Zh.I. ISSAYEVA
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University
(Kazakhstan, Turkistan), e-mail: zhazira.isaeva@ayu.edu.kz
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9801-8943

LINGVOGENDERAL BASIS OF «MAN» IMAGE IN THE PAREMIOLOGICAL WORLD

Abstract. In this article, the binary pair «Woman: Man», which constitutes the gender characteristic of the macro system «Man», an integral part of the triad «Man-Society-Nature», in the paremiological image of the world is divided into two separate, independent concepts – «Woman» and «Man».

In Kazakh paremiology linguistic characteristics of the concepts «woman» and «man» is provided by the integrity of multilevel micro-frame items of social, socio-ritual, socio-psychological content, reflecting the relationship of social status roles «boy – girl», «father» – «mother», «girl» – «guy», «bride» – «groom», «woman» – «man» and others.

As a result of inter-branch communication between the image of a man with «masculine traits» formed in ethnic consciousness and the image of a woman with «feminine traits» is the image of a «Man» in the language which has been passed through the «sieve» of national culture.

It is determined that gender is the result of a culture that reflects the idea of feminine tenderness and masculine courage, embedded in the traditions, customs, folklore and language of the people. It is assumed that in the collective consciousness of the ethnogenetic community there are gender stereotypes in any case, i.e. simplified or expanded concepts about the characteristics and peculiarities of women and men. Gender linguistics is a new scientific direction in linguistics, which arose in connection with the study of differences in the use of words by men and women in Kazakh linguistics. In the linguistic picture of the world, it is proved that the «female» and «male» signs of the binary pair «woman-man» are marked as a qualitative indicator of the conceptual apparatus of the «Man» macrosystem.

Keywords: Human-society-nature triad, picture of the paremiological world, paremiology, gender studies, gender linguistics, proverbs, sayings, frame, concept, conceptual system, microframe relation, literal meaning of a word, variable meaning of a word.

Ж.И. Исаева
филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор
Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті
(Қазақстан, Түркістан қ.), e-mail: zhazira.isaeva@ayu.edu.kz

Дүниенің паремиологиялық бейнесіндегі
«адам» концептісінің лингвогендерлік негізі

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада «Адам-Қоғам-Табиғат» триадасының құрамдас бөлігі «Адам» макрожүйесінің гендерлік сипаттамасын жасайтын «Әйел: Еркек» бинарлық жұбы дүниенің паремиологиялық бейнесінде «Әйел» және «Еркек» болып екі жеке, дербес концептілерге ажыратылған.

Қазақ паремиологиясында «Әйел» және «Еркек» концептерінің тілдік сипаттамасы «ұл» – «қыз», «әке» – «шеше», «қыз» – «жігіт», «қалыңдық» – «күйеу жігіт», «келіншек» – «ер азамат», т.б. әлеуметтік-статустық рөлдердің өзара байланысын бейнелейтін әлеуметтік-тұрмыстық, әлеуметтік-салт-дәстүрлік, әлеуметтік-психологиялық мазмұндағы көпдеңгейлі микрофреймдік тармақтар тұтастығында қарастырылған.

Еркек бейнесін этникалық санада қалыптасқан «еркектік белгілермен», ал әйел бейнесін «әйелдік белгілермен» кескіндейтін микрофреймдік тармақтар аралық байланыстың нәтижесінде ұлт мәдениеті «елегінен» өткізілген тілдегі «Адам» бейнесі сомдалған. Гендер мәдениеттің нәтижесі ретінде халықтың салт-дәстүр, әдет-ғұрпында, фольклорлық туындыларында, тілінде бекіген әйелдік нәзіктік пен еркектік жүректілік туралы түсініктердің бейнеленетіндігі айқындалған. Ал гендерлік стереотиптер, яғни әйел затына, ер адамға тән қасиеттер мен өзіндік ерекшеліктер туралы жеңілдетілген, оңайлатылған немесе ұлғайтылған түсініктер этногенетикалық қауымдастықтың ұжымдық санасында қайтсе де болатындығы қарастырылған.

Гендерлік лингвистика қазақ тіл білімінде ерлер мен әйелдердің сөз қолданыстарындағы ерекшеліктерді зерттеуге байланысты туындаған, тіл біліміндегі жаңа ғылыми бағыт болып саналатындығы зерделенген. Дүниенің тілдік бейнесінде «ұрғашы-еркек» бинарлық жұбының «әйелдік» және «еркектік» белгілері «Адам» макрожүйесінің концептілік аясының сапалық көрсеткіші ретінде таңбаланатындығы дәлелденген.

Кілт сөздер: «Адам-Қоғам-Табиғат» триадасы, паремиологиялық дүние суреті, паремиология, гендерология, гендерлік лингвистика, мақал-мәтелдер, фрейм, концепт, концептуальдық жүйе, микрофреймдік қатынас, сөздің тура мағынасы, сөздің ауыспалы мағынасы.

Ж.И. Исаева
кандидат филологических наук, ассоциированный профессор
Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави
(Казахстан, г. Туркестан), e-mail: zhazira.isaeva@ayu.edu.kz

Лингвогендерная основа образа «человек» в паремиологической картине мира

Аннотация. В данной статье бинарная пара «Женщина: Мужчина», составляющая гендерную характеристику макросистемы «Человек», неотъемлемую часть триады «Человек-Общество-Природа», в паремиологическом образе мира разделена на два отдельных, самостоятельных концепта – «Женщина» и «Мужчина».

В казахской паремиологии языковая характеристика концептов «Женщина» и «Мужчина» предусмотрена целостностью многоуровневых микрофреймовых пунктов социально-бытового, социально-ритуального, социально-психологического содержания, отражающих взаимосвязь социально-статусных ролей «мальчик» – «девочка», «отец» – «мать», «девушка» – «парень», «невеста» – «жених», «женщина» – «мужчина» и др.

В результате межфреймовой связи, в которой мужской образ изображается «мужскими знаками», сформировавшимися в этническом сознании, а женский – «женскими знаками», сформировался образ «человека» в языке, пропущенном через «сито» национальной культуры. В качестве результата гендерной культуры установлено, что пол отражает представления о женственности и мужественности, закрепленные в традициях, обычаях,

фольклорных произведениях, а также в языке народа. Следовательно, гендерные стереотипы заключены в упрощенных, укрупненных, расширенных представлениях о свойствах и особенностях, свойственных женскому и мужскому началу, которые закономерно существуют в коллективном сознании этногенетического сообщества.

Гендерная лингвистика является новым научным направлением в казахском языкознании, возникшим в связи с изучением особенностей употребления слов мужчинами и женщинами в повседневной жизни. Доказано, что в языковой картине мира бинарная пара «самка-самец» маркируется как качественный показатель концептуальной сферы макросистемы «человек» как «женское», так и «мужское».

Ключевые слова: Триада «человек-общество-природа», картина паремиологического мира, паремиология, гендерология, гендерная лингвистика, пословицы, поговорки, фрейм, концепт, концептуальная система, микрофреймовое отношение, буквальное значение слова, переменное значение слова.

Introduction

«Truth is a single image of reality», «a platform for human vision, perception, understanding of the world», «a means of coordinating and interconnecting various spheres of human life», «the result of human spiritual activity», «the core of association, grouping, unification, communication» which is based on image of the world and the act of world studies and leads to the understanding of the essence of various events and local situations in the world, the formation of subjective images of objective local situations [1, p. 25].

In paremiological linguistic models (proverbs) participating in the formation of the image of the world in language, both the views of the Kazakh ethnos on «universal human nature» and philosophical views and ideas were formed around the concept of «individual», the relationship between man and man, man and society and doctrinal commandments on various aspects are reflected. Proverbs describe the associative relationship of two typical life situations, with background (direct) and variable (indirect) meanings applied to a person in terms of type boundaries and in terms of content boundaries in the form of a set of images. Consequently, in the paremiological image of the world – human behavior, age, gender, worldview, and other properties are reflected in unity, integrity as a result of human sociocultural activity.

It is important to pay attention to the category «gender» when determining the linguistic and sociocultural basis of the interdependence of the trinity «Language: Human: Society», which is depicted on the image of the world. This is due to the fact that the gender of people is closely related to their role in society and affects the result of their socio-cultural activities. Thus, in the linguistic image of the world, which is a deep layer of the image of the world, the category «gender» is characterized by the linguistic and linguocultural basis of the semantic opposition «woman-man» in the language.

Since the first decades of the XXth century, the significant growth of cultural and gender studies in linguistics can be explained by changes at the turn of the century, in particular, the paradigm shift of the humanities. Linguistics of the new century has made the definition of the role of the human factor in language, the main object of the paradigm of scientific research has put important issues on the agenda and requires a revision of the scientific principles of research.

The development of the theory of sociocultural constructivism in linguistics made it necessary to revise the scientific and methodological principles of studying categories related to the age, gender, social status of a person, and another subject, linguistic personality, personal life, and to create a new terminological apparatus of research, give a new meaning to the terms used in other fields of science. This situation can be explained by the fact that the term «gender», which was previously used to denote the social, conditional, institutional, traditional nature of the gender characteristics of people, entered the linguistic scientific cycle.

Gender (the English word «gender» is translated as «zhynys», more precisely – breed, species) – one of the new linguistic terms, which began to stabilize in connection with the study of the linguistic mechanism of expression of gender characteristics in language and communication. The term «gender» entered linguistics as a scientific term in a new sense only after gender studies received the status of an interdisciplinary direction. Until the emergence of the new term, the concept of gender was not ignored in semantic research. This is due to the fact that gender semantics is part of the meaning of many lexical units (man, woman, mother, father, etc.) [2, p. 38-45].

If gender is a biological concept, then gender is a sign of sociocultural existence between the genders, i.e. the term «gender» refers to the sociocultural aspect of gender differences, not natural. Gender is a natural feature of the concepts of «woman» and «man», which gives biological meaning, and cultural and social characteristics that change society and culture – gender differences. Genderology is the science of the female and male structure of culture [3, p. 146].

The representative of gender linguistics A.V. Kirilina tries to distinguish the features of the terms «gender» and «sex», giving a broad understanding of the use of the term «gender» in Russian linguistics. He said: the term «Gender» is widely used in the study of the relationship of the phenomenon of language with a person, culture, society, linguistic personality, while «sex» is considered only as a unit of the phenomenon of language. It is claimed that the «gender» component included in the semantic structure of linguistic units «cannot be replaced by sex, especially in terms of the lexical-semantic component» [2, p. 38-45].

Gender as a result of culture reflects the notions of female politeness and male braveness, enshrined in the traditions, customs, folklore and language of the people. And gender stereotypes, that is, simplified or expanded ideas about the characteristics and peculiarities of woman and man, can return to the collective consciousness of the ethnogenetic community.

The issue of gender in linguistics is studied in relation to the following two problems [4, p. 19]:

1. Language and its reflection of human gender. It is aimed at explaining and describing the linguistic manifestations of gender segregation, as well as assessing the characteristics of men and women and assessing the actions of each of them and their semantic manifestations;

2. Strategies and tactics specific to men and women, gender vocabulary, ways to achieve certain success in communication, vocabulary, syntactic constructions and other communication activities of men and women, linguistic communication, which emphasizes gender differences in the choice of linguistic units.

Research Methods

In discovering the trends in the research study done by researchers, in tracing the contribution of philology towards Kazakh language, and laying a foundation for future researches, qualitative content analysis was employed. Qualitative content analysis was chosen because it aids in summarizing many research papers and presenting a strong and justifiable generalization in the field of research. In this respect, this study aimed to investigate the lingvogenderal basis of «man» image in the paremiological world.

Results

Gender linguistics in the second half of the twentieth century, along with the emergence of new socio-philosophical topical theories in Western countries, there is a strengthening of the idea of feminism, understanding of the socio-cultural conditions of gender division, democratization of society. Gender linguistics is an independent discipline of an interdisciplinary nature, developing in modern Russian linguistics in the socio-psycholinguistic, linguocultural, communicative and discursive directions, originating in the study of grammatical categories of the genus and person, conceptual categories describing the living beings of the world.

Kirilina A.V., Martynyuk A.P., Zemskaya E.A., Kitaygorodskaya M.K., Rozanova N.N., Guseinova I.A., Tomskaya M.V., Goroshko E.I. and others who took on the basis of the researches of J. Lakoff, D. Spencer, M. Block, D. Cameron, O. Espersen and other studies on gender problems in general linguistics of Western linguists, the theory of gender linguistics, the causes and consequences of the theory of feminism in their works consider gender differences in the speech of children and adults, gender metaphors, socio-cultural conditionality of gender, gender stereotypes and asymmetries, linguistic androcentrism, gender conceptual sphere, linguistic image of women and men, linguistic and cultural representation of gender division and other issues.

Gender linguistics is a new scientific direction in Kazakh linguistics, which arose in connection with the study of differences in the use of words by men and women [3, p. 146].

If the science of cultural linguistics is «a scientific direction that considers the manifestation of material and spiritual culture in the national language and linguistic processes» [5, p. 16]», then a part of ethnolinguistics studies and describes the synchronous form of linguistic correspondence and cultural interaction» [6, p. 217.], «In the form of an aggregated model that studies the relationship and interaction of language and culture in terms of their function and reflects this process in a single structure of linguistic and non-linguistic (cultural) units using systematic methods that determine modern priorities and cultural ideas (principles and systems of universal values). It is obvious that gender division leaves a certain imprint on the spiritual and material culture and worldview of people, the result of which is confirmed in the language. Each culture clearly reflects a person's gender identity, tying a person to his role in society, his place, norms and rules of behavior, that is, the mechanisms of socio-cultural regulation. Modern linguistic studies, considering language as a human-oriented phenomenon, describe language not only as a means of cognition, but also as a means of accumulating and transmitting cultural knowledge to future generations. Thus, the gender basis of the image of a person in a language is a linguocultural object.

In the content structure of the macro concept «man», the «female-male» system of contrasts, denoting the semantic connotation of gender, marks the concepts related to the cultural concepts «man» and «woman».

«The chain of ideological symbols, grouped into a multilevel concept, includes both synonymous concepts and intermediate concepts, and antinomic concepts based on general features. The polarity limit of each circuit is shorted to the opposite value. This is the reason why philosophers accept the meaning of a concept as a unit of contradiction due to the dualistic theory of dialectics. M. Eskeeva says that opposite connectors are reflected in the language world through binary pairs. She claims that «A phenomenon is accompanied by the decomposition of meaning in the opposite direction as a result of the polarization of the bound content. The concept of neutrality within the central boundary of binary pairs of antinomic nature maintains a balanced relationship with opposition concepts. The central, neutral point of the binary pair «female-male», which closes the semantic chains of synonymous, intermediate, antinomical meaning, forming the concept «man», is represented in the language by the lexemes human / man» [8, p. 41].

The gender basis of the linguistic models of the concept «man» goes back to the archetypal composition of monosyllabic words *ur- *er common to all Turkic languages. Eskeeva M.K. says: «Linguistic units included in the complex *u -monosyllabic indicate that this person is a secondary monosyllabic, the primary root can be a one-component *u-. In the ancient Turkic language, Uri Urig means «common generation», in medieval monuments the use of the word oglan in the meaning of «child in general» indicates that a person *u- \ *o- was originally used in a general sense, regardless of gender. *er--monosyllabic is not based on u-person, but its more mature and individualized personality is formed on ur-monosyllabic. Considering that the sound u cannot be directly transferred to the sound e, and also proceeding from the fact that the sound e and the contracted i in the ancient Turkic language are subject to interchangeability, the $u \approx e$ correspondence $u\setminus ü \approx o\setminus ö \approx i\setminus i \approx e\setminus ä$ should be considered in context. It is noted that in the process of phonosemantic development, the primary maternal stem of a monosyllabic word *ur- used in the

general sense «reproduction, growth, reproduction» is based on a female lexeme, and a paternal lexeme on a male lexeme» [8, p. 41].

In the linguistic image of the world, the signs of «femininity» and «masculinity» of the binary pair «female-male» are marked as a qualitative indicator of the conceptual framework of the macrosystem «Man». For example, in the Kazakh language, gender differentiation is clearly defined between the anthropomorphic features of concepts related to the inner world of man. Soul, anger, heart, etc. in relation to the inner world. In such concepts, a woman's natural maternal function is intertwined with her place in society (family-hearth), and the «woman's soul» is compassion, softness, beauty, tenderness, inferiority, protection, and so on. It is characterized by symptoms that require a woman from the language team (*qaraqat köz, qolañ şaş, jüregi ezilw;* ¤*Altın bastı ayelden baqır bastı erkek artıq;* ¤*Botasız ingen bozdasa, Balası olgen ananın qaygı-sherin qozgaydı; etc.*). And the masculine differentiation of the concepts of the inner world is characterized by courage, strength, courage, bravery, cruelty, toughness, and so on. Defines the connotative features of the «masculine spirit» (*zagasına zharmasu, qandı kek, kek qaytaru, aybar shegu;* ¤*Bir tentek, bir aqıldı daulassa, Atısqan zhauday bolar;* ¤*Erkek qoy buralqı bolmas;* ¤*Erdin qunı zhuz zhılqı etc.*).

Linguistic characteristics of the concept of «man» are realized through conceptual metaphors. Cognitive models are the basis of conceptual metaphors. Cognitive model can be understood as a stereotypical image that helps to organize, systematize the experience and knowledge about the world. Thus, the concepts of «Woman» and «Man» in the macrosystem «Man» fully include language images in which the gender division of man is hidden or taken into account at the level of real, conscious or unconscious.

If the concepts in the linguistic image of the world are universal, social, ethnopsychological, cognitive and other accumulated over the centuries, then what social factors are axiologically valuable in Kazakhstani society through the system of conceptual education in relation to the binary opposition «Woman» and «Man» of the macro concept «Man», as the relationship between gender differentiation and national mentality is reflected in the language of images created using conceptual metaphors. For example, in the explanatory dictionary of the Kazakh language, the word MAN has two meanings: [9] 1. Male gender of human being is man; 2. Hero, brave. At the lexicological level from the words Er and Erkek (with a meaning man and hero): erdey, erle, erli, ersiz, erlik, ersin(u) erkeksi (u), erkeksiz, erkeksin (u), erkeksire (u), erkektey, erkektik, erkekshe are derived words, er-azamat, erli-baylı, erli-zayıp, erkekzhip (top thread of a spiderweb), erkektas (upper stone of the mill), erkektis (main teeth of a comb) erkek bala, erkek kindik, erkek qoy, erkek minez, erkek shora compound words are formed. There are many names derived from this word. In the collection «Five centuries sing» we can meet such names as Er Targyn, Er Sain, Er Dospanbet, Er Dosai, Er Shoban, Er Zhaksymbet, Er Esim, Er Zhabai, Er Barak, Er Esbolat, Er Isatai, Er Kanai, Er Shenen, Er Kazybek. Apparently, this was due to the positive meaning of the word «hero». In our language, there are many names for boys starting with a word «Er», such as Erbol, Erzhan, Ermurat, Ertore, Erdaulet, Ernur, Ernar, Ertai, Ergali.

At the phraseological level with the participation of the word «Er (hero, adult)»: er qaruı bes qaru, er basına kun tudy, er kezegi ushke deyin, er azamat, er zhigit, er bala, er zhurek, er kokirek, er konil, er qunı, erdin qunı – nardın pulı, erdin qunın eki auız sozben bitiru, esil er, eniregen er, kossiz er, er qara boldı, er murındı, er zhetti, erge shıqtı and other phraseological expressions are formed.

At the paremiological level, the word «Erkek (man)», together with the binary pair «Ayel (woman)» or standing alone, serves as a key word in many proverbs: ¤Er moynında qıl arqan shirimes; ¤Ayel–uydin körki, Erkek–tuzdin korki; ¤Erte turgan erkektin ırısı artıq, Erte turgan ayeldin bir isi artıq; ¤Namıssız erkekti erkek deme; ¤Bir aptalıgın oylamagan qatınnan saqta, Bir aylıgın oylamagan erkekten saqta; ¤Uydi qırıq erkek toltıra almaydı, bir ayel toltıradı; ¤Erkektin qorı – tobashıl, Ayeldin qorı–tabashıl; ¤Erkek dauıstı ayeldin isi bolmas, Qatın dauıstı erkektin kushi bolmas; ¤Erkektin zhamanı qatının zhamandar, Eldin zhamanı batırın zhamandar, etc.

K. Omiraliev in his work «The language of Kazakh poetry of the XV–XIX centuries» says about the poetic expression of the word «Er»: «Makhambet Utemisuly used the word «Er» more than 40 times, and the word «batyr (hero)» only 5 times. The context of the word «Er» is also different. For example, ardaqtı ermen birge olse, asıl eldin balası, tarıgıp kelgen erlerge, enirep zhurgen er edik, kesekti erdin soyımın, mundas erler bolmasa, qızgıshtay bolgan esil er, and so on. The word «batyr» serves as a title, and the word «er» is probably the name of a man who fought against the enemy, a synonymous for «brave man» [10, p. 185].

The acquisition of anthropomorphic and biophysiological distinctive features of the masculine gender in the semantic framework of linguistic units, indicated at the lexicological level with the participation of the words er and erkek, may be associated with the relationship «language-name-motivation». And the phraseological-paremiological level of the language is the worldview of the concept of «Erkek», such as prosperity, unity, happiness, with social aspect power, genus, friends, family, dispute, enemy, slave, etc. and honor, perseverance, courage, dignity, respect combines ethnopsychological aspects and systematizes stereotypical ideas about behavior, actions, deeds, social status of a person in the form of linguistic images.

On the need to pay attention to the internal content of other concepts that have a certain connection with it, intersect at a certain point, in order to reveal the content of a particular concept Pavshenis says: «Revealing the content of any concept is possible only by correlating the content of other concepts with it, i.e. to assimilate some sense of the concept, it is necessary to construct a semantic structure consisting of the available concepts as «interpreters or analyzers of the concept in question, «introduced» into the conceptual system thus constructed» [11, p.106].

An integral part of the «Man-Society-Nature» triad, the «Woman: Man» binary pair, which creates a gender description of the «Man» macrosystem, is divided into two separate, independent concepts in the paremiological image of the world: «A woman and a man». The stereotypical image (cognitive model) of women and men within the framework of their constituent linguistic models, combined with a real life situation, which is noted, described and depicted by proverbs, is a qualitative and critical indicator of the image of «Woman» and «Man» in proverbs. In relation to the inner and outer world of a person, it is the basis for classification into categories of tenderness, shyness, dignity, carelessness, cruelty, heroism, hard working, greed, etc.

The concepts of «woman» and «man» are cognitive («Fate», «Soul and Body», «Life and Death», etc.), social («Fatherland», «Peace», «War», «Labor», «Power», «Freedom», «Friendship», etc.), morality («Wisdom», «Conscience», «Education», «Truth», «Lie», etc.), emotional («Happiness», «Joy», «Mood», «Love», etc.), artifact («Yurt», «Whip», «Dombyra», «Caravan», etc.) is intertwined with the concepts that define human life in a «coordinate system» consisting of the concepts of time, space, number» [12, p. 143].

The binary pair «Man-woman» in the paremiological image of the world is a universal phenomenon reflected in the linguistic image of the world of any nation and the highest basis of human culture. Mythological, primitive, linguistic and in other image of the world, the creation of the world is described in terms of the unity of the binary pair «man» and «woman».

The main, actual feature of the active layer of the universal concept «World» is «The male is principle, he is the father of all living things, and matter is the mother. As a result of their unification, the world arose «concept has its start from the ancient Chinese concept of yin and yang, the Greek myth of androgens, the Slavic and Turkic peoples' notions of «Mother Earth» and «Heavenly Father» date back to ancient mythical and philosophical worldviews. According to ancient cultural, philosophical and mythological views, a man and a woman are opposed to each other and are interpreted as «a woman-chaos, a man regulates it» [13, p.123]. For example, according to the ancient Greek historian Xenophon, «... God created two genders from birth at will: a woman to do housework and a man to work in the street. He made the man body and soul «special», able to withstand the heat and cold, able to go to war. That is why it is considered a shame for a man to stay at home and do household chores, and a woman is better at doing

housework than walking out» [14, p. 22]. The first, god created the earth and the sky. At first the ground was black, without form. Everything was flooded. Seeing this darkness, God created light. The next day, the god divided the flood into two parts, leaving one part on the ground and the other in the form of drops and rain. On the third day, God collected all the water on earth and called it the sea. Then there was the growth of many types of plants. On the fourth day, he created two celestial bodies: one large and one small: the large one is the sun, and the small one is the moon. One comes out during the day, the other - at night. On the fifth day, he created fish and birds that live in the water and in the sky. On the sixth day, he gave the animals a soul. After all, he created Adam to rule over them all. He gave names to animals and birds. However, he suffered from loneliness because he did not have a companion. Knowing this, God put Adam into a deep sleep and created a woman from his rib [15, p. 7].

And Muslim scholars, based on the Qur'an and life experience, consider a woman to be a creature much lower than a man, so they say to men, «If you have a difficult situation and you do not know how to get out of it, invite your friends, entertain them, and then follow their advice. If you do not have a friend, ask the first person you meet for advice and do what he tells you. And if you do not have friends, and you do not meet a stranger who will give you advice, then tell your wife everything, listen to her patiently, and then do exactly the opposite of what he told you» [16, p. 27].

The notion that a woman is created from a man's rib, or connects a woman's social status in society with domestic life, and recognizes a man as the owner of life out of housecores, also occurs in the Kazakh system of cultural values.

«The central point, the core of the conceptual structure of values, mainly serves for the study of culture, and the principle of value is the basis of culture. The presence of a value predicate is an indicator of value. If a cultural figure evaluates a phenomenon as «this is good» (bad, significant, meaningless, interesting, etc.), then this phenomenon forms a concept in this culture» [17, p. 42]. The set of Kazakh views and values referring to man and woman forms the cultural concepts of «Woman» and «Man».

In terms of the «continuity of language and culture», «a concept is a meaning that is culturally labeled and verbalized. This is expressed in the boundaries of the content, which form the lexical-semantic paradigm in the (cultural) language. In other words, the concept is the main cell of linguistic consciousness, the mental world of the collective, the unity of collective knowledge with the language type and ethnocultural characteristics» [17, p. 35]. Thus, the analysis of the ethnocultural and social background, which is reflected in the content of the lexico-semantic paradigm of linguistic units in relation to women and men in the Kazakh language, is intended to reveal the essence of the concepts of «Woman» and «Man».

The concepts of «woman» and «man» in Kazakh paremiology are «father» – «mother», «girlfriend» – «boyfriend», «bride» – «groom», «wife» – «husband», etc. is manifested in the form of a multilevel macro-frame of social, socio-traditional, socio-psychological content, reflecting the ratio of social-status roles.

Cognitively, the word «frame» in English means «structure». In the process of recognizing a new situation or a new approach to cognition, a person chooses a ready-made structure in his consciousness [18, p. 55].

A frame is a kind of structure of knowledge stored in memory and stored in consciousness, as well as information about a particular fragment of a person's life experience. This knowledge includes lexical meaning, encyclopedic and extralinguistic knowledge. The frame is built around a key, relevant conceptual name (meaning, concept expressed by a certain word) and therefore contains all the information associated with that conceptual name [17, p. 46]. For example, in the paremiological world, the lexical meaning of the word «zhigit (adult)» means «a man between the ages of 15 and 35» with other concepts related to the concept of a zhigit, such as a girl, a bride, childhood, an enemy, a quarrel, loneliness, relatives, place of birth, country of origin, etc. combines

with up-to-date information to create a frame image of the «zhigit» concept: ¤Tauir zhigit aqılına senip, is qılar; ¤Eti tiri zhigit elinin namısın, torgayının qamısın qorgaydı; ¤Zhaqsı zhigit zher sholar; ¤Borandı kuni bala qutırar, zheldi kuni it qutırar; ¤Zhetim qozı tas bauır, Tuniler de otıgar; ¤Zholı bolar zhigittin zhengesi aldınan shıgar; ¤Zhaman etikshi biz tandaydı, Zhaman zhigit qız tandaydı; ¤Zhaman zhigit zholdasın zhauga aldırar, ozin uyatqa qaldırar etc.

Macroframes in Kazakh proverbs, conveying knowledge about «woman» and «man», show that the paremiological worldview of Kazakhs is androcentric (the prevalence of the «male» position). For example: ¤Altın bastı ayelden baqır bastı erkek artıq; ¤Zhaman erden zhaydagım zhaqsı, Zhaman qatınnan boydagım zhaqsı; ¤Aq Edildin ozi bolmasaq ta bulagımız, Aqıldı bastın ozi bolmasa da qulagımız; ¤Ayel tilinen oledi, Tulki zhuninen oledi; ¤Aqıldı zhigit atqa da otırar, taqqa da otırar etc.

The notion of Kazakhs, which puts the social status of men above the family role of women in society and considers women second after men, and the stereotypical images formed in ethnic consciousness according to this evaluation, give a negative connotation to many proverbs about women. However, in the Kazakh mental world, the main constitutional features of «femininity» are a beautiful girl, a noble mother, a kind mother, a kind mother), which is interpreted as «a woman – a renewer of life, a giver of life, a source of life, a source of warmth and kindness, upbringing, prosperity)» [19, p. 93]. «Father» – «mother», «husband» – «wife», gives a positive meaning to the «feminine principle». For example: ¤Adam bolar zhigittin zharı ozine layıq, Keruen bastar zhigittin narı ozine layıq; ¤Qız erkem kestesimen korkem, Ul erkem onerimen korkem; ¤Aqıldı zhardın ishinde Altın aydar ul zhatar; ¤Akesiz zhetim – erke zhetim, sheshesiz zhetim-shın zhetim; ¤Atasız uy – batasız, Anasız uy – panasız; ¤Zhaqsı zhar teni zhoq zholdas, tubi zhoq sırlas and etc.

In Kazakh paremiology, Kurtka, Karlyga («Koblandy batyr»), Akzhunys («Er Targyn»), Kyz Zhibek (Kyz Zhibek), Bayan (Kozy Korpesh-Bayan Sulu), Ayman, Sholpan (Ayman-Sholpan), Karashash (Zhirenshe Sheshen), Umai (Mayene), Kunukey Kyz («Ertostik») carry positive nature of the description of the frame in relation to such conceptual names as a girl, wife, mother, sister is reflected in Kazakh mythological, folklore, epic-poetic world images can be associated with images of women. Through images praising wisdom, beauty, ingenuity, loyalty to husband, having courage to be the support of people in difficult times, the mythical-epic consciousness represents the best example of the «female nature» for the future generations.

Conclusion

Concluding, an integral part of the image of the linguistic world, the paremiological image of the world is characterized by the predominance of the androcentric (masculine) position. In the image of the paremological world, in terms of frame structural types, which are characterized by grouping around certain conceptual names, «masculinity» (perseverance, strength, toughness, coldness, etc., depending on human nature; friend, enemy, khan, throne, power, etc.). It is observed that the quantitative and qualitative indicators of social subgroups are higher than those of frame structural subgroups, which are based on the «feminine sign», i.e. the subject of which is a woman. In other words, the language models that make up the concept of «woman» are often negative, and the language models that make up the concept of «man» are positive. Thus, although the legal norms of modern Kazakhstani society state that the rights of men and women are equal and equal in freedom of choice, they have been preserved for centuries in the historical memory of the ethnic group, reflected in the forms of socio-economic and social life and spiritual and material culture. The evaluation of the status of women and men in society proves that male position of the binary pair «Woman-Man» has not changed radically today and cannot change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Роль человеческого фактора в языке: Язык и картина мира / Б.А. Серебренников, Е.С. Кубрякова, В.И. Поставалова и др. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 216 с.
2. Кирилина А.В. О применении понятия гендер в русскоязычном лингвистическом описании // Филологические науки. – 2000. – №3. – С. 38–45.
3. Мамаева Г.Б. Ерлер мен әйелдердің сөз қолданысындағы ерекшеліктер (гендерлік зерттеу): филол. ғыл. канд. ... дисс.: 10.02.02. – Алматы: әл-Фараби атындағы ҚазМҰУ, 2003. – 150 б.
4. Кирилина А.В. Гендер: лингвистические аспекты. – М.: Институт социологии РАН, 1999. – 189 с.
5. Опарина Е.О. Лексика, фразеология, текст: лингвистические компоненты // Язык и культура. Вып. 2. – 1996. – С. 16.
6. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. – М.: Школа языка и русской культуры, 1996. – 288 с.
7. Воробьев В.В. Лингвокультурология. Теория и методы. – М.: РУДН, 1997. – 331 с.
8. Ескеева М.Қ. Орхон, Енисей, Талас ескерткіштері және қазіргі қыпшақ тілдеріндегі моносиллабтардың құрылымдық ерекшеліктері: филол. ғыл. докт. ... дисс. автореф.: 10.02.06. – Алматы: ҚР БҒМ А.Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Тіл білімі институты. 2007. – 56 б.
9. Қазақ тілінің түсіндірме сөздігі. Т. 1–10. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1974–1986.
10. Өмірәлиев Қ. XV–XIX ғасырлардағы қазақ поэзиясының тілі. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1976. – 268 б.
11. Павиленис Р.И. Проблема смысла: современный логико-философский анализ языка. – М.: Мысль, 1983. – 286 с.
12. Гуревич А.Я. Время как проблема истории культуры // Вопросы философии. – 1969. – №3. – С. 8–9.
13. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Academia, 2001. – 450 с.
14. Ксенофонт. Домострой. VII. – М.: ООО «Издательство АСТ», 1998. – 310 с.
15. Таранов П. От Соломона до Роджера Бэкона. – М.: ООО «Издательство АСТ», 2000. – 448 с.
16. Дубинский М. Өмір гүлі // Парасат. – 1998. – №3. – Б. 27–36.
17. Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика. – Минск: ТетраСистемс, 2004. – 256 с.
18. Қасым Б. Сөзжасам: Семантика. Уәждеме. – Алматы: КИЦОО, 2007. – 167 б.
19. Смайлов А. Әйел лексемасының ұлттық көрінісі // ҚазҰУ хабаршысы. Филология сериясы. – 2004. – №8 (80). – Б. 93–97.

REFERENCES

1. Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke: Yazyk i kartina mira [The role of the human factor in language: Language and the world-picture] / B.A. Serebrennikov, E.S. Kubryakova, V.I. Postavalova i dr. – M.: Nauka, 1988. – 216 s. [in Russian]
2. Kirilina A.V. O primenenii ponyatiya gender v russkoyazychnom lingvisticheskom opisanii [On the application of the concept of gender in the Russian linguistic description] // Filologicheskie nauki. – 2000. – №3. – S. 38–45. [in Russian]
3. Mamaeva G.B. Erler men ayelderdin soz qoldanysyndagy erekshelikter (genderlik zertteu): filol. gyl. kand. ... diss.: 10.02.02. [Features of the use of words by men and women (gender study): diss. ... Candidate of Philological Sciences]. – Almaty: al-Farabi atyndagy QazMUU, 2003. – 150 b. [in Kazakh]

4. Kirilina A.V. Gender: Lingvisticheskie aspekty [Gender: linguistic aspects]. – M.: Institut sociologii RAN, 1999. – 189 s. [in Russian]

5. Oparina E.O. Leksika, frazeologiya, tekst: lingvisticheskie komponenty [Vocabulary, phraseology, text: linguistic components] // Yazyk i kultura. Vyp. 2. – 1996. – S. 16. [in Russian]

6. Teliya V.N. Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheski, pragmaticheski i lingvokulturologicheski aspekty [Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguoculturological aspects]. – M.: Shkola yazyka i russkoi kultury, 1996. – 288 s. [in Russian]

7. Vorobev V.V. Lingvokulturologiya. Teoriya i metody [Linguoculturology. Theory and methods]. – M.: RUDN, 1997. – 331 s. [in Russian]

8. Eskeeva M.Q. Orhon, Enisey, Talas eskertkishteri zhane kazirgi kypshak tilderindegi monosillabtardyn kurylymdyk erekshelikteri: filol. gyl. dokt. ... diss. avtoref.: 10.02.06. [Monuments of Orkhon, Yenisei, Talas and features of the structure of monosyllabs in modern Kipchak languages: philol. science. doct. ... diss. abstract.] –Almaty: Qazaqstan Respublikasy Bilim zhane Gylym Ministrligi A. Baytursynuly atyndagy Til bilimi instituty, 2007. – 56 b. [in Kazakh]

9. Kazak tilinin tusindirme sozdigi [Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh language]. T. 1–10. – Almaty: Gylym, 1974–1986. [in Kazakh]

10. Omiraliev K. XV–XIX gasyrlardagy qazaq poyeziyasynyn tili [Language of Kazakh poetry of the XV-XIX centuries]. – Almaty: Gylym, 1976. – 268 b. [in Kazakh]

11. Pavilenis R.I. Problema smysla: sovremennyi logiko-filosofski analiz yazyka [The problem of meaning: modern logical and philosophical analysis of language]. – M., 1983. – 106 s. [in Russian]

12. Gurevich A.Ya. Vremya kak problema istorii kultury [Time as a problem of cultural history] // Voprosy filosofii. – 1969. – №3. – S. 8–9. [in Russian]

13. Maslova V.A. Lingvokulturologiya [Linguoculturology]. – M.: Academia, 2001. – 450 s. [in Russian]

14. Ksenofont. Domostroy [Domostroy]. VII. – M.: OOO «Izdatelstvo AST», 1998. – 310 s. [in Russian]

15. Taranov P. Ot Solomona do Rodzhera Bekona [From Solomon to Roger Bacon]. – M.: OOO «Izdatelstvo AST», 2000. – 448 s. [in Russian]

16. Dubinskiy M. Omir guli [Flower of life] // Parasat. – 1998. – №3. – B. 27–36. [in Kazakh]

17. Maslova V.A. Kognitivnaya lingvistika [Cognitive linguistics]. – Minsk: TetrisSistems, 2004. – 256 s. [in Russian]

18. Qasım B. Sozzhasam: Semantika. Uazhdeme [Word formation: Semantics. Motivation]. – Almatı: KICOO, 2007. – 167 b. [in Kazakh]

19. Smaylov A. Ayel leksemasinin ulttiq korinisi [National expression of the female token] // QazUU habarshysy. Filologiya seriyası. – 2004. – №8 (80). – B. 93–97. [in Kazakh]