



## Semantic And Linguistic Characteristics Of Terms Connected With Wedding Ceremony (English, Russian, Tatar Materials)

Umurova Khushvakht Khakimovna<sup>1\*</sup>, Akhmedova Sarvinoz Hikmatovna<sup>2</sup>, Shukurova Madina Askarovna<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Senior teacher of English Linguistics department Bukhara State University, [x.h.umurova@buxdu.uz](mailto:x.h.umurova@buxdu.uz)

<sup>2</sup>Senior teacher, PhD of English Linguistics department Bukhara State University, [s.x.axmedova@buxdu.uz](mailto:s.x.axmedova@buxdu.uz)

<sup>3</sup>Senior teacher, PhD of English Linguistics department Bukhara State University, [m.a.shukurova@buxdu.uz](mailto:m.a.shukurova@buxdu.uz)

**\*Corresponding Author:** Umurova Khushvakht Khakimovna

*\*Senior teacher of English Linguistics department Bukhara State University, [x.h.umurova@buxdu.uz](mailto:x.h.umurova@buxdu.uz)*

In this article, the authors explore the role of language in the formation of cultural identity, using authentic linguistic material (verbal-musical, song). The main task of the study is to find interdisciplinary points of contact in understanding identity as a phenomenon in ethnolinguistics (signs of the language of culture), in linguoculturology, aesthetics (ontology of a work of art, perception and originality of artifacts created by ethnicity). The article uses the method of semantic reconstruction, analyzes the terminology of the wedding ceremony as an integral part of the spiritual culture.

**Keywords:** *cultural identity; ethnolinguistics; ethnic groups; linguoculturology; musical folklore; aesthetic categories; cultural terms; folk rituals; weddings; wedding ceremonies.*

### I. Introduction

The material for reconstruction is verbal and non-verbal stereotypes and norms of ritual behavior, as well as the system of symbols of the ethnic group. An analysis of the terminology of the wedding ceremony of the people made it possible to single out terms associated with ritual actions and ritual participants, motivated by signs of ritual action, and terms associated with subject realities. The most productive morphological types of word formation are affixal derivation, compounding, word combination. The article clarifies the features of cultural identity, the core of which is the consciousness of one's own historicity and authenticity. At the linguistic level, this is fixed in the form of the selection of an individual from a group of people or his inclusion in its composition (personal pronouns, verb endings). We believe that cultural identity is the most important value that allows a person to experience his life as an integral person and as a member of a community, but at the same time allowing him to become a value for another person, for other communities. Considerable attention is paid to the language and folk musical creativity, genre classification of musical folklore. The article touches upon the term "folk song", which contributes to the development of the consciousness of the English, Russian, Tatar ethnos. The authors trace the formation of the wedding ceremony and highlight the English, Russian songs that accompany each stage of the wedding. The idea that the English folk song is a source of reconstruction of the formation of the ethno-cultural identity of the the nations chosen is substantiated.

Language and folklore are inextricably linked with the construction of the category of "nationality", i.e. with ethno-cultural and ethno-confessional identity, which is also characterized by a certain ethnomusical thinking.

## II. Literature review

This article takes an ethnolinguistic approach to the study of Uzbek culture, which allows us to establish the main semiotic and cognitive mechanisms of the existence of the ethnic group. T. V. Tsivyan emphasizes: "... the language code is the only one of the world model codes that can adequately describe" any other (foreign) culture".

Highlighting in detail the semantic aspect of the study reveals the structure of the meaning of phraseological units describing wedding traditions in English, Russian and Tatar. All language units analyzed by us (including those with sentence structure) belong to the class of phraseological units, since they are characterized by phraseological stability, which determines their reproducibility in finished form and identity with all usual and occasional changes.

The main indicators of the stability of phraseological units are the stability of use, semantic complexity (various types of meaning rethinking, including complete and partial), separate form, the impossibility of forming a variable combination of words according to the generative structural-semantic model.

As you know, one of the most important characteristics of phraseological units is rethinking. The method that determines the rethought nature of the meaning of phraseological units is the imposition of a free or variable phrase or sentence, which formed the basis of this expression. Rethinking is observed at the slightest departure from the literal meaning of a phraseological unit, while, as a rule, there is a complete or partial rethinking.

Phraseological meaning is considered by us as a complex hierarchical unity of significative-denotative and connotative components, while the linguistic denotation or the denotative component of meaning, and is a complex, generalized idea of the extralinguistic denotation. Kopylenko M.M. and Popova Z.D. consider the denotation extralinguistic as an extralinguistic concept that can represent "objects, events, phenomena, states, as well as connections, relationships, various fantastic images".

## III. Analysis

The material we are studying contains various extralinguistic denotations related to the attributes of the wedding ceremony, types of marriage, the pre-wedding period, etc. Therefore, for example, in English-speaking countries, there is a tradition to announce the names of those who are getting married in the church, and this action carried out by the priest is an extralinguistic denotation that has received its linguistic expression in the English phraseological unit "call home". In the Russian tradition, there was a symbolic ritual action performed on a young woman who married in a foreign village. She was washed near the pond or pushed into the water. Crossing the river (the border of the worlds) was a typical moment of the wedding ceremony. This "real" denotation has the PU "to wash one's hooves" as its linguistic expression.

The Tatar people had a form of marriage, in which the main character was the matchmaker, matchmaker (*bashkoda*). This word was included as a component of the Tatar phraseological unit *bashkodalap chygu*.

Phraseological units are correlated with their denotations through the medium of significations fixed by linguistic usage. In contrast to the language denotation, i.e. representations, the significant is a concept; significant meaning (sign component of meaning) is the conceptual content of a phraseological unit.

At the same time, it must be emphasized that the concepts fixed in the meaning of phraseological units are not individualized, but typified and socially fixed in society, i.e. are social in nature and to a certain extent reflect the stereotypes that have developed in society.

Thus, the concept that the wedding day is in the vast majority of cases a happy day is reflected in the prototype of the English PU *the happy day*. However, the concept underlying the phraseological meaning includes numerous "component" components: *a happy bride and groom*, their relatives and friends, the bonding procedure, including the church one, the actions of witnesses from the bride and groom, the process of honoring the young, wedding feast, actions of those invited to the celebration, etc. Therefore, the sign component of the meaning in this example is a complex cognitive construction, which includes essential features that are relevant for the English-speaking community.

The role of connotation in the structure of the meaning of phraseological units plays a particularly important role; since phraseological meaning is, a linguistic semantic category used for figurative, expressive and emotional characteristics and enhanced subjective assessment of the phenomena of reality around us. That is why connotation as a component of phraseological meaning is considered in a large number of works of scientists-phraseologists. Significant-denotative and connotative components in the semantics of phraseological units do not exist in isolation from each other, but are closely intertwined with each other. Following the majority of scientists, we include emotiveness, expressiveness and functional-stylistic reference of phraseological units into connotation.

A feature of the manifestation of the evaluative component of the phraseological units we study in all three languages is the predominance of phraseological units with a rationally positive or neutral evaluative value, in contrast to the vast majority of other phraseological units with pejorative evaluativeness. Thus, our material does not confirm the widespread point of view of scientists about the asymmetry in phraseology and a significant shift towards a negative assessment.

This fact can be explained by the general positive or neutral orientation of the phraseological nomination of extralinguistic denotations - wedding traditions and realities, since the creation of a new family has always had a universal human value. At the same time, a significant part of the phraseological units we study characterizes the features of various ceremonies or rituals, or names the participants in the wedding ceremony, objects and phenomena associated with them.

The characteristic features of phraseological units associated with the description of wedding ceremonies in the three compared languages are the predominance of two semas - ameliorative approval and pejorative disapproval, the absence of four pejorative emosems and the presence of emotive mobility in a number of units we study, which combines emosems of disapproval and neglect.

Since the phraseological units we are studying are the designation of wedding traditions, rituals, feelings of love that bind the young, their relationships, etc. and, as a rule, are characterized by vivid and expressive imagery, they are characterized by the presence of the seme of expressiveness in the phraseological meaning, since most expressive phraseological units owe the appearance of the seme of expressiveness of their imagery. A feature of the manifestation of the functional-stylistic component of phraseological units that characterize wedding ceremonies in English, Russian and Tatar languages is that the vast majority of them are related to interstyle ones, i.e. Phraseological units not assigned to a particular style. Among Russian phraseological units, a significant number of obsolete or obsolete units have been identified. From the point of view of semantics, all the phraseological units we study can be divided into three large phraseological-semantic groups: those characterizing the pre-wedding, wedding and post-wedding periods.

The quantitative filling of subgroups indicates both the similarity and the manifestation of specific features: the uneven distribution of phraseological units in some phraseological and semantic subgroups, the presence of subgroups that include phraseological units of only one or two languages. At the same time, a number of phraseological units have been identified that can simultaneously belong to two and, in rare cases, to three phraseological-semantic groups.

#### IV. Discussion

Phraseological units of the first phraseological-semantic group can characterize various attributes and events of the pre-wedding period. Only in the Tatar language, we have identified two phraseological units denoting the places where young people meet: *aulak öy* – “gatherings that were usually held in autumn and winter evenings in their free time”, *kaz omase (yolku)* – “goose help (plucking geese). Girls were invited, who plucked slaughtered geese for a whole day in the air. Young people helped them in this matter, at the same time they looked closely at the girls. These phraseological units testify to the importance of communication between young people in order to choose a suitable couple for the Tatars, because earlier open meetings of boys and girls were not welcomed.

Of particular interest in this regard is the fact that today *kaz omase* is becoming one of the brightest national ritual holidays among the Tatars, significant not only in terms of creating a family, but also as a symbol (more importantly) of preserving national foundations in general.

It is quite natural that the names of the groom, bride, future husband or wife, bachelorette party, stag party and the events taking place on them are also reflected in the phraseology:

*Mr. Right* – “future husband, chosen one”, *Miss Right* – “future wife, chosen one”, *a hen party* – “bachelorette party”, *a stag party* – “bachelor party”, *young prince* – “groom”, *young princess* – “bride”, *hum groom* – “to sing wedding songs to the groom during a bachelorette party”, *kız kichese* – “bachelorette party”.

The theme of the wedding period is well represented in the phraseology of the English and Russian languages and, to a lesser extent, in the phraseology of the Tatar language: *bridal party* – “bride’s relatives”, *a maid of honor* – “bridesmaid”, *best man* – “best man, witness”, *a man of God* – “holy father”, *bride’s man* – “witness from the side of the bride”, *big boyars* – “witnesses from the side of the groom”, *the Khenny regiment* – “brides of the groom”, *the elder boyfriend* – “the main manager of the wedding ceremony (tied with two towels), *the thousandth governor* – “the most honorable person from the groom’s retinue”, *God-given mother* – “mother-in-law, mother-in-law”, *kiyay egetlare*, - “brides of the groom”, *kiyay egete* – “witness from the side of the groom”, *kiyay jingase* – “witness-woman from the side of the groom”, *su yuly kursatyche* – “a person showing the way”. As Russian examples show, the role of the participants in the marriage ceremony was especially high due to the established traditions of the Russian people; it was not for nothing that there was a special term for them – “wedding train”.

The designation in the phraseology of the three languages also received both the name of the wedding itself (or its absence), and the attributes of the wedding celebration, which, in addition to the name of the wedding dress, wedding rings, include the designations of the outfits of other participants in the marriage ceremony, the dishes served on the wedding table, the wedding feast itself etc.: *the happy day* – “wedding day”, *glad rag* – “the best dress”, *cut and come again* – “feast by the mountain”, *a banquet of Luculus* – “a plentiful treat”, *legal wedding* – “wedding with observance of all customs and rituals”, *canine runaway* – “absence of marriage during marriage”, *common table* – “the last treat of those present at the wedding”, *princes’ table* – “a table that is set separately for the young”, *prince’s table* – “a table with pancakes and other treats during the wedding ceremony”, *groom’s liter* – “wine that the groom puts on table, treating their loved ones”, *bairam ashly* – “treat for guests”, *court akchasy* – “money donated to the young at the wedding”, *kilem-kitem kyp bulu (kyp kunak)* – “the presence of a large number of guests at the holiday”, *tui kytaru* – “conduct a wedding”, *toshakkä / tyshakkä utyruchylar* – “bridesmaids guarding the marriage bed until the arrival of the young”.

Phraseological units denoting various realities of the post-wedding period are also presented in all three languages.

Thus, the concept of a honeymoon exists in the phraseological fund of the English, Russian and Tatar languages: *honeymoon*, *медовый месяц*, *ball / shirbat ae*, however, in English one can observe the continuous spelling of *honeymoon*, the phraseological unit *a honeymoon trip* describes the way it is carried out, namely “wedding Journey” of newlyweds – *just married*. There is also a unit in English that is directly related to the honeymoon trip: *bridal suite* – “a hotel room for the newlyweds”.

There are phraseological units in English that colorfully and figuratively characterize husband and wife, as well as new family members: *lord and master* – “husband”, *the old (one’s good) lady* – “wife”, *fresh (new) blood* – “new members families”.

Separate realities and traditions of the post-wedding period are presented in both Russian and Tatar languages: *блинный стол* is “a treat in the house of the young, where relatives from both sides gathered”, *визитная неделя* - “for seven days, relatives of the young come to the newlyweds, who, therefore, treats are arranged on occasion”, *открытый стол* – “after the wedding feast, which lasted three days, the young spouses left for their own house, where they gave a common final feast.

The young wife appeared for the first time without a veil. This feast was called *открытый стол, килен токмачы (салмак)* - “daughter-in-law’s noodles”, *яшь килен чәе* - “tea for the young”.

In three languages, it is also possible to distinguish a subgroup of phraseological units that characterize the features of the joint residence of spouses: *get on like a house on afire (fire)* – “get along with each other, live soul to soul”, *go (run, hunt) in couples* – “be inseparable”, *keep the home fires burning* – “keep the fire in the family hearth”, *cat and dog existence life* – “live like a cat and a dog”, *the gray (grey) mare is the better horse* – “the wife rules the house”, *быть под каблуком*, *рука об руку* (go through life), *душа в душу* (to live), *хранить семейный очаг*, *жить как кошка с собакой*, *бал-майда гына йөзү (бал-май эчендә йөзү)* -



“rolling like cheese in butter”, *аермасы жир белән күктәй, икесе бер кашыктан ашый* - “to live, do not spill water. This also includes the designations in English and Russian of a man or woman temporarily left without a spouse or not living with her / him: *a grass (straw) widower* – “straw widower”, *a grass (straw) widow* – “straw widow”.

The problem of searching for interlingual correspondences of phraseological units for a long time remains one of the main problems in the field of comparative phraseology. Probably, it can be considered one of the “eternal” problems of phraseology, since the various types of interlingual correspondences found when comparing languages are characterized by great diversity, and the study of the revealed similarities and differences at various language levels contributes to a deeper study of the phraseological material of the compared languages, and also serves the needs translation.

Scientists distinguish three main types of interlingual relations: phraseological equivalents (full and partial), phraseological analogues (full and partial) and non-equivalent phraseological units. The main difference between phraseological equivalents and analogues is observed in terms of expression.

Interlingual phraseological equivalents include multilingual phraseological units characterized by identical semantics, structural and grammatical organization and component composition. So phraseological units *honeymoon* in English, *honeymoon* in Russian and *медовый месяц* in Tatar enter into a relation of phraseological equivalence.

The significative-denotative component of their semantics completely coincides, since the extralinguistic denotation, the linguistic denotation (the idea of a given period of the beginning of family life) and the signification (the concept of a given period in the life of a married couple that has developed among peoples who speak three languages) coincide. In the structural and grammatical organization, we observe full correspondence in English and Tatar languages (structure noun + noun), in Russian the first component is an adjective that acts as a determiner of a noun.

In the component composition, we also find full correspondence in English and Tatar languages (components of the letters “honey” and “month”), in Russian – partial correspondence. Thus, in English and Tatar, these phraseological units are full equivalents, which act as partial equivalents in relation to Russian phraseological units. Note that in the Tatar language there is also a variant *шурбәт ае*, in our opinion, demonstrating the oriental flavor of the wedding ceremony among the Tatars (sherbet is an Arabic word borrowed through Turkish).

A significant part of the material studied by us belongs to the group of phraseological analogues, and we can observe the presence of similar correspondences both in three and in two compared languages.

So, for example, PU *miss one's market*, *остаться в старых девах* and *кыз килеш утырып калу* are characterized by the same significative-denotative meaning “do not get married, stay single”, pejorative appraisal, vivid imagery, belong to the class of verbal phraseological units.

We observe the main difference in the component composition – not a single lexeme that is part of the English, Russian and Tatar phraseological units matches, which leads to completely different figurativeness of these units. The same type of phraseological correspondences is typical for phraseological units *старая дева* and *карт кыз*.

Non-equivalent phraseological units include phraseological units that do not have phraseological correspondences in another language. As a rule, such units reflect the features of the material and spiritual culture of peoples – native speakers, specific customs and traditions. When transferring non-equivalent phraseological units into another language, it is advisable to resort to four methods of translation: tracing, descriptive or descriptive translation, lexical translation and combined translation. All four of these methods of translation are presented in different proportions in bilingual phraseological dictionaries. The main requirement for the accuracy of translation in the selection of translation equivalents is compliance with the norms of the receptor language. When using calque, phraseological units of the source language are calque word by word and are organized into a phrase in accordance with the norms of the receptor language (*lead smb to the altar* – “lead someone to the altar”; *marriage is a lottery* – “marriage is a lottery”; *all are good lasses but whence come the bad wives* – “all brides are good, where bad wives come from”; *kiyau munchasy* – “bath for the groom”; *kaz omase / kaz yolku* – “goose help / plucking geese”, etc.).

Descriptive or descriptive translation consists in the reproduction of a non-equivalent phraseological unit of the source language descriptively, i.e. with a phrase or sentence. The undoubted advantage of this type of translation is the complete preservation of the semantics of the phraseological unit being translated, i.e. we can state the complete transfer of the significative-denotative meaning of phraseological units to the receptor language (*name the day* – “set the wedding day”; *set one's cap at smb* – “hunt for the groom”; *May and*

*December* – “young wife and old husband”; *make an honest woman out of smb* – “marry a mistress, legitimize relationships”; *a maid of honor* – “bridesmaid”; *a bread and cheese marriage* – “marriage with the poor”; *the answer to a maiden’s prayer* – “the dream of girls, an enviable groom”; *kыз кымәчләре, katlama keläve* – “cakes that the bride bakes before the wedding”; *kiyay pәрәмәче* – “crosses for the groom-son-in-law”; *tөshәkkә / tyshәkkә utyruchylar* – “bridesmaids guarding the marriage bed until the arrival of the young”; *birna bagu (kortlau)* – “bridesmaid of the bride’s dowry”; *kilen kurenderu* – “young bride”; *su yuly kursatu* – “a ceremony in which the bride is led to the well”; *bashkodalap chygu* – “a form of marriage, in which the main character is a matchmaker”, etc.)

## V. Conclusion

As a result of the comparative analysis, both the significant similarity of the phraseological units under study, due to the commonality of the world around us, the universality of the categories of human thinking (universals of existence, universal grounds and stereotypes for evaluating the wedding), and their national and cultural originality, associated with the peculiarity of the worldview of the peoples – bearers languages, with reflection in the phraseological funds of the studied languages of the history of the development of peoples, national psychology, rituals, echoes of the ancient religious beliefs of the peoples. The significance of the work performed is determined by the prospects for further research that it outlines – phraseological units that reflect the wedding ceremony as a cultural code; originality of their use in oral and literary speech; inclusion in the comparison-comparison of these phraseological units and material from other languages, for example, Turkish, Arabic, German, etc.

## References:

1. Gilfanova D. A. The connotative component of the meaning of phraseological units characterizing wedding ceremonies in English, Russian and Tatar / D. A. Gilfanova. – BRIDGE (language and culture) – BRIDGE (language&culture). – Naberezhnye Chelny: Publishing and Printing Department of the Naberezhnye Chelny branch of the Nizhny Novgorod State Linguistic University. ON THE. Dobrolyubov”, 2013. – No. 31. – Pp. 6-17. (1.4 p.l.)
2. Kopylenko, M. M. On the use of the term "denotation" / M. M. Kopylenko, Z. D. Popova // Semantic categories of comparative study of the Russian language. - Voronezh, 1981. - P. 8.
3. Baklushinsky, S.A. Development of ideas about the concept of "social identity" / S.A. Baklushinsky, E.P. Belinskaya // Ethnos. Identity. Education: Proceedings on the sociology of education / ed. V. S. Sobki-on. - M.: Russian Academy of Education, 1998. - pp. 64-85.
4. Benveniste, E. General linguistics. Chapter XXIII. On subjectivity in language / E. Benveniste. - M.: Progress, 1974. - pp. 292-294. - URL: [helpiks.org/2-3212.html](http://helpiks.org/2-3212.html) (date of access: 01/25/2020). - Text: electronic.
5. Gura, A. V. Correlation and interaction of actional and verbal codes of the wedding ceremony / A. V. Gura // Slavic and Balkan folklore. Semantics and pragmatics of the text. - M. : Indrik, 2006. - p. 268279.
6. Joseph, J. Language and National Identity / J. Joseph. - Text: electronic // Logos. - 2005. - No. 4. - pp. 4-32. - URL: [ruthenia.ru/logos/number/2005\\_04\\_49.htm](http://ruthenia.ru/logos/number/2005_04_49.htm) (date of access: 01/25/2020).
7. Karpushina, L.P. Ethnomusical thinking of personality as a problem / L.P. Karpushina. - Text: electronic // Bulletin of the Tomsk State University. - 2009. - No. 327. - pp. 175-180. - URL: [journals.tsu.ru/vestnik/&journal\\_page=archive&id=840&article\\_id=14076](http://journals.tsu.ru/vestnik/&journal_page=archive&id=840&article_id=14076) (accessed 04/25/2018).
8. Kitanova, M. Ethnolinguistics on the border between two centuries / M. Kitanova // Slavica Slovaca. - 2015. - No. 50, 2. - pp. 103-115.
9. Perekhval'skaya, E. V. Ethnolinguistics / E. V. Perekhval'skaya. - M.: Yurayt, 2015. - 352 p.
10. Pliskova, A. The current state of the Rusyn literary language in Slovakia / A. Pliskova. - URL: [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu) (date of access: 11/25/2019). - Text: electronic.
11. Asafjev, B. V. Hudebni forma jako proces / B. V. Asafjev. - Praha: Statni hudebni vydavatelstvi, 1965. - 402 p.
12. Bartminski, J. Jazyk v kontextu kultury. Dvanact stati z lublinske kognitivni etnolingvistiky / J. Bartminski; Preklad I. Vankova. - Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Nakladatelstvi Karolinum, 2016. - 168 p.
13. Magdalena Ngongo & Nanda Saputra & Lasino Lasino & Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna, 2023. "A Systemic Functional Linguistic Analysis of Clauses Relationship in Luke Gospel Text, Janji Baru Using Kupang Malay," (<https://ideas.repec.org/a/rfa/smcjnl/v11y2023i5p33-40.html>) Studies in Media

- and Communication, (<https://ideas.repec.org/s/rfa/smcjnl.html>) Redfame publishing, vol. 11(5), pages 33-40, June.
14. Isломов Eldor Yusupovich, Ahmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna. The Essence Of Spirituality In The Uzbek Language. Xiii Международная Научно-Практическая Конференция " Язык И Культура"Челябинск, 26 Апреля 2018 Года. - P.12-15
  15. Ermawati Zulikhatin Nuroh(B), Tri Linggowati, and Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna. Beyond the Screen: Exploring Primary English Teachers' Attitudes Towards Digital Learning Management Systems. Beyond the Screen: Exploring Primary English Teachers' Attitudes Towards Digital Learning Management Systems. – P.185-195
  16. Vevy Liansari(B), Sylva Alkornia, and Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna. Speed Reading Boosts Elementary Students' Learning Outcomes in Offline Learning. – P.156-161.