THE IMAGERY OF SPIRITUAL CONCEPTS IN TEACHING PROCESS EXPRESSED BY PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF THE ENGLISH, TATAR AND TURKISH LANGUAGES

Diana. F. Kajumova[1], Elmira M. Vildanova[2], Gulfiya S. Mullagayanova[3], Emma N. Gilyazeva[4], Liliya I. Galeeva[5] and Irina V. Strakhova[2]

Phraseological units in all languages are correlated with background knowledge of their speakers, peculiar way of life and ethnic features in general. This research focuses on the comparative analysis of phraseological units and their usage in the teaching process in genetically and structurally unrelated linguocultures (Tatar, English and Turkish). It has been conducted at the intersection of anthropocentric, linguo-cognitive, communicative-functional and structural-semantic paradigms, and is based on the prominent analysis of ethnocultural data from all respective languages. The linguistic worldview, as well as phraseological units, of the English, Turkish and Tatar languages express many spiritual notions. A soul is described as an inner topos, i.e. a person's inner world. In the latest decades linguists have been building their research around cognitive and, particularly, conceptological topics. As a result, they have touched upon such fundamental problems as the structural representation of knowledge and ways of its conceptualization in the language. This research dwells upon the content and sphere of language objectification of different nationalities. Furthermore, it stresses out specific ways of expressing spiritual concepts in phraseological worldviews of the above-mentioned ethnic groups. The paper analyses the phraseological data which belong to different language groups (Turkic and Germanic) and Turkic subgroups (Tatar and Turkish). Therefore, scientists have got valuable results on the typological level. The general characteristics of a linguistic identity and its components revealed and systematized in this research, namely linguocultural units, principles of their classification and comparison, are of great importance for further scientific endeavors in this field. The comparative analysis of spiritual concepts and their usage in teaching process are expressed in phraseological units is conducted in accordance with the linguocultural approach.

Keywords: linguocultural units, phraseological units, conceptology, teaching process

INTRODUCTION

While mostly corresponding with a logical representation of the world in peoples' consciousness, the language worldview comprises formations which are determined by mediated perception forms. Every language has specific phraseological units which correlate with speakers' background knowledge, traditional forms of labor,

[1] Department of Germanic Philology, Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia, *E-mail: missdiana7@mail.ru.*

[2] Department of Philology, Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia.

[3] Social Sciences and Humanities Department, Kazan National Research Technical University named after A.N. Tupolev - KAI. Kazan, Russia.

[4] Department of Foreign Languages, Kazan Innovative University named after V.G. Timiryasov (IEML). Kazan, Russia.

[5] Department of Management, Institute of Social and Humanitarian Knowledge, Kazan, Russia.

peculiar way of life and ethnic features in general. It is the content plane of linguistic units that embrace basic stereotypes laying the foundation for ethnic culture and cognitive structures predetermining the adaptation to the extralinguistic reality.

The language worldview regards people as unique and extraordinary among all other living beings, and especially stresses out their spiritual traits. Such renowned scientists and scholars as N.D. Arutyunova (1993), A. Vezhbizkaya (2002), W. von Gumboldt (1998), B. Whorf (1952), Ch. Fillmore (1987) described the spiritual world in their numerous books.

The above-mentioned works emphasize peculiarities of anthropocentrism in different languages. In its turn, it promotes the study of universal trends of representing consciousness aspects in the naïve worldview and their methodological significance.

In the Russian linguistics the term concept was firstly used by N.D. Arutyunova (1993) and was described as a mental formation. When people make general statements about some plants, they do not mean any particular vegetation but rather the indefinite quantity of all real or at least imaginary plants.

N.D. Arutyunova (1993, p.3) writes about the concept as "a notion of practical (everyday) philosophy which is a result of interaction between national traditions, folklore, religion, ideology, life experience, art, feelings and human values. Concepts form "the so-called cultural layer which serves as a mediator between people and the world around them".

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

From a physiological point of view, a concept is a mental formation which fulfills a substitutive function.

Modern scientists share the opinion that concepts are the units of consciousness and represent humans' experience in the form of various informational structures. The researches consider concepts to be mental formations and believe that they fulfill a substitutive function, i.e. they replace real processes and phenomena in humans' consciousness. B. Whorf (1952) and Ch. Fillmore (1987) highlight that in the framework of cognitive linguistics concepts are the units of the concept sphere which can be expressed verbally and is easy to be used in teaching process.

The theory of the Polish scholar A. Vezhbizkaya (2002) is also worth mentioning. She takes into consideration the national specificity of languages, i.e. the verbal representation of natural environment, culture and speakers' national character. A. Vezhbizkaya (2002) states that any culture is studied with the help of a comparative analysis and can be described with a few key words.

The researcher W. von Gumboldt (1998) is convinced that the concept cannot have more than one meaning. However, the same linguistic sign can code two or even more different concepts.

The concepts under study are mental images representing cognitive structures and external characteristics of surrounding objects, like their colour, form or any other external features. The overall types of concepts are universal and do not depend on the language chosen for their verbalization and are widely used in teaching process.

RESULTS

The main results of this study are: the knowledge of spiritual concepts and it's usage in teaching process expressed by phraseological units of the English, Tatar and Turkish languages.

The definition of the soul as a sum of conscious impulses

Among all substances inside a human's body the soul, spirit or conscience takes a special place. In the ancient times people defined the soul through the act of breathing because it made a difference between a living being and a dead one. Classical philosophers interpreted the soul as a special substance. For instance, the Presocratics believed that the soul is the thinnest matter, while Democritus regarded it as a set of unusual atoms. The philosophical dictionary defines the soul (psyche in Greek, anima in Latin) as a sum of conscious impulses, the antithesis of matter and the foundation of all living beings, especially people (Makkai, 1972, p. 23).

The concept soul is expressed by the word "җан" (zhan) in Tatar, "can" in Turkish and "soul" in English, and stands for a non-material source, the basis of physical life on the earth. According to the naïve language worldview, the soul is immortal and invincible. It is the soul that turns a dead thing into a living being. Thus, in Tatar, "җан алып" (zhan alyp) and "җан биреп тору" (zhan birep toru) mean to give up one's soul (describing someone being between life and death or half-starving); "җан саклау" – to keep one's soul, live or exist; "җан алу" (zhan alu) – to take one's soul away, kill someone. In Turkish, "can teslim etmek" stands for to yield up one's soul, rely on someone or place confidence in someone. Let's compare the Tatar and Turkish phraseological units "җан тЩслим кылу" (zhan teslim kylu in Tatar) and "can pazarý" (in Turkish) which denote a matter of life and death or "canını Allaha ısmarlamak" – to yield up one's soul. In English, "bare (pour out или unburden) one's soul" is used as a synonym of to reveal a dark secret or to relieve one's feelings; "a living soul" – a living being [originated in the Bible]; "sell one's soul (to the devil)" – to pay with one's soul for something. For example, "…nothing saintly about Simeon Lee. The kind of man you might say had sold his soul to the devil and enjoyed the bargain" (Christie, Hercule Poirot's Christmas, 2004, p. 58).

The study of phraseological units with the component "soul" has revealed the following trends: when a person is characterized as an individual, imaginative associations are based upon their appearance; when a person is characterized as a

human being, their physical state is taken into consideration; and when a person is characterized as a member of some society, social relations and social positions serve as the basis for idioms (Weinreich, 1964).

Furthermore, the lexical unit "soul" is used in different languages to describe traits of someone's character. In the Tatar language, "җанлы кисҢк" (zhanlu kisek) – wooden-headed (a rude and ignorant person) or "җанлы бЇкҢн" (zhanlu buken) – a lubber-head. In the Turkish language, "ne kadar can adam" – a kind-hearted, honest person; "canı aziz" – a selfish person; "can kaygésé" (can derdi, cana kıyıcı) – a cruel, ruthless person or a fiend; "canı pek" – a sturdy person. In the English language, "a twin soul" – someone to relate to; a penny soul never came to two pence (proverb) – narrow-mindedness in living and in dealing… leads to failure. "A penny soul never came to two pence" (Smiles, Self-Help, 1997, p. 124).

Similar expressions can be found in the English language: "he is a simple soul"; "the ship was lost with two hundred souls on board"; "not a (living) soul". For example, "it gave me a wonderful thrill to know that there wasn't a living soul within twenty miles of me" (Maugham, The Razor's Edge, 2004, p. 398).

The similarity of phraseological units in the languages under comparison attests to the fact that English, Tatar and Turkish speakers share common image and association thinking.

The steam "җан" (zhan) is often followed by a possessive suffix, and the derived word is commonly used to address loved ones. In Tatar, "җан дусты" (zhan dustu) – a close friend; "җан юлдашы" (zhan yuldashu) – a beloved one; "җаным" (zhanum) – my soul; "җан кисҢгем" (zhan kisegem) – a part of my soul. In Turkish, "canım" – my soul! My darling! (the stress is on the second syllable). It is quite interesting that the word "canim" with the first syllable stressed expresses a speaker's discontent and negative emotions. Let's examine the following statements: "caném ciğerim" – my life, my soul (literally, "the soul of my liver" since the liver is a vessel of the soul); "canım kardeþim" – darling; "canlar" – dear friends; "canım sevgilim" – a beloved one. In English, "be a good soul" (sometimes "there's a good soul") – a colloquial, familiar way to say "be my friend". For instance, "be a good soul and leave me alone".

The foregoing examples analysed, we can conclude that all image associations connected with the "soul" concept are based on emotional-volitional and intellectual actions or states and characterise a person as a reasonable being.

The transferred meaning of a word can denote a kind of beauty that draws peoples' attention but describes an inanimate object. In Tatar, "әдәби әсәрнең" (edebi esernen), "шигырьнеңяшәтүчежаны" (shigurnen yashetuche zhanu), "конкретбертөпидеясебулыр (konkret ber top ideyase bulurga tiesh) (Taktash, 1947, p. 102). Any work of the belles-lettres style, especially a lyrical poem, should have the so-called soul or a main idea.

The research has revealed that the "жан" (zhan) concept is closely connected with the sphere of emotions. In Tatar, "жанəрнү" (zhan ernu), "жансызлану" (zhan cuzlanu) – one's soul bleeds; "жанрəхəте" (zhan rekhete) – delight for one's soul, peace of mind, good mood; "жаныңсаубулса–авырумындимə, тəнеңсаубулса–ярлымындимə" (zhanun sau bulsa – avurumun dime, tenens au bulsa – yarlumun dime) – a healthy soul does not know any diseases, a healthy body does not know poverty. "Юкшулкөчбукүңелдə, улзəгыйфь, улкечкенə, уйласамуй, сызлыйкүңел, əрнижандаэчкенə" (yuk shul Koch bu kunelde, ul zeguif, ul kechkene, uilasam ui, suzlui kunel, erni zhan da ech kene) (Ramiev, 2000, p. 57) – I am so exhausted, my soul is small and weak, and it hurts all the time.

Similar expressions can be found in the Turkish language: "canını yakmak" – to worry, torment, to make one's soul bleed; "canım sıkılıyor" – one's soul bleeds. In English, my soul is crying. Due to the linguocultural approach applied in this article, universal and specific features of phraseological units in the above-mentioned languages have been distinguished.

The research has shown that the soul is a peculiar organ of a person's inner world which is not directly connected with physiology. The soul embraces the inner world, i.e. thoughts, feelings and aspirations. In Tatar, "жанөрү" (zhan oru) – literally, to ensoul, inspire, give a new impetus; "икежанбергəбулса, икесербергəбула" (ike zhan berge bulsa, ike ser berge bulla) – if two hearts are together, two secrets become one. For example, in Turkish, "can vermek" – to ensoul, cheer up, inspire, bring back to life. "Înun eve dönmesi bana can verdi" –when he returned home, I was greatly inspired. In English, "possess one's soul in patience" – to have the capacity to endure some misfortunes (from the Bible). For instance, "…I have endured it all, and have possessed my soul in patience, because I would come back and fight that God of yours" (Voynich, The Gadfly, 2000, p. 282).

The analysis has proved that the word "soul" frequency and its lexico-semantic variation indicate its major role in these language worldviews

The axiological comprehension of a culture through phraseological units with spiritual imaginary

G.P. Vuzhletsov (2006) based his research on the classical philosophy and the Soviet linguistics which strived to withdraw from narrow practical and axiologically abstract approaches. Therefore he developed the concept of the axiological comprehension of a culture. After this concept is thoroughly studied, we will give some examples of phraseological units with spiritual imaginary in the English, Tatar and Turkish languages:

1) the key peculiarity of axiological relations is their content, i.e. they are connected with a wishful, voluntary choice or a person's internal urge. In Tatar, "ярткангажанбиргэн" (yaratkanga zhan birgen) – only a loving one has the soul; he will take the heart but the soul will not permit. In Turkish, "canım istiyor" – the soul wants; "can vermek" – to crave, long, pine after someone. In English, "he will take the heart, but the soul will not permit".

2) values do not estrange people from nature, themselves and society, on the contrary, they unite people and bring them together as a family, social group, ethnos, nation, state and society in general.

3) axiological relations are not external and forced, they are rather internal and voluntary. In Tatar, "яртыикмэген,   булсын,   жаныңтынычбулсын" (yartu ikmegen, bulsun, zhanun tunuch bulsun) – it is better to have half a loaf but a calm mind, if you put your heart into something you will do it well, if you want to do something with all your heart the hands will do the task for you, they are united not by kin blood but by kin souls; "койтыбулсадаузжаныңузеңэкадерле" (koitu bulsa da uz zhanun uzene kaderle) – it is good to be yourself regardless of appearances. It is also worth mentioning that the imperative mood is often used in the English, Tatar and Turkish languages.

4) real values as conscience, love or courage cannot be seized by force, bought with money or got by deceit (Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English, 1984, p. 200).

The soul can be injured or even wounded. In Tatar, "яхшысүзжангарэхэт, ямансүзжангажэрэхэт" (yakhshu suz zhanga rekhet, yaman suz zhanga zherekhet) – a kind word makes one's soul sing and a rude one wounds it; "жанөшеткеч" (zhan oshetkech) – literally, something that freezes one's soul, heartbreaking; "жанныжэрэхэтлэγ" (zhannu zherekhetleu) – to hurt one's soul with aspersions; "жанөшγ" (zhan oshu) – to be repelled by someone, dislike someone. In Turkish, "canın canını sıkmak" – to bother someone, worry, annoy, tear one's soul apart; "iyisözcanarahatlık, kötü söz canı yaralıyor" – a kind word makes one's soul sing and a rude one wounds it; "can üşüyor (dönüyor)" – the soul freezes over (Muallimoğlu, 1983).

The soul is usually associated with warmth. In Tatar, "жанжылысы" (zhan zhulusu) – literally, the warmth of one's soul, love, affection. Furthermore, the soul can be on fire because of a big joy or a great sorrow: "жаняну" (zhan yanu); "жанавырта" (zhan avurta), "жансыкрый" (zhan sukrui). In Turkish, "can sıcaklığı" – the warmth of one's soul; "canı yanmak" – to feel heartache.

Thus, the "soul" concept is directly connected with a person's life and their inner emotional world. This concept is hidden within a human's body and is represented by a certain substance, however its nature is still a complex and ambiguous matter since its comprehension embraces different aspect of peoples' consciousness. The concept under study has both a positive and negative meaning (Palmer, 1982, p. 78). When a person is characterised as a reasonable being, the basis of imaginary associations is formed by emotional-volitional and intellectual actions or states, intersocial relations and a person's position within a certain social group.

It should be mentioned, however, that the soul mainly correlates with a universal notion rather than a religious one in the naive worldview of the English, Tatar and Turkish languages. It denotes the psychological processes which take place in a person's mind.

There is a special lexical unit to denote the inner or spiritual world of people: "күңел" (kunel, Tatar), "gönül" (Turkish), "soul" (English). It is no longer connected with any religion, physical life or human's survival. Undoubtedly, this lexical unit belongs to culture-specific vocabulary and can be relatively translated to other languages as "soul" or "heart", and can be used in both a negative and positive meaning.

This lexical unit is deemed as the source of human's thoughts and emotions. It is the place where various feelings are born (Lyons, 1995). The lexical unit also relates to intuition, apprehension, irrational comprehensions of some essence.

The fact that the soul is the sphere of emotions, feelings and moods is supported by numerous derivative words. In Tatar, "күңелле" (kunelle) – cheerful, joyful; "күңелсез" (kunelsez) – gloomy, boring. In Turkish, "gönüllü" – beloved; "gönülsüz" – plain, modest. In English, "mental", "psychical", "sincere", "hearty", "heart-rending". These derivative adjectives are commonly used in collocations with other parts of speech, like pronouns, particles, prepositions or composite parts of phrasal verbs. Moreover, they can express a wide range of emotional connotations.

In the Turkic languages there is a derivative adverbial word "ê¯£åëäÙí" (kunelden)/"gönülden" which is derived from the lexical unit "ê¯£åë" (kunel) with the help of the elative case affix. It can be translated into Russian as "from a pure heart" or "from one's heart".

As is evident from the foregoing examples, this lexical unit is specific and diverse. This word holds a special place among all the units characterising a person's inner world since it combines rational and emotional levels and integrate conscious and unconscious spheres (Uryson, 2003).

Based on the evidence found, we can conclude that phraseological units in the three above-mentioned languages are more isomorphic than allomorphic on a structural level. This fact alone signifies that they have certain common features.

The lexical unit "soul" can be accompanied by other words which denote grievance or anger. These emotions represent one side of human nature, so a person can possess these traits or be devoid of them.

The analysis has shown that the concept "күңел" (kunel), "gönül" or "soul" is more than a non-material and spiritual formation. In the everyday language worldview this concept embraces material, even physical features and non-material, spiritual characteristics.

The soul can be described as an inner topos or person's inner world. This definition is supported by the collocations with the following words in the English, Tatar and Turkish languages: empty ("күңелбушлыгы" (kunel bushlugu), "gönül boşluğu"), broad or narrow ("киң" (kin), "genişdar") (Shamov, 1995, p. 33).

The mentioned words which represent the concept "soul" are widely used in an everyday speech and phraseology. Depending on the context, they can be synonyms or substitutes because both words describe the inner spiritual world, feelings and emotions. Their content plane goes back to spiritual and non-material substances. However, the analysis of their lexical combinability has also revealed their material characteristics. While "жан" (zhan), "can", "soul" are more like specific substances, "күңел" (kunel), "gönül" are parts of a topos. When we studied these examples, we concluded that the imaginary of the "soul" concept expressed in phraseological units of the English, Tatar and Turkish languages is similar since people express their emotions in the same manner on a physical level (Dictionary of Phrase and Fable, 2015).

Every nation has its specific lexical units which can be understood or interpreted only by its members. Other languages have mere translated analogues which do not convey the same meaning in all its diversity and fullness. For instance, the native Tatar word "моң" (mon) cannot be translated into Russian but can be compared with music, a melody or lyrical song. Sometimes it is used as a synonym of a person's soul and is translated as "sorrow, muse, nostalgia". We did not manage to find equivalents in the Turkish and English languages, it means that the Tatar language is allomorphic. All the phraseological units analysed in this article have similar content planes but different imaginaries. As a result, we have reached the conclusion that phraseology is greatly influenced by a culture and other national peculiarities.

Comparative and linguocultural aspects of describing spiritual concepts

The comparative study of phraseological units in languages which fall into different groups and have distinct systems helps to reveal certain morphological and semantic models expressed in the language phraseology and pinpoint its cultural connotation, i.e. the connection between the image of a phraseological unit and other symbols, stereotypes and standards of national or universal cultures.

The Tatar notion "мон" (mon) is as vague and mystical as the enigmatic Russian soul. Surely, the word "мон" (mon) describes a person's inner world but it is also connected with the expression of these emotions which can be clearly seen with the eyes of people around. However, this lexical unit can be used for denoting inner emotions which are analysed in the depth of a person's soul or heart and as a result become essential – they are memories of the youth, the best and unforgettable moments in life.

While learning the Tatar language, one should feel the true meaning behind lexical units since these words convey information about the spirituality of the whole Tatar nationality.

The "heart" concept is essential in the three languages and is expressed by the following lexical units: "йөрәк" (iorek in Tatar), "kalp", "yürek" (in Turkish) and "heart" (in English). In the language worldview this organ is considered to be the centre of physical and spiritual life, the source and vessel of all emotions and feelings.

According to its proper meaning, the heart is an organ that pumps blood through a human's body. The heart function is "йөрәкэшчәнлеге" (iorek eshchenlege) in Tatar and "kalpçarpıntısı (Uzun, 1991, p. 34)" in Turkish.

This word can also denote the left part of the chest where the heart is. The scholar E.V. Uryson emphasizes that in the Russian naïve worldview "heart is an invisible organ producing good emotions" (Uryson, 2003, p. 27). Its transferred meaning in the Tatar language is also connected with human feelings.

The heart is a person's inner world, soul and memory. Here are some curious examples with similar meanings from the Turkic languages: "карамабеләккә, карайөрәккә" (karama belekke, kara iorekke) – in Tatar literally, do not look at one's elbow, look at the heart; "йөрәгеңтимердәнбулса, хәнжәреңагачтанбулсадаярый" (ioregen timerden bulsa, khanzheren agachtan bulsa da yarui) – in Tatar literally, if your heart is made of stone, a sword can be wooden; "kalbi açýldý" – in Turkish, he opened up his heart or soul (Rattigan, 1994, p. 16).

However, the heart is hidden inside the chest; it can reveal itself through certain deeds and actions of its owners. S.I. Ozhegov defines the heart in the following manner:

1.   "An organ in a human's body which symbolizes moods and feelings".

2.   "The key point or centre of something" (Kunin, 1996, p. 120).

In the English, Tatar and Turkish languages the lexical unit "heart" denotes many similar phenomena. The heart is regarded as the source of physical strength in these linguocultures. For example, there are the following Tatar phraseological units: "аюбеләгенәышаныр, кешейөрәгенәышаныр" (ayu belegene ushanur,

keshe ioregene ushanur) – literally, a bear relies on its claws while a person relies on their heart; "көчбеләктәтүгел, йөрәктә" (koch belekte tygel, iorekte) – the power is not in strong elbows but the kind heart. The Turkish language is rich in such phraseological units as: "yüreğinipektutmak" – to resist a fear; "yüreðini söylemek" – to be brave. The following idioms are well-known in the English language: "to have a heart to" – to dare to do something; "a heart of oak" – brave, courageous, to keep one's chin up (Nayır,1995).

When the heart got influenced by some unexpected events, it can be found in the most unusual places. In Tatar: "йөрәктабангатөшу" (iorek tabanga toshu) – literally, to have one's heart in one's mouth, to be seriously scared; "йөрәгемучтөбендәгенәтора" (ioregem uch tobende tora) – literally, to have one's heart on one's palm, to have a dread; "йөрәкбугазгакилептерәлде" (iorek bugazga kilep terelde) – literally, to have one's heart in one's mouth, to stand in awe. In Turkish: "yüreğim ağzıma geldi" – to have one's heart in one's boots. In English: "bring smb's heart into one's mouth"; "have one's heart in one's boots".

The heart can have wounds. Thus, in Tatar: "йөрәкнеашау" (iorekne ashau) – literally, to gnaw at one's heart, to describe graving thoughts or pangs of one's loss; "хәсрәтйөрәкнеашый" (khesret iorekne ashui) – literally, a sorrow gnaws at one's heart; "йөрәкжәрәхәте" (iorek zherekhete), "йөрәкярасы" (iorek yarasu); "йөрәкнекимеру" (iorekne kimeru) – literally, to gnaw at one's heart, about a regret or a sorrow which makes a person feel worried. In Turkish: "yüreğişişmek" – to hang down one's head; "kalbi kanamak" – to suffer and angusih; "kalbim kan ağlıyor" (Tekin, 1997, p. 34) – one's heart bleeds. In English: "be sick at heart" – to pine, to feel that one's heart aches; "break smb's heart" – to upset someone; wring smb's heart – to clench one's heart.

The heart can be warm, cold or open. In Tatar: "кайнарйөрәкле" (kainar iorekle) – literally, a person with a warm heart, i.e. a person capable of strong and deep feelings who can get inspired by moral ideas; "йөрәгесалкын" (iorege salkun) – literally, a cold heart, a heartless person incapable of love. The heart can be seared or pierced with a strong emotion. It is of a great interest to compare the following images. In Tatar, "йөрәккәутсалу" (iorekke ut salu) – literally, to set one's heart afire, to bring sorrow to someone; "йөрәкжылысы" (iorek zhulusu) – literally the warmth coming from the heart, love or affection. In Turkish, "yüreði geniþ" – affectionate, to conceive a passion from; "birine kalbini vermek" (Sanlyer, 2006) – to fall in love with someone. In English, "lose one's heart" – to fall in love; "one's heart goes out to" – to be affectionate towards someone; "set one's heart on smb" – to dream about someone, conceive a passion from.

DISCUSSIONS

The study of literature indicates on the presence of theoretical framework on the issue of the imagery of spiritual concepts in teaching process expressed by phraseological units of the English, Tatar and Turkish languages (Cowie, 1998). The term "concept" is among the key notions of linguistics and linguocultural studies and correlates with mental representations of objects and phenomena surrounding people in their everyday lives. A concept is a conventional mental structure which defines the correlation between objects but does not exist beyond people's consciousness. People's thoughts and feelings are represented by concepts. Undoubtedly, a large number of the examples shows the connection between the soul, heart and the feeling of love. According to D.S. Likhachev (1990), the concept is an "algebraic" expression of the meaning which is used by native speakers since "people cannot embrace the meaning in all its complexity and sometimes interpret it in conformity with their educational background, personal experience, social or professional affiliation and etc." (Likhachev, 1990, p. 8). N.D. Arutyunova (1993) stresses out that one concept contains several denotations from several objects to some of their characteristics and even mental functions. We should also acknowledge the great contribution to cognitology made by such scientists as Charles Fillmore (1987), A.P. Cowie (1995) and many others. They closely studied the conceptual basis of humans' consciousness and the acquiring of meanings by frames. The efficiency of education of phraseological units is increased provided motivational and valuable orientation of teachers on the formation of learners ability to study idioms.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

All the concepts analyzed in this article are expressed in the form of phraseological units and are used in the above-mentioned languages to characterize a person's spiritual world. Since these formations are closely connected with human feelings, they are unique, i.e. all people possess their own heart and soul, the so-called concepts. The ability to feel pain is the feature that brings the notions heart and soul together in these three linguocultures. The languages under comparison demonstrate a high level of sensibility and sentimentality among these nations. As a result, these feelings cause the formation of special concepts which correlate with the spiritual world. While the national character is more or less stable, it can seriously vary within an individual as it is exemplified in the concepts studied in the article.

The concepts which characterize a person's inner world are abundantly expressed in the language phraseology and are taught at schools. They contain the national character and convey it much more vividly than common vocabulary.

As reflected by the examples listed above, the word "soul" frequency and its lexico-semantic variation indicate its major role in these language worldviews.

The comparative analysis of phraseological units which express physical or spiritual concepts proves that the transformation of these phraseological units in different languages undergo similar stages. Being explained by extralinguistic factors, this phenomenon helps to pinpoint universals within the language worldview. The originality of the English, Turkish and Tatar national cultures, their worldview attitudes and moral values is the main reason for existing different concepts.

References

Arutyunova, N.D. (1993). 'Introduction. The logical analysis of a language. Mental activities'. Moscow: Science.

Christie, A. (2004). 'Hercule Poirot's Christmas'. England: Wordsworth Classics, part IV, ch. II.

Cowie, A.P. (1998). 'Phraseology. Theory, Analysis and Application'. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. (2015). London: Bloomsbury Books.

Fillmore, Ch. (1987). 'Toward a Frame-based Lexicon'. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Humboldt, W. Von. (1998). 'On the Comparative Study of Languages for Different Periods of Their Development'. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Kunin, A.V. (1996). 'The course of phraseological units in the modern English language'. Moscow: Science.

Lyons, J. (1995). 'Linguistic Semantics. An introduction'. Cambridge: CUP.

Makkai, A. (1972). 'Idiom structure in English'. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Maugham, W.S. (2014). 'The Razor's Edge'. London: Pan Books, ch. IV, ch. VI.

Muallimoğlu, N. (1983). 'Deyimler, atasözleri, beyitler ve anlamdaþ kelimeler'. İstanbul Muallimoğlu yayınları.

Nayır, Y.N. (1995). 'Hikayeler'. Ankara: Fen.

Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English (1984). London: Oxford University Press.

Ozhegov, S.I., Shvedova, N.Y. (1999). 'The definition dictionary of the Russian language'. The Russian Academy of Sciences. The Institute of the Russian language named after V.V. Vinogradov, 4th edition, enlarged. Moscow: ABC.

Palmer, F.R. (1982). 'Semantics. A New Outline'. Ìoscow: Science.

Ramiev, S. (2000). 'At dawn'. Kazan: TaRIK.

Rattigan, T. (1994). 'The Winslow Boy'. England: Penguin Classics, act IV.

Sanlyer, D. F. (2006). 'Verbal phraseological units with the modal component in English and Turkish languages'. Yoshkar-Ola: GUP RME.

Shamov, A. (1995). 'About love'. Kazan: Magarif.

Smiles, S. (1997). 'Self-Help'. England: Wordsworth Classics.

Taktash, K. (1947). 'Selected works'. Kazan: Tatgosizdat.

Tekin, T. (1997). 'Eþanlamlık ve kullanış.Türkoloji Eleþtirileri'. Ankara: Simurg Yayınları.

Uryson, E.V. (2003). 'Problems of the linguistic worldview study: Analogy in semantics'. Moscow: The Slavic languages.

Uzun, L.S. (1991). 'Deyimleþme ve Türkçede Deyimleþme Dereceler. Dilbilim Araþtırmaları'.

Vezhbizkaya, A.A. (2002). 'Language in scientific lighting'. Ìoscow: Science.

Voynich, E.L. (2000). 'The Gadfly'. England: Wordsworth Classics, part I, ch.VI, part III, ch.VI.

Vyzhletsov, G.P. (2006) 'Axilolygy of the culture'. St.-Petersburg: SPGU Press.

Weinreich, U. (1964). 'Problems in the Analysis of Idioms; Substance and Structure of Language'. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Whorf, B.L. (1952). 'Language, Mind and Reality'. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.