to elicit 10 positive microspheres: PU expressing skill, characterizing good, friendly favor, accolade, respect, honesty, decency, expressing emotional enthusiasm, joy, happiness, merriment, love, describing diligence, desire to work, amazement, characterizing confidence, victory, luck, reflecting volitional conditions, endeavour, zeal, desire, overcoming difficulties, characterizing customs, norms of behavior, patronage, help. PU of (îãéîðàòèâîúé) meaning with the somatic component «hand» are divided into 6 microspheres: PU, expressing common negative condition, characterizing condemnation, carelessness, thoughtlessness, unwillingness, inactivity, expressing disappointment, depression, misery, characterizing avarice and greed, fail, loss. The particularity of English language is eliciting a group of PU describing arrogance. PU, characterizing avarice and greed are noticed in Russian language.

In the “MD of PU” the somatic component “ãîéîâà/head/ââø” is the most productive one. Total number of PU with this component mentioned in the dictionary in all the languages under consideration constitutes 928 PU (245 in Russian, 292 in English, 391 in Tatar language). It is peculiar to most cultures to receive head as the main and most vital part of the body. The languages under consideration are not an exception. PU with the component “head” mostly are included into a semantic field “psychic activity” and connected with concepts such as “thinking”, “memory”, “mental abilities” etc. There are 7 microspheres expressing positive meanings in 3 languages: PU, expressing mental abilities, sound mind, quick-wittedness, having love-tender meaning, expressing happiness, friendly relation, characterizing customs, traditions, characterizing dignity, pride, and 8 microspheres, having negative tinge: PU, expressing danger, risk, difficult situations, death, characterizing moral, physical impact or anaction expressing mental abilities, silliness, short memory, trial, misery, humiliation, disappointment, defining betrayal. PU describing victory and triumph; reflecting financial state; characterizing arrogance, chattiness and boasting; denoting alcoholic intoxication are mentioned only in English. PU, denoting independence and self-sufficiency are typical only for Russian language.

“Leg”-is the main lexeme for the lower extremity in Russian and Tatar languages, while in English it is separated in two zones: “leg” (upper part) and “foot”

(lower part). Within these three languages we examined anthropocentric phraseological units (PU) with this lexeme and distinguished two positive spheres of their usage: PU meaning firmness, support, stability of a person in the world and meaning distance; and two negative spheres: PU meaning psychological humiliation, suppression, submission, dependency; describing a bad state of a person. In Tatar language there are PU with this lexeme with the meaning of good fortune. A leg symbolizes movement, speed. This symbolism also is quite widespread in English and Russian cultures. There are 218 PU with this component marked in dictionaries (23 in Russian, 99 in English, 96 in Tatar).

We examined lexemes derived from organs of a human body and separated the following ones: “ñâðããâ/heart/é?ð?ê”, “îã+âîü/liver/âââüð,á?âüðü”. There are 685 PU with these components marked in dictionaries (185 in Russian, 252 in English, 248 in Tatar). PU with a somatic lexeme “heart” transmit emotional and psychological state of a person. According to this, we distinguished five positive groups: PU nominating positive human qualities: kindness, sympathy, generosity; PU which associated with friendship, joy, and love, because of a common allegory notion about heart as a love organ amongst Russians, Englishmen and Tatars. In addition, we distinguished four pejorative groups: PU naming negative qualities of a person: cruelty, callousness; expressing fright, fear, anxiety, bad presentiment; characterizing offence, disappointment, hatred, suffering, soul torture; expressing sadness, grief, concern. Phraseological units meaning bravery, courage, fortitude, purposefulness were only found in Russian and English languages. PU meaning oath, promise, thought process, working state of a man are only typical for English language. There are 657 anthropocentric PU with this somatic lexeme marked in dictionaries (180 in Russian, 250 in English, 245 in Tatar). Somatic lexeme “liver” plays an important role in a formation of PU in Tatar and Tajik languages. There are only a few PU with this lexeme in Russian language and all of them have negative or ironic meaning. There are two PU with this lexeme in English language. There are a total of 10 anthropocentric PU with a somatic lexeme “liver” marked in dictionaries (5 in Russian language, 2-in English, 3-in Tatar).

Lexemes derived from human senses form one of the smaller parts in language system. There are 913 PU with these lexemes marked in dictionaries (238 in Russian, 303 in English, 372 in Tatar). In current research, we examined PU with somatic lexemes “ãèàç/eye/ê?ç” (303 PU), “óðî/ear/êîèè” (111 PU), “ðîð/mouth/ââüç” (130 PU), “ÿçüê/tongue/ðãè” (244 PU), and “îñî/nose/âîðüî” (145 PU).

We distinguished ten groups with pejorative

meaning amongst the PU with the lexeme “eye”: meaning anger, hatred, despise, threat, deceit, disgust, irritation, envy, jealousy, prejudice, greed; expressing depravity, dissoluteness, impudence; indicating disbelief and distrust; indicating directed observation, examination, “piercing glance”; indicating negative deeds of a person, power, violence; indicating fright, physical condition, weakness, sickness; expressing all kind of vows, curses and will. In addition, we distinguished eleven positive groups: PU indicating good attitude, friendliness; indicating modesty, inexperience, shame, embarrassment; describing interpersonal relations, such as: introduction, meeting, friendship, love, marriage, kinship, good attitude and treatment, a mark of respect, consent, solicitous attitude; meaning surprise, amazement; describing care, worry, friendly attention; expressing efficiency, diligence, experience, intelligence; indicating time characteristic; reflecting traditions and customs. There are 81 PU with this somatic lexeme in Russian language, 119 – in English, 103-in Tatar.

Phraseological units with the somatic lexemes “óõî/ear/êîèâê” (111 PU) and “îîñ/nose/âîðûî” (145 PU) are widespread in all of the considered languages. We distinguished six positive groups amongst the PU with the lexeme “óõî/ear”: describing passion, love, adoration; indicating desire, interest; indicating attentiveness; and five negative: describing apathy, indifference, inattention; stating financial situation or debt; indicating curiosity or flattery. PU meaning victory; indicating maturity and independence; indicating abundance; meaning anger, resentment, wrath, strife, despair and hopelessness are only found in English language. There are 45 marked PU with this lexeme in Russian language, 20-in English, 46-in Tatar.

We distinguished four groups with positive meaning amongst the PU with the lexeme “nose”: meaning nearness; indicating cautious, vigilance. PU describing experience, skill, efficiency and endurance were only found in English language. There are 8 groups of PU with negative meaning: indicating deceit; meaning curiosity; describing a person; meaning despair, hopelessness, defeat; indicating arrogance, power, extravagance, contempt. PU meaning rudeness and insolence; describing infliction of harm; indicating weakness and lack of willpower were only found in English language. There are 41 marked PU with this lexeme in Russian language, 45-in English, 59-in Tatar. We distinguished four pejorative groups within the PU with the somatic lexeme “mouth”: indicating anger; meaning insolence, rudeness, swearing; characterizing person’s communicative activity (these examples could also relate to a group with positive meaning but mostly they have

pejorative characteristics). PU expressing poverty and predicament were only found in English language. In addition, we distinguished three positive groups: PU meaning action; indicating practical activity, purpose and goal achievement. PU expressing prosperity were only found in English language. There are 130 PU with this somatic lexeme (37 in Russian language, 43-in English, 50-in Tatar). We distinguished four negative groups within the PU with the somatic lexeme “tongue”: PU indicating indiscretion, betrayal, anger; meaning confusion, embarrassment, mode of presentation; describing cursing, swearing, curses; expressing flattery, hypocrisy, mockery, humiliation. The last one was only found in Russian and English languages. In addition, we distinguished one positive group: PU expressing thinking, intelligence, human response to any kind of phenomenon. There are 244 marked PU with this somatic lexeme (84 in Russian language, 46-in English, 114-in Tatar).

## CONCLUSION

In the work a multilingual dictionary of PU was analyzed. The analysis showed that there are 3338 PU in the dictionary, what makes up approximately 18% of all the composition-16% (921 PU in Russian), 18% (1129 PU) in English, 20% (1288 PU) in Tatar from the total number of PU of anthropocentric direction in all the languages under consideration. In the dictionary there are also 88 proverbs and sayings with a somatic component. Within the frames of the study 3 characteristic groups are examined: PU with somonymic components “ðóèâ/hand/éóè”, “âîèîââ/head/ââó”, “îîââ/foot/âÿè”; PU with components “ñâðâóâ/heart/é?ð?è” “âèàç/eye/è?ç”, “óõî/ear/êîèâê”, “ðîò/mouth/ââùç”, “ÿçûè/tongue/ðâè”. and PU sensonymic components. As the research showed, these components are included into quite a lot of PU, what is attributed to the lucidity of the organs’ functions that are named by these words, easiness of their allegorical comprehension, branching of their figurative and allegorical meanings system.

The antropocentricity of modern linguistics manifests in its orientation on the human factor in the language, in raising and solving problems such as interaction of human language and human thinking, interactions of language and society, interaction of language and mental culture of nations, national mentality etc. In linguistics the anthropocentric principle is connected with research of problems considering the connection between a human and his language such as: language and mental activity of a human; language, thinking and consciousness of a

human; language and physiology of a human; language and culture; language and communication; language and human values. Thus, modern linguistics has focused its attention on the human factor in language. Attracting somatic material of Russian, English and Tatar languages, that belong to different language groups of Indo-European (English, Russian) and Altaic (Tatar) family to comparative phraseological research is conducted for the first time ever.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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

#### **REFERENCES**

- Asher, R.E. and J.M.Y. Simpson, 1994. *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Pergamon Press, New York, Pages: 3435.
- Cowie, A.P., R. Mackin and I.R. McCaig, 1985. *Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Volume 2: Phrase, Clause and Sentence Idioms*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, Pages: 685.
- Gove, P.B., 1993. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Vol. 2*. Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., Chicago, Pages: 1992.
- Hornby, A.S., 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press, USA., Pages: 1537.
- Naciscione, A., 2001. *Phraseological Units in Discourse: Towards Applied Stylistics*. Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Pages: 283.
- Onions, C.T., 1996. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Reichstein, A.D., 1990. *Comparative Analysis of German and Russian Phraseology*. Vyschaja Shkola, Moscow, Pages: 143.
- Simpson, J., 2008. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, Pages: 333.