

Supra-Word Units with a Turkic Component

Guzel Nurutdinovna Karimullina^{1,*} and Karlygash Kurmangalikyzy Sarekenova²

¹Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; ²Department of Kazakh Linguistics, ENU named after L.N. Gumilyov, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

Abstract: The article presents an analysis of Turkic borrowings in the semantic aspect, particularly features of their functioning within set expressions. The materials for the study are academic dictionaries of the Russian literary language published from the 18th to the 20th centuries. These sources were chosen because the lexical variety of the language becomes, at a particular stage of its development, reflected in lexicographic sources, and most comprehensively – in explanatory dictionaries. This type of reference books is aimed at most fully comprise the everyday vocabulary of a literary language. Comparing the lexicographic sources of various periods, as well as a comparative analysis of the Turkic units contained in them, allows tracing the life of a borrowed word in a language and the stages of its assimilation in the receiving language, and identifying the features of functioning of the Turkic layer in the Russian vocabulary. Supra-word units with a Turkic component are also analyzed from the viewpoint of their lexicographic registration, i.e., in compliance with the parameter indicated in explanatory dictionaries. It was found that during their functioning in the Russian language, Turkisms broaden their sphere of usage and occur within phraseologisms, some of them being registered as early as in the 18th – 19th centuries.

Keywords: Borrowing, Dictionary, lexicography, Russian language, Supra-Word Units.

1. INTRODUCTION

About 40% of all speakers of Turkic languages are native Turkish speakers. The characteristic features of Turkish, such as vowel harmony, agglutination, and lack of grammatical gender, are universal within the Turkic family. The Turkic family comprises some 30 living languages spoken across Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and Siberia (Kenneth, 2002). Turkish is a member of the Oghuz group of languages, a subgroup of the Turkic language family. There is a high degree of mutual intelligibility between Turkish and the other Oghuz Turkic languages, including Azerbaijani, Turkmen, Qashqai, Gagauz, and Balkan Gagauz Turkish (UCLA International Institute, 2007). Russian is a Slavic language that has shares its origins with such languages as Ukrainian or Belorussian and, earlier, Polish or Bulgarian. Most of its vocabulary comes from this common Slavic “stock.” However, a few words in Russian have Turkic origins. They probably entered Russian from the Turkic languages (the group that includes Turkish, Tatar, and Kazakh, among others) spoken in the Golden Horde (Золотая Орда) and the Ottoman Empire (Османская империя). The issue of language contacts has always been within the scope of Russian and foreign linguistics. It is especially topical for a multi-national state like Russia (Kasemu *et al.*, 2019; Galiullina & Sh, 2014). Many researchers today highlight the importance of a comprehensive study of

Turkic elements in the Russian language (Gilazetdinova *et al.*, 2014; Oreshkina, 2013; Kasemu *et al.*, 2019).

Approximately 85% of the population of Turkey speaks Turkish as a first language, although many other ethnic groups such as Kurds, Greek, Judeo-Spanish Ladinos, Armenians, Serbo-Croatians, Circassians, Georgians, Laz, Arabs, etc. live in Turkey. There is no official statistic about ethnic groups who speak any Turkic languages in Turkey other than Turkish. The official language as well as the language of education must be Turkish according to the constitution. Turkish is also spoken by people who live in a large geography outside of Turkey in territories which used to form a part of the Ottoman Empire. Albanians, Macedonians, and others adopted Turkish under the Ottoman Empire. There is a considerable number of people speaking Turkish as a first language in Bulgaria. Turks were settled in Cyprus in the sixteenth century by the Ottoman government. In 1974, the northern part of Cyprus became the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus under Turkey’s protection. A group of Turkish speaking people living in Georgia who are called Meshkhetians or Ahiska Turks who were deported to Central Asia by the government of the Soviet Union. Finally, Turkish is spoken by more than 3 million migrant workers who went to western, central and the northern Europe, (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, France, the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, etc.) during the 1960s and 1970s. In addition to the population of Turkey and former guest workers throughout Europe, Turkish is spoken by

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Applied and Experimental Linguistics, Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; Tel: 89033139724; E-mail: abahman.aa@yahoo.com

indigenous populations in Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Macedonia, Romania, and Bosnia as well as Syria and Lebanon, with approximately 80 million people in the world speaking Turkish as the mother tongue (Boeschoten, 1998).

Studying Turkic borrowings in the Russian language has a long tradition. Researches were carried out on various materials (written records, dialects, the language of mass media, etc.), in various aspects (etymological, semantic, grammatical, comparative, etc.) (Yunaleyeva, 2000; Asfandiyarov, 1991; Desheriev, 1987).

One of the critical indicators of the borrowed word assimilation in a language (including a Turkic word) is its functioning within set expressions, demonstrating, as a rule, broad exploitation of the denoted object and active usage of its name.

Explanatory dictionaries, which we analyze, contain vast information about a word (phonetic-orthographic, grammatical, functional, etc.), which allows forming a detailed idea about the functioning of the Turkic layer of the Russian vocabulary (Islamova *et al.*, 2014; Gushina, 1979). The phraseological component of a dictionary entry comprises catch-words and phrases, proverbs, sayings, and phraseological units with headwords. It should be noted that in most cases, the criterion for inclusion of a set expression into explanatory dictionaries is its frequency of use (Kuhiwczak, 2014).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There have been studies on the subject of this article that have more or less addressed the main issue. Arslan (2017) says: Human beings have been interaction with each other since the beginning therefore they learn foreign languages. To find the most effective method to teach languages, different methods were applied in linguistics. Each method emphasized different aspect of languages. Some focused-on grammar, some emphasized vocabulary. Generally, language learning approaches developed on 2 bases: one that is focusing on structure of the target language (grammar) and the other one that is focusing on practical use of the language. Vocabulary has an important role in language learning and communication. People express their feelings using the vocabulary which was restored in their memories. This natural need motivates learners to learn more vocabulary to maintain life. Vocabulary is so powerful that sometimes

using a single word cluster may give the whole meaning to the opponent The size of vocabulary leads to the development of communicative and productive skills of a learner. Student who do not know enough vocabulary generally fail to express their feelings and ideas among society. Based on the idea of vocabulary is important, in this study we will try to investigate vocabulary acquisition using suggestopedia method. Larsen-Freeman (2014) argues: Modern teaching methods emphasized on motivation, personal differences to make students successful. Suggestopedia in this respect aims to teach students through suggestions and motivation so that every individual can learn at her own pace. Kuhiwczak (2014) says: The selection of the target vocabulary was done in the following way: Students were given a list of vocabulary to be mentioned in the target topics. Students have eliminated the known words. Researchers combined and analyzed the results and prepared a target vocabulary list which contains 206 words. Following an evaluation of the other Turkish Language books for beginners, it was found that Lale Turkish Book for beginners and Sevgi Dili Turkish book for beginners were having the most suitable materials regarding Suggestopedia. He also summarizes trend in conventional language learning as follows: In conventional language learning classrooms, teachers give the language material in a linear mode regardless of students' emotions or feelings. Homework's, test results show that there is little learning in this type of language learning. Due to the low success and retention rate, teachers feel inadequate and quality feel desperate. Depending on the findings and the points mentioned above, Suggestopedia was found effective in teaching languages. Suggestopedia's whole brain learning approach provide an enjoyable learning atmosphere. Aydingün, & Aydingun (2010), states: This research design used mostly in classroom based studies. Placement of the students in language classes randomly is almost impossible therefore the participants are selected according to pre-arranged criteria such as entrance or placement test. To maintain the homogeneity of the classroom, gender and student distribution were emphasized by researchers. Assuming that students were placed in the classes equally in terms of gender, age and other criteria makes both of the groups homogeneous. In this study 2 groups of students chosen randomly by Fatih University Turkish Language Center were given. The first group was taught according to Suggestopedia method and the second group was taught classical approach where teacher student interaction is

minimized. Classical teaching method facilitates textbooks and teacher and does not consider personal differences compared to Suggestopedia method.

3. METHODS

Russian explanatory dictionaries play a significant role in Russian lexicography and studies being based on the results of fundamental work describing lexis. They can implement various approaches, i.e. set phrases, multiword expressions and collocations can be described not only in special sections of the entries but also in the examples, sayings and quotations. Below we will present three main dictionaries of the type, two of them, however, exist only in printed version (Kasemu *et al.*, 2019).

The explanatory dictionaries of the Russian language¹ of the academic type compiled in the 18th-21st centuries were used as the sources: 1) "Словарь Академии Российской" (1789-1794) ("The Dictionary of the Russian Academy", hereinafter AD-1), 2) "Словарь Академии Российской, по азбучному порядку расположенный" (1806-1822) ("The Alphabetical Dictionary of the Russian Academy", hereinafter AD-2), 3) "Словарь церковно-славянского и русского языка" (1847) ("The Dictionary of the Church Slavonic and Russian Language", hereinafter DCR), 4) "Толковый словарь русского языка" под ред. Д.Н.Ушакова (1935-1940) («D.Ushakov's Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language», hereinafter UD), 5) "Словарь современного русского литературного языка" (1948-1965) ("The Dictionary of the Modern Russian Literary Language", hereinafter LAD), 6) "Словарь русского языка" под ред. А.П.Евгеньевой (1981-1984) ("A.P.Evgenieva's Dictionary of the Russian Language", hereinafter SAD), 7) "Толковый словарь русского языка" С.И.Ожегова и Н.Ю.Шведовой (1997) ("Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language" by S.I. Ozhegov and N. Y. Shvedova, hereinafter OD), 8) "Большой толковый словарь русского языка" под ред. С.А.Кузнецова (1998) ("Large Dictionary of the Russian Language" edited by S.A.Kuznetsov, herein-

after LED), 9) "Новый словарь русского языка. Толково-словообразовательный" Т.Ф.Ефремовой (2000), ("New Dictionary of the Russian Language. Explanatory and Word-Formative" by T. Efremova, hereinafter ED). The research uses descriptive method (when analyzing the semantic-functional materials of the thesauri), as well as linguo-statistical (for quantitative characteristics of the Turkisms) and comparative methods.

A core element of an MTM, where the biggest part of data about specific language is stored, is a formalised semantically oriented lexicon called an Explanatory Combinatorial Dictionary (ECD) The ECD is a monolingual dictionary featuring the following five important properties (Mel'čuk 1995):

1. it is active: it is oriented not only toward making texts comprehensive (i.e. providing for the transition from a text to the meaning expressed by it), by also toward assisting the user in the production of texts (i.e. providing for the transition from a meaning to the texts which express it). The objective of this type of dictionary is to give the user as complete a set as possible of the correct means for the linguistic expression of a desired idea.
2. it is generalist (not specialised): the ECD attempts to systemise all synonymic means of expressing a given idea.
3. it includes a great deal of encyclopaedic information, strictly distinguishing the encyclopaedic from the linguistic information proper (it presents them in different sections of a dictionary entry).
4. it pursues theoretical goals: the ECD is completely theory-oriented. It is conceived and implemented within the MT theory, and the lexicographic method used is intimately tied to this general linguistic framework. It is designed primarily for scientific purposes and tries to bridge the chasm between lexicography and theoretical linguistics by laying the basis for an interaction between both fields.
5. it strongly emphasises the systematic, explicit and formalised presentation of all information made available. The ECD allows for the representation of the following three basic types of relations between lexical items (Mel'čuk, 1995):

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The national identity issue emerged in the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century, when the Empire faced

¹Although not a reflection of liberal ideals, the Ottoman Empire had no official language policy or policies that standardized education. For the Ottoman rulers, the main aim was to maintain power and ensure the continuation of the Empire. However, the Turkish Republic was founded with the modernist idea of a nation-state, and therefore it required a common culture. As a result, language and education were standardized to create a Turkish national identity. Adoption of a language policy was one of the most important strategies used by the founders of the Turkish Republic during the process of transition from an empire to a nation-state (Aydingün, and Aydingün 2010).

problems in ensuring the continuation of the social order. The Ottomans' military defeats had encouraged the national revival of the non-Muslim groups within Ottoman borders, and these groups were influenced by Western nationalist movements. In particular, the nationalist movements that emerged in the Balkans had significant influences on the development of Turkish national consciousness and the concept of a national language. The Ottoman Empire faced with nationalism via Balkan nationalisms and Turkish nationalism was developed as a reaction to these. The ideological roots of these nationalisms can be said to lie in the populist movement that emerged in Russia (Berkes, 1975: 231-232). Turkish intellectuals were exposed to these concepts mainly through Turks who had immigrated to Turkey from Russia. The populist movement became a source of inspiration for Turkish intellectuals, including Ziya Gökalp. Over time, as described above, Gökalp played an important role in building Turkish national consciousness and promoting the idea of a national language. He defined 'nation' as follows: "A nation is not a racial or ethnic or geographic or political or volitional entity, but is composed of individuals who share a common language, religion, morality, and aesthetics; that is to say, of those who have received the same education." (Gökalp, 1968: 15).

However, in order to better understand the concept of Turkishness, a more detailed analysis of the willingness of migrant communities to adopt this identity is required. The integration of the non-Turkish Muslim communities that migrated from the Balkans cannot be explained by religious unity alone. The readiness of these people to define themselves as Turks by appropriating Turkish culture and Turkish language was an essential factor. The Turkish state and Turkish intellectuals identified acceptance of culture and language as the main criteria for being recognized as Turks. For example, although Muslim, Arab communities did not adopt Turkishness and therefore were not considered as Turks. This shows that exclusion from or inclusion in Turkishness depended not only depend on state policies since, in line with the constructionist approach, we do not consider such groups as passive actors.

Discussions about the concept of Turkishness that occurred in Turkish Parliament during the preparation of the 1924 Constitution clearly reveal the views of the law-makers of the time. In discussions on Article 88, Hamdullah Suphi Bey, Deputy for Istanbul, objected to the initial text that read, 'the people of Turkey, regardless of religion and race are named as Turks

(Türk itlak olunur)'. He said: It may be an aim for us to give the title of Turk to all people who live within our political borders. However, as you know, we went through a very difficult struggle (war of independence) and we all know in our hearts that the struggle is not over (Gilazetdinova *et al.*, 2014).

After the Turkish Republic was founded, individual members of different cultures that had been living side by side, almost as separate entities, were now supposed to mix together in the public sphere as citizens. The creation and continuation of the nation-state required cultural homogenization, penetration of once-separate communities and weakening of their social boundaries. Groups that had live as closed communities within the social order of the Ottoman Empire, interpreted this process as threat to their social distinctiveness. Muslim or non-Muslim communities of the Balkans or the Caucasus that wanted to adopt the Turkish culture and language were included within the definition of Turkishness with ease. In fact, the discussion about Turkishness that took place during the preparation of the 1924 Constitution also shows that Jews who were willing to adopt Turkish culture and language were also accepted as Turks. Hamdullah Suphi bey said: Someone (meaning a Jew) asked me 'How can I become Turk? Could you please tell me?' I said, 'You can be a Turk. Jews who left Spain and came here with the Spanish language will be Turks after accepting the language of the country and the Turkish schools as their own, like Jews in France, like Jews in England (Gilazetdinova *et al.*, 2014). The influence of the Russian language on Turkish is undeniable. Russian language is the most geographically widespread language of Eurasia, the most widely spoken of the Slavic languages, and the largest native language in Europe. Russian belongs to the family of Indo-European languages and is one of three living members of the East Slavic languages, the others being Belarusian and Ukrainian (and possibly Russian, often considered a dialect of Ukrainian). It is also spoken by the countries of the Russophone. Russian is written using a modified version of the Cyrillic (кириллица) alphabet. The Russian alphabet consists of thirty three (33) letters. Turkish language is a very ancient language and belongs to the Altaic branch of languages. Turkish language is spoken by over 90 million people worldwide. Turkish language speakers are located predominantly in Turkey, with smaller groups in Bulgaria, Cyprus, and other parts of Eastern Europe. Turkish is also spoken by several million immigrants in Western Europe, particularly in

Germany. Like the other Uralic and Altaic languages, Turkish is characterized by vowel harmony and agglutination. Thus suffixes added to the stem of the verb may indicate passive, reflexive, causative, and other meanings. Postpositions are used instead of prepositions. Both the definite article and grammatical gender are lacking (Islamova *et al.*, 2014).

Of the analyzed Turkic lexical elements (about 800 units), a phraseological parameter is present in dictionary entries of over 100 units. The comparative analysis enabled us to distinguish the Turkic borrowings for which set expressions are given in one of the studied dictionaries only. Thus, one may assume that if set expressions with a particular word are present in earlier dictionaries, then the set expression gradually goes out of use; the same in the 20th-century dictionaries is somewhat due to the differences in approaches to describing units in the sources. See the set expressions given for Turkisms in respective dictionaries (the words, which entries contain the respective unit, are written in bold):

in AD-2 – **barysh** s nakladom na odnikh sanyakh ezdyat [profit and loss go in the same sledge = profit and loss go together];

in DCR – zasorit' **bechevu** (snag a tow on something), *kazna kolyalmazhnaya* (tsar's carriages), **karakuli** podmetnyye (iron forks thrown under the hoofs of enemy's horses);

in UD– u vsyakogo svoy vkus: kto lyubit dnyu, kto **arbuz** [everyone has its own taste: some like a melon, some a watermelon]; **kharchi** khozyayskiye, est' – pit' svoyo [senior's meals, eat and drink your own];

in LAD – zolotaya **kisa** [golden pouch]; nabit' **kisu** [fill the pouch]; na **savrasoy** ne obyedesh [you can't trick someone]; kakov **khan**, takova i orda [as the khan, so is the horde = everything depends on the leader]; bit' **shabalu** (fritter away one's time);

in OD – svoy glaz – **almaz** [one's own eye is a diamond = one's own eye is precise]; spit kak **surok** [sleeps like a marmot = sleeps like a log]; khodit' **tabunom** [go in herds]; skolko ni krichi "**khalva**", vo rtu sladko ne stanet [however long you shout "halva", you won't feel sweet taste in your mouth = you can put your boots in the oven, but that won't make them biscuits];

in LED – **alyye** shcheki [scarlet cheeks] (symbol of women's health and beauty).

All explanatory dictionaries give phraseological units for one Turkism only – *karman* [pocket]. Only three phraseologisms are presented in all analyzed dictionaries: *nabit' karman* [fill up a pocket]; *tolstyy, tugoy, polniy karman* [thick, bulging, tight-filled pocket]; *toshchiy* or *pustoy karman* [thin or empty pocket].

In the 20th century dictionaries, there are only two phraseologisms with the Turkism *karman* [pocket]: *derzhi karman shire* [hold your pocket wide open = in your dreams!]; *ne lezt' za slovom v karman* [not to reach into one's pocket for a word = to have a ready tongue]. The rest of the cited set expressions were reflected in some of the analyzed sources (the dictionaries in which these expressions are given are indicated in square brackets): *bit' po karmanu* [hit at one's pocket = be too costly] [SAD; OD; LED]; *veter svistit v karmanakh* [wind is whistling in the pockets = there is no money] [SAD; LED]; *ne po karmanu* [not according to the pocket = not affordable] [SAD; OD; LED], etc.

For the unit *karman* [pocket], as well as for a Turkic word *sobaka* [dog], the analyzed sources give the largest number of set expressions – 15 and 16 units, respectively.

Phraseologisms with the lexeme *sobaka* [dog] occur only in lexicographic sources of the 20th century, and five of them are present in all of them: *vot gde sobaka zaryta* [that's where the dog is buried = that's where the shoe pinches]; *kak sobak nerezan(n)ykh* [as many as unkilld dogs = a lot of]; *sobak veshat' na kogo-nibud'* [to hang all dogs on somebody = to blame somebody for everything]; *sobaku syest'* [eat up a dog = be a specialist in something]; *ustat' kak sobaka* [be tired like a dog = be very tired]; (*kak*) *sobaka nna sene* [(like) a dog on hay = (like) a dog in the manger].

In the 20th century dictionaries, the phraseological component is present in the dictionary entries of 24 Turkisms: *Allah*, *altyn*, *arshin*, *beads*, *money*, *heel*, *boot*, *elephant*, etc. All in all, the analyzed explanatory dictionaries contain over 300 phraseological units and expressions with a Turkic borrowing. Of these, only 25 are present in all lexicographic sources: *ne bylo ni grosha, da vdrug altyn* [there was not a grosh, and suddenly there is an altyn = there was not a small coin, and suddenly there is a large one]; *merit' na svoy arshin* [measure with one's own arshin = judge about somebody or something from one's own viewpoint]; *metat' biser pered svinyami* [cast beads before swine]; *ne funt izyumu* [not a pound of raisins = it's not a trifle]; *pod kablukom* [under a heel = under one's thumb];

khot' karaul krichi [one may shout for help = pretty shitty]; *vot gde sobaka zaryta* [that's where the dog is buried = that's where the shoe pinches], etc.

The set expression cited for a Tuirkism in the phraseology section may sometimes include a derivative formed from the headword: **artelniy chelovek**, *paren'* [artel man, guy = sociable person]; *dlya milogo druzhka i serezhka iz ushka* [an earring for a sweetheart = when a friend asks there is no tomorrow] [OD]; *sognut' kogo v baraniy rog* [bend someone into a ram's horn = make someone obey] [AD-1], etc.

The structure of an entry in explanatory dictionaries allows including to the phraseology section not only a set expression but also an explanation of its meaning and a stylistic comment to it. In the analyzed sources, the semantics is shown, as a rule, for *phraseological units*: ARSHI'N [measure of length], -a, masculine. <...> ♦ **Merit' vsekh na odin arshin** [measure all with the same arshin] — treat everyone with the same requirements without differences. **Merit' na svoe arshin** [measure with one's own arshin] — judge about somebody or something unilaterally, from one's own viewpoint. **Merit' kogo-cto obyknovennym (obshchim) arshinom** [measure somebody or something with a common arshin] — view somebody or something as a common, usual thing <...> [SAD]. *Phraseological expressions* are given with explanations only in earlier dictionaries (AD-1 and AD-2): BRA'GA [home-brewed beer], -i, feminine. <...> **Proverb Bragi chastyya, a ruki odinakiya** [home-brewed beer is frequent and hands are the same], meaning frequent feasts and merrymaking of people who neglect their business for that <...> [AD-1]. In other editions, mainly semantics of proverbs is revealed, while meanings of other set expressions are given inconsistently. See, for example, in OD: BARY'SH [profit] <...> *Ne do barysha, byla by slava khorosha* [it's not the time for profit, but for mere survival = one wouldn't want too much from life, one would simply want to stay alive] (obsolete proverb) <...>; SER'GA' [earring] <...> *Vsem sestram po ser'gam* [give earrings to all sisters = give everyone a good dressing-down] (proverb: all and everyone got something) <...>.

5. SUMMARY

The labeled phraseological expressions and units found in the course of analysis belong to vernacular vocabulary (they are given with labels *vernacular* and *colloquial-substandard*): NABEKRE'N' [aslant] <...> **Mozgi nabekren'** u kogo [one's brain is aslant =

someone is crack-brained] (*vernacular jocular*) – about a person with a folly, strange, light-minded, rash in reasoning [SU]; CHI'REY [furuncle] <...> ♦ **Chirey tebe na yazyk** [Let a furuncle be on your tongue]. *Colloquial-substandard*. Evil wish to someone who tells lies [LED], etc.

Some phraseologisms belong to colloquial speech. It should be noted that such units are not marked in SAD: “Label *colloquial* is not written at phraseological expressions, as most of them belong to colloquial style of speech” [SAD 1981: 9]. Other dictionaries register about 70 units with such stylistic label: ARSHI'N [measure of length] <...> *As if swallowed an arshin* (about a person who stands or sits unnaturally straight; colloquial) <...> [OD]; BALALA'YKA [balalaika] <...> **Besstrunnaya balalayka** [stringless balalaika] (colloquial derogative) – a talkative person, a windbag [SU].

LED presents many set expressions with labels *abusive* and *rude* (9 units), other dictionaries do not give these expressions: *khren ego znayet* [damned if I know], *khren tebe!* [Fuck you!], etc. In our opinion, this is due to the vocabulary composition of this dictionary, which, as stated in the foreword, includes even “the words which till recently remained at the boundary of remote periphery of the literary language (substandard, jargon and abusive words)” [LED 1998: 3].

Several set expressions are marked as obsolete in some dictionaries; some of them are only registered by one dictionary: KA'ZOVIIY [for show] <...> ♦ **Kazoviy konets** [the part for show] (*obsolete*) – the best part, the winsome side of something [SAD]; TOVA'R [goods] <...> *U vas tovar, u nas kupets* [yours is the goods, ours is the buyer] (i.e. you sell, we buy; *obsolete colloquial*) [OD].

It should be noted that stylistic characteristics, given for phraseological units in explanatory dictionaries, do not always coincide. The units, marked in one dictionary as vernacular, in another are marked as colloquial; sometimes stylistically labeled phraseologisms appear without any labels in one of the sources (as a rule, in LED): SOBA'KA <...> **Kak sobak nerezan(n)ykh** [as many as unkilld dogs = a lot of] (*vernacular*) <...> [SAD]; SOBA'KA <...> **Kak sobak nerezan(n)ykh** [as many as unkilld dogs = a lot of] (*colloquial derogative*) <...> [OD]; BARA'N <...> ♦ **Kak baran na noviye vorota** [Like a ram at new gates = staring bluntly, without understanding] (stare at, look at, etc.) (*vernacular derogative*) [SAD] and BARA'N <...> *Ustavilsya*

kak baran na noviye vorota [stares like a ram at new gates = staring bluntly, without understanding]. <...> [LED], etc. In our opinion, such differences in marking are not related to changes in the field of their functioning; rather, they are due to the specific features of presenting material by the dictionaries.

The dictionaries also have no unified approach to qualification of supra-word units. Sometimes set expressions with Turkisms are marked as a proverb in one dictionary and as a saying in another. Most often such differences occur between UD and OD, sometimes LED. See, for example: ALTY'N, -a, masculine <...> **Ne bylo ni grosha, da vdrug altyn** [there was not a grosh, and suddenly there is an altyn = there was not a small coin, and suddenly there is a large one] saying <...> [SU]; ALTY'N <...> **Ne bylo ni grosha, da vdrug altyn** [there was not a grosh, and suddenly there is an altyn = there was not a small coin, and suddenly there is a large one] (proverb) <...> [OD]; ALTY'N <...> * **Ne bylo ni grosha, da vdrug altyn** [there was not a grosh, and suddenly there is an altyn = there was not a small coin, and suddenly there is a large one] (proverb) <...> [LED]; SER'GA' [earring] <...> **Vsem sestram po ser'gam** [give earrings to all sisters = give everyone a good dressing-down] (proverb) [OD]; SER'GA' [earring] <...> **Vsem sestram po ser'gam** [give earrings to all sisters = give everyone a good dressing-down] (saying) <...> [LED].

6. CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the phraseological component of the Turkic borrowings reflected in academic dictionaries of the Russian language enables to more reliably identify the degree of assimilation of the borrowed word. The very appearance of phraseological expressions with Turkic lexical units in the receiving language testifies to their firm entry into the language system (Mardanov *et al.*, 2017; Bobojoaev, 1979). The phraseological units with a Turkic component, which are included into explanatory dictionaries, belong to the core of phraseological composition of the Russian language.

It is important to note that a number of Turkisms occur in bound usage or as part of phraseologisms as early as in the 18th – 19th century dictionaries, which

confirms that they had been already assimilated by the Russian language, while some of them are reflected in modern lexicographic sources, that is, are functioning in the Russian language now as well.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

REFERENCES

- Asfandiayrov, I.U. (1991). Eastern vocabulary in Russian, *Tashkent, Fan*, 122 p.
- Aydingün, A., & Aydingün., I. (2010). The role of language in the formation of Turkish National Identity and Turkishness, August 2010 *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics Autumn 2004*(3) <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537110490518264>
- Bobojoaev, A.B. (1979). Semantic features of turkisms in the Russian language», *Questions of lexical and phraseological semantics*, Rostov n / D, 107-113.
- Boeschoten, H. (1998). "The Speakers of Turkic Languages", in: *The Turkic Languages*, ed. Lars Johanson and Eva A. Csató (London-New York: Routledge).
- Desheriev, Y.D. (ed.). (1987). Mutual influence and mutual enrichment of the languages of the peoples of the USSR. *Moscow, Nauka*, 319 p.
- Galiullina, G. R., & Sh, Y. A. (2014). European linguistic borrowings in the Tatar sprachraum (by written sources of the XIX-XX centuries). *Life Science Journal*, 11(10), 697-700.
- Gilazetdinova, G. K., Edikhanov, I. Z., & Aminova, A. A. (2014). Problems of Ethno-cultural Identity and cross-language communication. *Journal of language and literature*, 5(3), 39-42. <https://doi.org/10.7813/ill.2014/5-3/7>
- Gushina, V.P. (1979). Turkisms in the composition of phraseological units of the Russian language. *Bashkir literature and literary language at the present stage*, Ufa, 113-121.
- Islamova, E.A., Safonova, S.S., & Bolgarova, R.M. (2014). Written Records of the Kazan Region of the XVI century: Historical, lexicological and lexicographical aspects», *Journal of Language and Literature*, 5(4), 321-324.
- Kasemu, S., N Denmukhametova, E., & G Khisamitdinova, F. (2019). Synonyms in Explanatory Dictionary of Turkic Languages. *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2019) July 19-20, 2019, Saint Petersburg, Russia), 1025-1032.
- Kenneth, K. (2002). *Languages of the World* (Third ed.). Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-25004-7.
- Kuhiwiczak, P. (2014). Transculturation and Multilingual Lives: Writing between Languages and Cultures. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*. 2(2), 103-111.
- Mardanov, G. I., Karimullina, G. N., Karimullina, R. N., & Karpenko, T. E. (2017). Complex corpus of turkisms of the Russian language. *SCOPUS23934727-2017-5-10-SID85038967662*.
- Mel'čuk, I 1995, *The Russian Language in the Meaning-Text*
- Oreshkina, M.V. (2013). The Dictionary of borrowings into Russian from the languages of the peoples of Russia and the Near Abroad Countries: principles and concepts. *IV International conference «Language, Culture and Society in Russian / English studies» (22 - 23 July, 2013)*, London, Senate House, University of London, 170 – 173.
- Yunaleyeva, R.A. (2000). Turkisms in Russian language: (Problems of multi-aspect research). Kazan, Taglimat, 172 p.