Zoonymical Phraseological Units in the East Slavic Languages as Means of Reflecting the View of the World

Prokhorova Olga, Chekulai Igor, Baghana Jerome and Kuprieva Irina
Belgorod State University, Pobeda Street 85, 308015 Belgorod, Russia

Abstract: The study deals with the comparative cognitive semantic and pragmatic discourse analysis of the use of the animalistic phraseological nominations. They characterize behavior, appearance and peculiarities of human beings. The aim of the study is to show how the linguistic view of the world is seen throughout the verbal material. It is supposed that animalistic phraseological nominations are the means that can help the researcher to see the way the outer world is conceptualized in the human consciousness. The actual material of the analysis is represented with the examples in the Byelorussian, Russian and Ukrainian languages. The point is that alongside with the common cognitive characteristic features in the motives of animalistic nomination of the people the lingual image of the world possesses its singleness in the languages analyzed. The actual evaluative functioning of the lexemes examined being influenced greatly by the latter phenomenon is being traced throughout the study.

Key words: Zoonyms, view of the world, metaphor, East Slavonic Languages, common cognitive

INTRODUCTION

Zoonyms have long occupied a leading position in the research of semantic and linguistic potential of nominative units in the language study. Scientists have always been interested in the basic models of metaphorical transformations and thus they have found some important problems of research of stylistic resources of the language system, including more imaginative and capacious ways of transmitting thoughts, feelings and emotions (Chekulaj, 2014). It would seem, therefore that there is no space left in the named field, no possibilities and no new aspects for a study. But in our opinion, this research has the potential and it is associated with the development of a particular research principle such as cognitive linguistics, dealing with the paradigm of language units of nomination and their functional potential (Evans and Green, 2006; Schalley, 2004). But, this doesn't actually mean that the language tends to rotate and become new. This only means that the language is seen from the other point of view.

As you know, the subject of cognitive semantic research in linguistics is basically the study of such important processes of structuring of consciousness in terms of language and speech as the conceptualization and categorization (Kornilov, 2003). Concepts are structured representations of the processes, phenomena and objects of the objective world in our consciousness. Their grouping according to the principle of characteristic features and properties defined in many ways the language view of the world within a certain linguistic society, like united cultural, historical, political and other long-term bonds of the social plan that is elevating them into certain conceptual or structural semantic category is called categorization. Constant interaction of processes of conceptualization and categorization provides harmony of thought and language linguistic system which allows to arrange the harmony of human communication and the transfer of information from one medium to another language.

An important place in this synthesis is occupied by the nomination of objects of reality and consciousness by means of language designation of some phenomena which is by means of a sign associated with objects of a different kind in the mind of an indidvidual. This is where the leading process of restructuring seems to be a metaphor or the process which as it is mentioned by Lakoff and Johnson (2003) with a certain exaggeration is a process people live by Zoometaphor which is the subject matter of the ongoing research is one of the most fundamental models of transmission of the diversity of thoughts, feelings and emotions, allowing to convey effectively the information to the other person as it may seem very important.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The ongoing research is mainly based on the cognitive methodology. The latter is seen as the most

---

Corresponding Author: Prokhorova Olga, Belgorod State University, Pobeda Street 85, 308015 Belgorod, Russia

important method to reveal the true nature of the studied concepts in general and in different lingvo cultures in particular. The main part of this linguistic method is aimed at the lexical level of the ongoing research while interpreting the terms under study and their correlation. Thus, the comparative cognitive semantic and pragmatic discourse analysis of the use of the animalistic phraseological nominations is aimed to construct the part of the linguistic view of the world.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Zoometaphore here is a process of naming the target-object with the name of the animal taken from the source. Thus, the source is represented by different names of animals that from a scientific point of view can be divided into the bird's names (names of birds species), entomonimy (names of insects species), ihtionimy (names of fish species) and other classes that correspond to the biological classification of living species according to C. Linnaeus. But, along with scientific thinking there also exists another source of structuring concepts and consciousness which is also represented in daily communication and is important in ordinary, everyday life. It exists in the present but is formed during the development of the national culture and thus has certain associative connections in the consciousness of the linguistic society; it is reflected in the linguistic view of the world. It can bind together the nomination of the different classes of biological scientific picture of the world.

So the question arises: what has caused this discrepancy between these different structures of thinking on the basis of seemingly the same linguistic material? The answer seems to be axiomatic: this is due to the communicative and more specifically, discursive characteristics. People associate the same or similar ideas about the phenomena of the world of reality and thinking from different spheres of the existence of the world, tie them together and reflect this relationship in different units of language, especially in lexical and phraseological units for the characteristics of the same entity or relationship. When it comes to the same subject, we often encounter cases of absolute synonyms such as hippo and hippopotamus in the Russian language or linguistic units to describe the same phenomenon in various areas of communication in other words, stylistic synonyms such as marijuana and grass in the English language.

In the case of attributes or characteristics of abstract relations, we are often dealing with ideographic synonyms. Such cases of ideographic synonyms, we can observe in the use nominations of animals of different types and classes to express the evaluation or qualification while describing things of the outside world and above all, people, their appearance, behavior and signs of external actions which can be qualified by certain content in different languages.

We have deliberately not emphasized until now the existence of the level structure of metaphorical representation of data. Naturally, the determining factor in this regard is the lexical level because as you know is in the form of lexical units that implements the vast majority of concepts in the form of units of language and speech. But, suprasegmental phraseological level seems no less important to achieve the meaningful pragmatic effect achieved by the use of zoonyms for the characterization of human relationships with the external natural world and the world of human relationships in real speech in other words to create a certain fragments of a linguistic view of the world as a unit.

We would like to illustrate these phenomena using the material of modern Russian and other East Slavic languages and see how their contrastive semantic features in the use of names of animals work and also to find out whether the phenomena described can be qualified as universal, etc.

To achieve this goal let us refer to the material of these languages. First of all, the analysis of the material shows that they can be traced quite clearly as a categorical semantic opposition as domestic: wild animals. This is understandable, since people quite clearly classify the qualifications of various spheres of life, including the sphere of the animal world using the algoritm: a friend or foe. This cognitive phenomenon repeatedly was spoken of in the researches on the semantics of the language.

The lexical set of words nominating animals in the Belarusian, Russian and Ukrainian languages for the characteristics of the category of people and their behavior is fairly standard. First of all, these are such prototypical animals like Dog/Sabaki, cat/kishka, cow, horse, calf/telya, chicken/cock and others. However in a real discourse, especially for the realization of the goals of speech, their use shows particular interpretation data as seen from the semantic content of these items of in these languages.

Take for example, the lexeme as well as different gender categories of the concept. In Russian, the word is most often associated with the person in the context of its negative characteristics and therefore is often used as a component of stable combinations with total negative semantics. From a stylistic point of view such set phrases are most commonly associated with lower registers of speech and are often associated with regional factors of the formation of stable units for example:

- It is in their coachman stood Davydka
- With the landlord's table scraps catches

- You, Jack as a chain dog, any obreshesh
- Ivan, would you have stayed asked the hostess. In the forest lodge, I know no dog to not glance
- Vyazhi-vyazhi fool and preempting thanks face you will stuff
- For what?
- For nothing, I know Grishka , druzyaki him . It's a dog bite and will not say why
- Wait, villagers!
- Kutsyy male stanishnik you!

At the same time, phrasal units as part of which the vertex component is the lexeme bitch are quite homogeneous in their discourse and evaluation characteristics in these languages and are used primarily to refer to a woman of easy virtue. It is quite illustrative in the following example taken from Tihij Don (And Quiet Flows the Don) where the word appears in the well-known proverb as the antithesis to the word dog.

Aksinia angrily yanked the gate sweaters. On dumped pinkish, girlish breasts strong cherry-blue streaks are frequent.

Do you know what? Beats every day! Blood sucks! And you too good. Napaskudil like a dog and away. All of you. With trembling fingers, buttoning buttons and frightened no offense Do looked at Gregory turned away:

- Looking to blame? Bilkov biting grass, he drawled
- Calm his voice burned Aksinya
- Ala' s not your fault? He cried passionately
- Bitch do not want, the dog did not jump
- Aksinia covered her face with her hands. Stout, calculated blow fell offense

At the same time, the Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian languages often provide common set phrases of the low stylistic register that have the same semantic and discourse-pragmatic characteristics and are used for the negative characteristics of a person with an emphasis on the fact that his mother was bitch, describing not her sexual behavior but just her quite dirty, slavishly ingratiating animal nature, able to eat leftovers in other words as the center of negative human characteristics. In this sense, man appears as the son of a female dog just a puppy. This set phrase is it can be illustrated by the following example:

- Hex dull, out of the water and muttered Gregory directly in bluish nose looked to his father
- You keep your mouth shut

- Few people gutaryut
- Shut up, bastard

Pantelei doesn't actually want to say that his own son is son of a bitch (a dog's son) as well but just wants to show his father's authority and force his son to shut up and not not argue.

Many of the Zoological phraseological units at the same time have internationally leading linguistic positions and are associated with important cultural human sources such as the Scriptures, myths of various peoples (primarily from Greek ancient mythology). Thus for example is the phraseologism dog in the manger, the source of which as you know is one of Aesop's fables. Existing in various languages (in particular, being a conceptual marker-title world-famous plays of Lope de Vega), it has its counterparts in East Slavic languages in sufficient integrity and backup form and meaning of the original statement and is often used in these languages for example.

His head his hands go I and at last the women of their kind entailed on which to sit like a dog in the manger and to die of starvation in the box of money (Karatkevich, 2015).

In general the semantics of the word dog is heterogeneous but most of the phraseological units with dog as the top component can quite clearly expresse negative-evaluation semantics for example.

Poosteregsya, my dear, you have to hang the dog began. The city have been told if you're a Count Deviera milueshsya.

One mother pokiynychka, I and senior Elisha earned. The rest of the swell on the stove and squabbled like dogs (Samchuk, 2015).

Colonel, I continued your daughter to us. We will drown first. Do not forget that. Not immediately answered the Colonel. "We have perestrilyayemo like rabid dogs. For every finger of my daughter ten povishu on reyah" (Janovs'kij, 2015).

The interesting fact is that the Russian language contains a certain variation of principles of this unit's use. This variability is manifested in the fact that the lexeme son can be replaced with names of animals like the cat and other lexemes, mostly expressing negative evaluative attitude in particular:

Carnota: death saw that's as close as your scarf. I once went to the headquarters to Krapchikovu and he gave me son of a bitch in the propeller put into play the small worms and you guns! Budyonny for you from the sky!.

- Pantelei Prokofich son you!
- His head was gold! Brainstorming, son of a bitch

Variability of the phraseological unit is obvious and in combination with other zoo nomination in particular: What are you kulaks suchish, wolf fornication? What are you, ask kulaks suchish?! Roared, bumping him a horse, the sergeant, the chief of the convoy.

In general, the lexeme wolf as a part of set phrases and expressions often serves as a means of discursive characteristics of the person but about it, we will say more positively because the evaluative semantics of the word dog is not yet completely understood, especially in the Russian language. We can also mention briefly the most characteristic cognitive-discursive sphere of use of these lexemes.

Clever dog, e.g., Round head Cossack clung to the horse's neck. He is at the races, a horse led a furious gallop have a high fence lifted him on its hind legs and deftly jumped to the other side.

A trickster entot: Look waved over the fence like a greyhound dog!.

Dirty dog: e.g., our regiment is a more or less organized and all the counter cross us strive to lean. Transports fasten as many have mangy dogs Repev in wool. And gunners and refugees and the encirclement. gypsy Tabor.

Unpretentious dog: e.g. for the third platoon of the food went Mishka Mishka. On a long stick he brought low and steaming pots, barely entered the dugout shouted:

- So you can not, Bratushka! Well it is, Al, we dogs?
- You about what? Asked Curly
- Dohlinoy feed us! Angrily shouted Mishka
- Gregory lit the lamp, saw a brownish face his blood and fire a scratch above his forehead
- Who is it you? Bandaged? I at once wait that's a bandage find jumped out of bed found the gauze and bandage
- Zago, like a dog, rumbled Khristonya. It's me, therefore, commandant skoblenul with revolver

It is easy to notice that idioms with component names of animals, naming the animal world, close to people living next to them, being friends, bodyguards, assistants in hard work, sometimes serving as food (dogs, cats, horses, pets artiodactyls, pigs, rabbits, etc.) are not as usefu but associated with the house and farmland (mice, rats, moles) and are representatives of wildlife "enemies" and "foes" of man (predators, especially wolves, foxes, bears and Hori, marten and others, rabbits and so on) are linked, first and foremost with nominations mammals.

Undoubtedly, they dominate the phraseology composition compared to other animals. But, this does not mean that members of other types, families, genera do not constitute a potential active part of the phraseological fund of the East Slavic languages. Moreover, it should be noted that in some specific semantic field dominat not just dogs, cats and predatory mammals but for example, birds, amphibians and insects, particularly in areas related to the peculiarities of human speech sounds for example:

Okay, schemer, go to the bath, wash off the dirt, pushed Igor Ermakov. When Igor left, Poroshin said: I would not want such literate command. Chicks greenhorns . More bass croak not learned and with his short climb.

But evil Juno, daughter Sutch, Rozkudkudakalas, yak Kvochka Aeneas did not love fear; It has long been won hotila, Yogo dwellers darling poletila. To hell i i dwellers spirit groin (Kotljarevs'kij, 2015).

A more detailed analysis of the different speech actualizations shows that the use of these appeal to broader areas of reality, rather than its mere sense-perception. It is often similar or the same type of phraseological units that use the same vertex zoonimic components found in different related languages as can betraced in the following examples which are associated with the inertia of the flies in the Autumn and Spring.

And I see that people umayutsya per night, sleeping on the move. How to fly a sleepy afternoon walk. But what is the impact of their work? And look to get into the car.

Ochi, vysusheni demonichnym overloading imagination, crawling like flies lypuchi seeking who conceals his sins before God (Andrijashik, 2015).

It is noteworthy that the semantics of the weak fly is not unique to phraseological subsystems of the East Slavic languages. At least, this phenomenon is recorded in such West Slavic language is Czech. It is not necessary even updated the qualifying adjective (Hasek, 2015). Cadet Biegler was like a fly (Hasek, 2015).

The frequency of the word fly in the East Slavic languages, needs further study. Of course, one can hardly argue that fly in phraseological context is less frequent than dog or cat. However, the semantic scope of such use is very diverse, reflecting the solid fraction of the tlexeme in the creation of certain fragments of a linguistic view of the world. Where the devil brought him swore Yuri. The elephant of a fly inflate, he could always.

Children covered shawl like flies honey and tiy hustyni was all good: I horihy of seed, I hrushi and apples also Medianik (Nechuj-Levic'kij, 2015).

Of course if not for the build numbers and fiction, with a twinkle, it can be I odnomanitni these boxes

animate something and then Vnochi as well during fly husband and it is unlikely vtrapyt home, zabludytsya this standard tsarstvi (Gonchar, 2015).

As mentioned above, the semantics of the word fly in the aspect of its nomination of the part of the physical world, its capacity in the field of phraseology is associated primarily with weakness, inertia, passivity. However, analysis of the facts of the same phraseology paradigm shows the possibility of the very opposite semantic interpretation, of course in specific situations.

What kind of gone crazy from time immemorial, married, enti let him have survived with their wives and young youngster, I would decree on the ban did marry. Which it will be revolutionary if it is for Zhenya hem priobyknet stay? Baba for us as greedy flies to honey. Dorazu vlipnesh. I experienced, it for yourself, absolutely know!.

When I divchynu Select se, the vizmu good as kvitochka red as viburnum in luzi as quiet as quiet Summer, said gay Lavrin: To me was working and nimbly and that was a bit pungent, like flies in spasivku said Karp (Nechuj-Levic'kij, 2015).

Thus, the capacity of the lexemes forming the phraseological units being their main componens-zoonyms in the Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian languages is truly immeasurable. Such units are very different and have a high illocutionary potential, often used in fiction and nonfiction works and in the immediate oral speech communication. In addition, they are conglomerates of certain ethnic and cultural values, the generalization of the national experience of language comprehension of reality. For these reasons, they can rightly be considered as one of the most important factors in creating a linguistic view of the world in these cultures.

CONCLUSION

The ongoing research shows that phraseology itself is an enormous sourse of knowledge and and a perspective field of study from the point of view of different methodological points. Thus taking into consideration cognitive methods, discourse analysis combined with traditional comparative methods and interpretation of empirical material in several Slavic languages helps to reveal specific features and pecularities of categorization and adds to the research of cognitive processes in the human brain.

REFERENCES

Andrijashik, R., 2015. People fear zi. http://royallib.com/book/andryashik_roman/lyudi_z_strahuv_obloz.html.

Chekulaj, I.V., 2014. Princip Ocenochnoj Aktualizacii v Sovremennom Anglijskom Jazyke. Moskva: INFRA-M.

Evans, V. and M. Green, 2006. Cognitive linguistics: an introduction. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ.

Gonchar, O., 2015. Sobor. Cathedral Oles Gonchar. http://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printout.php?id=32&bookid=9.

Hasek, J., 2015. O sudy Dobrjho Vojbka Svejka za svmtovj vblky. http://klempera.tripod.com/svejk.htm.

Janovs'kij, J., 2015. Majster Korablja. Yuriy Yanovsky Master ship. http://www.ukrclassic.com.ua/katalog/ya/yurij-yanovskij/1138-yurij-yanovskij-majster-korablya.

Karatkevich, V., 2015. Dzikae paljavanne karalja Staha. http://knihi.com/Uladzimir_Karatkievic/Dzikaje_palavannie_karala_Stacha.html.

Kornilov, O.A., 2003. Jazykovye kartiny mirov kak proizvodnye nacional'nyh mentalitetov [monografija]. Moskva: CheRo.

Kotljarevs'kij, I., 2015. Soul, life. http://www.pysar.net/Kotljarevskyj.

Lakoff G. and M. Johnson, 2003. Metaphors, we live by. London: University of Chicago Press.

Nechuj-Levic'kij, I., 2015. Kajdasheva sim'ja. http://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printout.php?id=74&bookid=5.

Samchuk, U., 2015. Volin' Favorit. http://www.lib.ru/SU/UKRAINA/SAMCHUK/volun.txt.

Schalley, A.C., 2004. Cognitive Modeling and Verbal semantics: A Representational Framework Based on UML. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.