Emotional concepts in English and Russian phraseology

[1]Asel Botobaeva, [2] Kapar Zulpukarov
[1] Kyrgyz-Uzbek University, Kyrgyzstan ,[2] Osh State University, Kyrgyzstan

Abstract *: This article provides a comparative analysis of the connotative component of phraseological units in Russian and English. The relevance of the research topic is due to the need for practical application of the results of analysis in translation studies. The object of analysis is the procedural phraseological units. The study was based on materials from the Russian and English-language media. The analysis showed that the language systems of the Russian and English languages are very similar to each other. The most frequent in use are phraseological units with a negative connotation. Among the positive, the most common emotions in both Russian and English are «interest-excitement» and «irony-joke». Among the negative ones are «contempt-neglect», «anger-rage», «fear-horror». The authors conclude that connotative component of phraseological units has a pronounced sociolinguistic nature and is the basis for the formation of social ties. Therefore, in our opinion, in order to achieve objectivity, it is necessary to carry out not only structural-semantic, but also cognitive linguistic analysis of phraseological units.*

Index Terms *: comparative linguistic analysis, phraseological units, connotative component, emotional concepts.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In any language the phraseological units are a complex and multicomponent linguistic phenomenon that can be decomposed into several components. First of all, it is a subject-conceptual (denotative) component, which, in fact, reflects the main meaning of the statement. However, the connotative component of phraseology, which is an emotional assessment, is also extremely important. Sema, representing the connotative element, complements the usual or occasional meaning of the phraseological unit [1]. In addition, connotation may reflect a subjective assessment of a phenomenon or process. Thus, any phraseological unit has at least a two-level structure, each element of which is closely related to the other [2].In this regard, the most important problem of linguistics, in general, and translation studies, in particular, is the correct translation of phraseological units. This focuses on comparative studies of linguistic pictures of the world, helping to determine the correlations, as well as the similarities and differences of phraseological units.The relevance of our study lies in the need for a comparative analysis of the connotative component in English and Russian phraseological units, with a view to the practical application of the results in the work of translators.

II. RESEARCH METHOD AND DATA

The object of the study were the procedural phraseological units of the English and Russian languages [3]-[4], selected by the continuous sampling method. Procedural phraseological units are closely related to verbs, together with which they represent a single class of procedural language units. Procedural phraseological units are linguistic units that express a feature of an object, which, in turn, reflects a change in the state of this object, or its dynamics. More often than not, such the feature refers to a physical action (e.g. beat, play, run). The study was based on materials from the Russian and English-language media. The choice of the research base is due to the fact that the media provide the most vivid example of live communication. Mass media reflect the realities that are used in the

language every day. This gives the study a relevant, applied character. In the course of the study, we selected 100 phraseological units of English and Russian languages in the meaning of the process.

To analyze the collected data, we used the component, descriptive and comparative methods, as well as the method of semantic identification. In addition, since our study has a pronounced specificity and a clearly defined research area, we used the research methods of phraseological units proposed ipsō factō by E. Samylina and Y. Kryuchkova [5]-[6]. Since these methods relate to two different areas of linguistic analysis, our study was implemented simultaneously in the framework of the structural-semantic paradigm and cognitive linguistics. In particular, the tasks of structural-semantic analysis were to identify phraseological units with a positive and negative connotation. The tasks of linguistic-cognitive analysis were to detail the semes of the identified phraseological units by basic emotions: irony-joke, pleasure-joy, interest-excitement, anger-rage, fear-horror, contempt-neglect, and sadness-despair.

III. THEORETICAL BASE

Globalization, blurring the boundaries between countries and cultures, has fundamentally changed the approach to scientific research. Interdisciplinary research has become a trend of our time, and this significantly enriches science through the interpenetration of analysis methods. As part of this trend, cognitive linguistics has developed, which combines a research approach in terms of several disciplines at once - psychology, anthropology, philosophy, linguistics, and even neurophysiology. The design of cognitive linguistics in a separate direction is due to a change in the research paradigm in science, in general. Modern interdisciplinary methodology, due to qualitatively new heuristics, makes it possible to study what was previously considered inaccessible for reliable analysis.Terra incognita also includes emotional concepts in the language. M. Fabiszak notes that linguistic science has not yet developed an unambiguous definition of the concept of emotions - due to the extreme complexity of this concept and its close connection with psychological processes. The researcher makes an interesting observation: emotions are somehow connected with basic instincts, which means that it is not possible to identify the essence of the «emotional concept» in linguistics without using methodological tools and the terminological field of psychoanalysis [7]. Concerning specific indicators and scales by which one could «believe the harmony» of the conceptual structures of human consciousness, science has been debating for almost half a century. Some researchers group emotions into relatively large blocks, which are two or three poles, for example, «positive-negative», or «pleasure-displeasure, dominance-humility», etc. Another part of scientists, on the contrary, atomizes emotional concepts to such an extent that they distinguish between parental love, romantic love, shame and shyness, etc. [7] We believe that it is necessary to observe the «golden mean» in this case: excessive scaling, as well as vice versa, can significantly distort the real situation.In addition, in our opinion, the relationship of emotions with instincts cannot be disputed, as evidenced by their universal character – obviously, emotions are the oldest conceptual representations of a person's state based on a deep archetypal basis. In this context, verbalized artifacts look like social reflection represented in the linguistic picture of the world [8].The phraseological units, according to many researchers, are facts of the nomination of emotions in speech. The phraseological units are very rich from a lexical point of view, which implies their full meaning. The semantic field of each phraseological unit includes several seme, which have a hierarchical order. Connotation is one of the seme of the phraseological units. Despite the fact that the connotative meaning is not basic, nevertheless, it is the connotation that gives the phraseological unit a wealth of meanings, one or another stylistic shades. These nuances serve to express emotions and evaluative judgment [9].In the context of our study, the ability of the connotation to convey the assessment of the speaking subject in relation to the phenomenon or process in question is extremely important. In fact, this assessment is directly related to how true the opinion of the subject will be perceived by the people around him [10].

That is, connotation is an essential element of communication that helps to build a hierarchy of meanings and relationships. Thus, phraseological units have a sociolinguistic nature, due to the compulsory presence of evaluative judgments in them. This property of phraseological units is integral in their semantic structure. Studies of the emotional component of phraseological units in Russian and English have a rich academic history. In general, the topic of reflection of emotions in phraseological units is presented in the framework of two paradigms – structural-semantic and cognitive linguistic. The mono- and polysemy of phraseological units using the functional-parametric method was studied, in particular, by E. Samylina, N. Khomyakova [11], N. Ilyushchenko [12], J.R. Abdullayeva [13], A. Inoue [14], V.V. Dobrova, et al. The direction of cognitive linguistics is represented by the works of Y.M. Kryuchkova, A.Y. Vyuzhuzhina, A. Bogacz [15]. The range of questions investigated by the listed scientists is extensive, however, within the framework of this article it makes sense to present one of the conclusions, which, in our opinion, is of key importance for understanding the phenomenon under study: phraseological units with a negative connotation in English and Russian are much more than with positive. Some researchers attribute this fact to the fact that a positive event is perceived by people as an ordinary phenomenon, something for granted. At the same time, a negative event is always something out of the ordinary, something that makes people mobilize intellectual and physical forces. Language, being a reflection of the picture of the human world, repeats these deep cognitive attitudes and embodies them in specific linguistic units.

IV. RESEARCH RESULTS

Table 1

Number of positive and negative value judgments

Connotation	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Explicit	E.g: earn one's corn – «Оправдывать вложенные средства»	E.g: give rise to smth. – «быть источником чего-либо»	E.g: cut one's own throat – «Рубить сук, на котором сидишь»
Implicit	E.g: have a high profile – «Быть видной фигурой»	E.g: give smb. a free rein – «предоставить кому-либо свободу действий»	E.g: cut one's cloth – «По одежде протягивать ножки»
Total	14 Russian / 16 English	7 Russian / 8 English	79 Russian / 76 English

Table 2

Additional expressive connotations

Коннотация	English	Russian
Positive		
Irony-joke	6 «Take the wind out of smb.'s sails»	4 «Заблудшая овечка»
Pleasure-joy	3 «Be a success with smb.»	4 «Заткнуть за пояс»
Interest-excitement	7 «Champ at the bit»	6 «Руки чешутся»
Negative		
Contempt-neglect	27 «Turn one's back on smth.»	23 «Деньги не пахнут»
Anger-rage	16	19

	«Step out of line»	«Метать громы и молнии»
Fear-horror	18	19
	«Lose one's battle»	«Панический страх»
Sadness-despair	15	18
	«Have had one's ships»	«Каждому – своё»

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The analysis showed that the language systems of the Russian and English languages are very similar to each other. Small differences in frequency of use are not statistically significant. The results of our analysis correlate with the results of earlier studies: the most frequent in use are phraseological units with a negative connotation. Among the positive, the most common emotions in both Russian and English are «interest-excitement» and «irony-joke». Among the negative ones are «contempt-neglect», «anger-rage», «fear-horror». From our point of view, this is explained by the fact that 1) fear is a manifestation of the basic instinct of self-preservation, 2) the same can be said about the «anger-rage» emotion, although its connection with the self-preservation instinct is indirect – anger acts as a protective reaction to the onset adverse and / or threatening circumstances, 3) the emotion of «contempt-neglect» is directly related to the social status of a person that is always recognized with increased sensitivity.

Thus, we can conclude that the connotative component of phraseological units is extremely important. It has a pronounced sociolinguistic nature and is the basis for the formation of social ties. At the same time, the connotations of phraseological units associated with evaluative judgments have a deep psychological nature, due to human instinctive reactions. Therefore, in our opinion, in order to achieve objectivity, it is necessary to carry out not only structural-semantic, but also cognitive linguistic analysis of phraseological units.

REFERENCES

[1] P.H. Matthews, "The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics (2 ed.)", Oxford University Press, 2007. DOI: 10.1093/acref/9780199202720.001.0001

[2] V.V. Dobrova, V.M. Savitsky, L.R. Nurtdinova, O.A. Kistanova, and N.V. Ageenko, "Modeling of Semantic Structure of Similative Phraseological Units", SHS Web of Conferences 50, 01044 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185001044

[3] I.G. Kazachuk, "Procedural Phraseological Units of the Russian language (The Categories of Being and Relationship)", Chelyabinsk, 2004. [In Russian]

[4] Y. Ke, "The Phraseology of Phrasal Verbs in English: a Corpus Study of the Language of Chinese Learners and Native English Writers", The University of Birmingham, 2013.

[5] E. Samylina, "Structural and Semantic Properties of Procedural Phraseological Units with the Meaning of Physical Activity and Physical Condition in Russian and English", Chelyabinsk, 2008. [In Russian]

[6] Y.M. Kryuchkova, A.Y. Vyuzhuzhanin, "Representations of Positive Emotions in Phraseological Units of the English Language and Their Features of Translation to the Russian language", Language And Culture (Novosibirsk), no. 2, pp. 168-172, February 2012. [In Russian]

[7] M. Fabiszak, "The concept of 'joy' in Old and Middle English: A semantic analysis", Wyzsza Szkola Biznesu Pila, 2001.

[8]   I. Ostrovskaya, "Emotional concepts in Russian and English linguistic cultures", Krasnodar, 2006. [In
Russian]

[9] M. Sap, M.C. Prasetio, A. Holtzman, H.Rashkin, Y. Choi. "Connotation Frames of Power and Agency in Modern Films", Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp. 2329–2334, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 7–11, 2017.

[10] J. Zehr, "Vagueness, Presupposition and Truth-Value Judgments", A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor in Linguistics, 18 December 2014.

[11] N. Khomyakova, "Emotional Phraseological Units in Russian, French and English (comparative analysis)", Moscow, 2008. [In Russian]

[12] N. Ilyushchenko, "Comparative Study of English and Russian Phraseology: Component Theory of Identity and Difference of the Seme Organization", Journal of Language and Education, no. 3(1), 75-84, 2017.

[13] J.R. Abdullayeva, "On the Emotive Phraseologisms with Kinesthetic Basis Taking Place in the Phraseological System of the English Language", International Journal of English Linguistics, vol. 6, no. 2, 2016.

[14] A. Inoue, "Functional Conversions of Phraseological Units Working as Prepositions: the Case of Group Prepositions Expressing Concession", International Journal of English Language and Linguistics ResearchVol.6, No 3, pp. 32-56, June 2018.

[15] A. Bogacz, "Negative Emotions in English and Polish Phraseology: a Cognitive Approach", 2015. http://repozytorium.ur.edu.pl/handle/item/1202