

Evaluative Component in the Meaning of Verbal Phraseological Units of English, Russian and Tatar Languages¹

Regina M. Plankina², Maria S. Pestova³, Fanuza H. Tarasova⁴, & Albina M. Yakhina⁵

Abstract

Despite the fact that axiological interpretation of the linguistic and logical categories of evaluation, the problems of the value picture of the world and values, as well as the interpretation of appraisal, are rather widely represented in the works of modern Russian and foreign scientists, the problem of evaluation today has been more developed in the lexical system of the language than in phraseological corpus, that also explains our interest to the representation of the evaluation category in the units of secondary nomination. The main aim of this work is to study the evaluative component in the meaning of verbal phraseological units, describing human behavior in English, Russian and Tatar languages. Phraseological units denoting human behavior are one of the most active formation of the phraseological structure of any language. This group of phraseological units takes a significant place in phraseological system of Russian, English and Tatar languages as well, is characterized by semantic and structural diversity and expresses specific appraisal of the world and a person in it. The authors take an attempt to study evaluation as one of the macro components of the connotation of phraseological meaning of the researched units, suggest their own scale of emotive marks, separately consider the interaction of evaluation with expressiveness, emotiveness.

Keywords: Evaluative Component; Stereotypes; Verbal Idiomatic Phrases; Dictionary Marks; Semes.

1. Introduction

Although the linguistic science is developing, the questions of semantics and pragmatics correlation and interdependence are still to be investigated. At this stage

¹ Please cite this paper as follows:

Plankina, R. M., Pestova, M. S., Tarasova, F. H., & Yakhina, A. M. (2019). Evaluative component in the meaning of verbal phraseological units of English, Russian and Tatar languages. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(SP), 1009-1016.

² Kazan Federal University; regina_pl@mail.ru

³ Ural State Law University

⁴ Kazan Federal University

⁵ Elabuga Institute of Kazan Federal University

of the development of linguistic science, when the problem of the correlation and interaction of semantics and pragmatics has come to the fore, the study of the value-based approach seems especially relevant. The notion of evaluative approach has been already studied from various angles, which, above all, points out its high theoretical and practical significance among the number of other concepts that linguistics and related sciences deal with.

Value-based approach to the surrounding reality and to the perspectives of societal development forms the system of human knowledge regarding the aspects of the past and present daily life and the perspectives of our future development. To evaluate, to assess and to analyze means to cognize and to reflect the existing unsaid knowledge.

Inevitably evaluating the phenomena and the facts of reality, people express their attitudes with the help of the language, which, being the most important means of communication, expresses all possible estimates. Therefore, when studying the structure of a language and its features, it is necessary to thoroughly study the features of the vocabulary, and the phraseological corpus, in particular, as it conveys a variety of methods and types of evaluation. To be able to evaluate and to analyze means to be emotionally intelligent, which is quite essential from the point of view of effective communication.

Evaluative component of connotation still requires detailed study because it is associated with a number of ideological, social, psychological, situational-speech aspects (Avrasin, 1992; Bahreman, 2015).

The axiological interpretation of the linguistic and logical categories of evaluation, the problems of the value picture of the world and values, as well as the interpretation of appraisal, are rather widely represented in the works of such scientists as N.D. Arutyunova, V.N. Telia, E.M. Wolf, L.M. Vasilyev, A.A. Ivin, L.A. Sergeeva, S.G. Sheydaeva, N.A. Lukyanova, T.V. Markelova, A.I. Prikhodko, T.V. Pisanova, I.N. Khudyakov, T.N. Persikova, A.P. Sadokhin, V.A. Vasilenko, Z.A. Safiullina, A. Wierzbicka, Ch.L. Stevenson, B. Harnstein Smith, R.M. Hare, etc. Active research is conducted in the system of phraseological units.

Phraseological corpus of the language represents an exceptional knowledge in the form of 'additional information about the nature of actions and human behavior' (Atyomova, 1991). Phraseology is a part of linguistic fund, which, in addition to its national identity, is characterized by the breadth of interlingual links (Diaz et al., 2018). Multilingual comparative phraseology has a considerable potential, as it expands the scope of such observations, allowing to compare the languages, in terms of both the national specifics of its phraseology and the degree of interlanguage relations (Davletbayeva et al., 2016). A comparative analysis of the evaluation of phraseological units makes it possible to compare and correlate fragments of phraseological worldviews of different peoples. The importance of the analysis of the phraseological units, denoting human behavior shouldn't be

underestimated, as E. Sepir pointed out that social behavior represents “a combination or rather well-ordered variety of such kind of sides of individual behavior that are connected with the cultural norms built-in its own context” (Sepir, 2001).

2. Methods

The choice of methods of linguistic analysis used by the authors is determined by the tasks of the paper and the specifics of the material being studied. In the course of the study, we applied such methods as the method of generalization and systematization, the method of descriptive and comparative analysis, the method of component and contextual analysis, the method of etymological analysis, semantic field acceptance, modal frame acceptance, quantitative statistical method. Besides, we analyzed the idioms depicting human behavior with the help of monolingual, bilingual and multilingual dictionaries of phraseological units (Phraseological Dictionary by A.I. Molotkov, Russian-English Phraseological Dictionary by E.F. Arsentieva, English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary by A.V. Kunin, Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms, The Penguin Dictionary of English Idioms, Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms) and some other lexicographical sources in English, Russian and Tatar languages.

3. Results and Discussion

Modern science approaches the problem of emotions from different angles. Thus, R. Briner believes (1999) that «emotions tend to be rather specific reactions to particular events that are relatively intense and short term. This would include, for example, feelings such as guilt, envy, surprise, excitement, rage or resentment» (Briner, 1999).

The category of evaluation is usually represented in the form of an opinion, a kind of judgement about the positive or negative aspects of the person’s character or some object, phenomenon or action (Aydarova & Aminova, 2016). Among the characteristic features of this category are its stability and consistency.

Emotions, their classifications have been of interest of many researchers, the majority of whom recognize three basic types: positive, negative, indifferent or neutral ones. It is important to mention that a human rarely experience the so called pure emotions which can complicate the emotivity of any language means, and the emotivity of verbal idiomatic units in particular. Emotions related to the human physiology enter the language in the form of positive and negative emotions. However, it is quite disappointing to recognize that there is no universally accepted or recognized classification of dictionary marks.

If some Russian language phraseological dictionaries (monolingual, bilingual and multilingual ones) have at least some dictionary marks, English and Tatar language phraseological dictionaries hardly have any. Only some English

the norms, standards or limits, we characterize this deed or object negatively or pejoratively:

- in English: *go beyond all bounds, go over the edge, carry smth. to excess, go to extremes, carry smth. too far, overplay one's hand, cross the limit,*
- in Russian: *далеко заходить, хватить через край, перегнуть палку, не знать меры, позволить себе лишнее, переходить всякие границы, ударяться в крайности, выходить из рамок, дойти до ручки, дойти до черты,*
- in Tatar: *актык чиккә жыту, арттырын жибәру, артыкка киту, таякны бөгештерү, бер яктан икенче якка таилану, киртәдән чыгу, хәттән узу.*

Thus, if we compare verbal phraseological units with the meaning of labor activity, we will see that hard and efficient work is to be found in the positive part of the scale and would be considered to be the norm. Work without any result or work up to the exhausted state of the body and mind will be evaluated negatively.

4. Russian

бездельничать,	работать усердно,	работать очень много,
работать плохо,	ответственно,	напряженно,
непродуктивно,	продуктивно,	надрываясь, до
безответственно	вкладывая душу	изнеможения,
		надрываться
работать спустя рукава	работать засучив	гнуть хребет
гонять лодыря	рукава	ломать спину
бить баклуши	работать не покладая	тянуть ляжку
сидеть сложа руки	рук	мозолить руки
собак гонять	уйти с головой в работу	надеть хомут
слоны слонять	работать не разгибая	проливать пот
играть в бирюльки	спины	работать как ломовая
English	работать как черт	лошадь
lie down on the job	работать с огоньком	
rest on one's oars	заниматься делом	work one's fingers to the
plough the sands		bone
chase one's own tail	work body and soul	work one's guts out
gild the lily	put one's heart and soul	break one's back
Tatar	into	
	work one's heart out	

күнел бирмәү	roll up one's sleeves and	
юк-бар белән маташу	get down to work	бил (арка) бөгү
юкны бушка аудару		бөкрен чыкканчы эшләү
трай тибү	баштанаяк эшкә чуму	дөнья йөген тарту
жил куу	кулын да алмый эшләү	камыт кию
мич башында яту	баскан жирдән ут	кабалага төшү
	чыгару	йөк аты урынына эшләү
	күңелне биреп эшләү	
	юк-бар белән	
	маташмау	
	ару-талуны белмәү	

The evaluative scale represents a mixture of social, individual and stereotype images of the world around us; it expresses the subjective attitude of the individual towards some certain object. Defined by the circumstances, life experience and psychological and physical state of the individual, the evaluation may vary and turn from the positive to the negative one and vice versa. The emotive and evaluation scale suggested by us takes all these moments into consideration and defines only those emotions which are universally accepted and recognized in the form of the dictionary marks or emotive semes (Aminova & Yakhina, 2016; Mendes & Silva, 2018).

5. Summary

Linguistic consciousness of a human being is well reflected in the phraseological fund of the English, Russian and Tatar languages. Meaning of verbal phraseological units contains the information, which reflects the form of evaluation of some certain property of the named object or action.

In English the ability to control one's feelings and not to reveal one's feelings characterizes human's behavior as rational, enduring, patient, the one which inevitably leads to positive outcomes (*bear and forbear, hold (or keep) oneself in hand, keep one's balance, keep one's head, be master of oneself, control one's temper, face the music, not to ban an eye, keep smth. within bounds, etc.*). English speakers tend to be less emotional and capable to self-regulate their feelings.

On the contrary, Russian speakers demonstrate meliorative, positive evaluation of such notions as 'openness', 'sincerity', 'cordiality' 'sociability', 'ease of communication', 'belonging to' one's own'. According to the analysis of the empirical data, the Tatar language is similar with the Russian in terms of being more emotional than rational, if compared with the English language Accordingly, we find that the English language seems to be less evaluative.

6. Conclusions

All the abovesaid leads us to the conclusion that

- Evaluative component of verbal semantics should be recognized as the ability of phraseological units to express positive or negative attitude of the speaker towards the subject of the delivered message or towards the object of nomination from the standpoint of stable, permanent rather than casual and temporary properties.
- From the perspective of the secondary nomination, the evaluative component acts as the major extralinguistic factor, which is easily explained by its sociolinguistic nature.
- Social factor complicates the semantic structure of the verbal idiomatic phrases related to behavior: basics of morality set the norms of behavior and determine the way they should be followed.
- The actions and state of a human are connected with social relationships, which need a figurative, expressive designation that contains not just the name of a certain way of life, but also its evaluation to a much greater extent than any other action. Behavior should be considered as a subject to qualification from the point of view of good and evil of people's activities, and from taking into account of their value attitude towards people and other objects of reality.
- Behavioral patterns presented in verbal idiomatic phrases are also complex and diverse, as well as the variety of actions performed by a human being.
- To identify the evaluative component in the meaning of verbal idiomatic phrases, one should apply a number of criteria, among which are extralinguistic, semantic, the criterion of the component structure, dictionary emotive marks.
- The Tatar language has a lot in common with the Russian language in terms of the evaluations and values at the time when the English language depicts a more rational, rational perception and evaluation of reality.
- To properly identify the evaluation semantics of the verbal phraseological units related to human behavior in different languages, an analysis of the cultural level is necessary.

The authors of the research do not insist that the data obtained within the presented research answer all the questions but point out the necessity to continue linguistic investigation of the issue under consideration as it will help not only to better understand the cultural differences, but to contribute to the development of the theory of lexicography.

Acknowledgements

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

References

- Aminova, A. A., & Yakhina, A. M. (2016). *Human behavior in lexical and phraseological representation*. Kazan.
- Arsentieva, E. F. (2006). *Comparative phraseology and phraseography (Based on the Russian and English languages)*. E.F. Arsentieva; Kazan State University. Kazan: KSU.
- Atyomova, A. F. (1991). Connotative aspect of semantics of phraseological units. *Topical Issues of Modern Semasiology: Collection of research papers*. Leningrad: RSPU.
- Avrasin, V. M. (1992). *Synaesthesia as a tool of evaluation*. New tendencies in linguistics and methodics of teaching foreign languages. Perm.
- Aydarova, A., & Aminova, A. (2016). The negative evaluative component within the semantic structure of behaviour verbs in Russian, English and Tatar languages. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(3), 150-153.
- Ayupova, R. (2015). Illustrative material in the structure of phraseographic entries. *Asian Social Science*, 11(7), 284-289.
- Bahreman, A. (2015). The concept of translation in different teaching approaches and methods. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 5-9.
- Babenko, L. G. (1990). *Russian emotive lexicon as a functional system*. Sverdlovsk.
- Briner, R. B. (1999). The neglect and importance of emotion at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 323-326.
- Chernova, M. S. (2008). *Phraseological units based on the hyperbole in the English and Russian languages*. Kazan State University.
- Davletbayeva, D., Arsenteva, E., Ayupova, R., & Arsenyeva, Y. (2016). Contextual use of phraseological euphemisms: Component addition. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 159-163.
- Diaz, Y. D. V., Arsenteva, E. F., & Nikulina, E. A. (2018). Phraseological units designating mature age in the English and Russian languages. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 8(10), 423-426.
- Mendes, I. A., & Silva, C. A. F. D. (2018). Problematization and research as a method of teaching Mathematics. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(2), 41-55. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/2694>
- Lukianova, N. A. (1986). *Expressive conversation vocabulary: Problems of semantics*. Novosibirsk.
- Sepir, E. (2001). *Unconscious stereotypes of behavior in the society*. Collected works on linguistic and cultural studies. Moscow: Progress