

ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ**LANGUAGE STUDIES**

UDC 10.12731/2077-1770-2019-5-14-25

УДК 811.1

**RUSSIAN AND FRENCH PHRASEOLOGY:
AXIOLOGICAL ASPECT***Maximets S.V., Pudeyan L.A.*

Purpose. *The article is aimed to distinguish such close concepts as value and evaluation on the phraseological material of the two multi-structural languages, i.e. Russian and French. The emphasis is placed on the fact that most of the phraseological units are characterized by evaluative rather than value content. The article examines the way the national value paradigm is objectified in both languages by means of semantics, figurative component and component composition of phraseological units, as well as the way the evaluative properties of phraseological units are determined by their stylistic features.*

Methodology and research methods. *Phraseological material was collected by continuous sampling from phraseological dictionaries. The semantic and component analysis methods were also used to analyze the obtained material.*

The results of the study. *The concepts of value and evaluation on the basis of the phraseological material of the Russian and French languages were clearly distinguished. Cultural values were objectified, as well as it was identified that national cultural values are manifested by means of phraseological units that have unique semantics, image component, and component composition.*

Practical implications. *The results obtained can be used in teaching the basics of linguistics, as well as for preparing specialized academic courses on phraseology and axiology.*

Keywords: *axiology; phraseological unit; value; evaluation; expressiveness; general cultural values; national cultural values.*

РУССКАЯ И ФРАНЦУЗСКАЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЯ: АКСИОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ

Макимец С.В., Пудеян Л.А.

Цель. В статье на фразеологическом материале двух разноструктурных языков – русского и французского – разграничиваются такие близкие понятия, как ценность и оценка. Делается акцент на том, что большая часть фразеологизмов характеризуется оценочным, а не ценностным содержанием. Исследуется, как национальная ценностная парадигма объективируется в обоих языках посредством семантики, образной составляющей и компонентного состава фразеологизмов, а также как оценочные свойства фразеологизмов обуславливаются их стилистическими особенностями.

Методология и методы исследования. Фразеологический материал был собран методом сплошной выборки из фразеологических словарей. Для анализа собранного материала применялись методы семантического и компонентного анализа.

Результаты исследования. В статье были подробно изучены и дифференцированы понятия ценности и оценки на основе фразеологического материала русского и французского языков. Были выделены культурные ценности, а также определено, что национально-культурные ценности могут быть репрезентированы через фразеологизмы, имеющие уникальную семантику, образную составляющую и компонентный состав.

Практическое применение. Результаты исследования могут быть использованы в базовом курсе лингвистики, а также при преподавании фразеологии и аксиологии.

Ключевые слова: аксиология; фразеологизм; ценность; оценка; экспрессивность; общекультурные ценности; национально-культурные ценности.

The semantic structure of most phraseological units (PU) is the unity of logical (significant and denotative) and emotional and expres-

sive aspects of the content. The second component of the meaning of PU assumes the presence of evaluation semes in it. Thus, the object of this study is actualized in the appropriateness of the axiological aspect of phraseology examination. The subject of our research is the ability of phraseological units to express evaluation and mark general cultural and national cultural values.

Axiology (from Greek “axia” – value and “logos” – science, teaching) is a philosophical concept that has a fairly wide range of different definitions depending on the source used. The shortest and laconic definition is presented, for example, in the philosophical encyclopedic dictionary: “Axiology – the science of values” [3, p. 14]. In our opinion, the most capacious definition of this concept is given in the four-volume New philosophical encyclopedia: “... philosophical discipline, exploring the category of “value”, characteristics, structures and hierarchies of the value world, the ways of its knowledge and its ontological status as well as the nature and specificity of value judgments” [9, p. 62].

However, there is an expansion of this concept beyond philosophical research at the present stage of science development, in linguistics, in particular, an example being the definition from the dictionary of new foreign words, where the philosophical interpretation is followed by linguistic, “Axiology – section of the sociology of language, studying the system of evaluations of natural languages and their elements” [5, p. 4]. More recently, the new direction in the field of linguistics such as axiological linguistics has been formed, which aims to study the concept of values in terms of of language. The most important research task of axiologically oriented linguistics is to determine the methodology and technology in the study of the content of the inner world of linguistic (discursive) personality, value orientations of the individuals and the whole society according to the language, which is possible within the framework of the Human–Language–World paradigm [7, p. 19].

Taking into account the above definitions, it is necessary to identify the understanding of axiology within the framework of linguistics, which we will adhere to in this study: axiological linguistics is a branch of linguistics that studies the ways of expressing the evaluation of the

speaker in relation to the object of expression, variants of classification of evaluations, and also determines the general cultural values and the national cultural values through language analysis.

It is necessary to differ the concepts of “evaluation” and “value”. The Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language by S.I. Ozhegov and N.Yu. Shvedova provides the following definitions respectively: “opinion about the value, level or value of someone or something” [11, p. 486] and “importance, significance” [11, p. 876]. As can be seen, these concepts, while they differ, are close, because the evaluation, first of all, involves the opinion of value, and secondly, it is directly related to what matters to someone. Since most PUs from the point of view of their semantics are characterized by evaluation, we can say that the analysis of language material, in particular phraseological, involves the allocation of elements with axiological properties that 1) either implicate the evaluative characteristics of the statement, 2) or indicate national cultural values. Within the first facet of the axiological aspect, with the help of language and some specific language elements, the speaker can convey, in addition to the information message itself, his own evaluative connotation in relation to the object of the statement.

Any PU represents the versatility of its categorical properties, but it is the evaluation that is one of the most important characteristics that fills the PU with expressiveness and emotions. This characterizing function is inseparable from the semantics of most PUs. The axiological aspect adds to the meaning of PU the relation of the subject of speech to the object. In the generalization of the PU’s category of evaluation there can be two types of evaluation: positive [“*ангельское терпение*” and “*patience d’ange*” in the meaning of “*angelic patience*” [6, p. 58] and negative [“*retourner qqn comme une crêpe*” (literally (lit.) “to turn someone over like a pancake”) in the sense of “to influence someone and make him change his opinion” [6, p. 193]; “*в чужом пиру похмелье*” in the sense of “trouble because of others, because of someone else’s guilt” [2, p. 535]. It should be emphasized that any PU in its semantics has one or another evaluative (axiological) connotation, but most of them convey a negative assessment.

The semantic structure of PU, which has a complex organization, includes an axiological component, representing the so-called private evaluative meanings. E.I. Dibrova offers the following classification of private evaluative meanings:

1. Emotional evaluation: “*умирать со смеху*” – to laugh so hard, to have fun, to have fun intensively (positive), “*постная физиономия*” – sad, pale and gloomy person (negative); “*voir tout en bleu*” (lit. “see everything in blue” – be optimistic) (positive), “*avoir la berlue*” (lit. “to have eclipse” – to be stunned, to be crazy) (negative).

2. Ethical evaluation: “*человек слова*” – a reliable person who always keeps the promise (positive), “*шагать по трупам*” – to be cruel, able to eliminate competitors to achieve the goal (negative); “*avoir de l’atout*” (lit. “to have trump card” – He’s very much on the ball) (positive), “*un homme sans aveu*” (lit. “the man without a confession” – a dark person; an adventurer; rogue) (negative).

3. Intellectual (epistemic) evaluation: “*браться за ум*” – to become more reasonable (positive), “*пустая голова*” – a stupid person (negative); “*avoir oublié d’être bête*” (lit. “to forget how to be stupid” – to be very sharp) (positive), “*bouché à l’émeri*” (lit. “plugged with a sandpaper” – stupid, thick-headed) (negative).

4. Normative (deontic) evaluation: “*вырастать в глазах*” – to change in a positive sense according to somebody’s evaluation (positive), “*валять дурака*” – to speak or to do stupidity (negative); “*remplir l’attente*” (lit. “to fill waiting” – to justify hopes) (positive), “*donner une aubade*” (lit. “give the morning serenade” – play a cruel joke with somebody) (negative).

5. Qualificative (qualitative/quantitative) evaluation: “*в два счета*” – very quickly (positive qualitative), “*толстый как боров*” – speaks of an obese man (a negative qualitative); “*faire un bail avec la vie*” (lit. “to sign a lease with life” – to be cheerful, strong in old age) (positive qualitative), “*barre à mine*” (lit. “bar look” – unreliable, unlucky person) (negative qualitative); “*сколько душе угодно*” (very much) (positive quantitative); “*кот наплакал*” – very little (negative quantitative); “*corbeille à pleine*” (lit. “with a full basket” – in abundance, generously)

(positive quantitative); “*être de petite vie*” (lit. “to be from a small life” – to eat not much) (negative quantitative) [12, p. 328].

The feelings of the speaker, their emotions, spiritual experiences are necessarily generated by a private, personal attitude to the object of speech, designated by the PU, which gives us the right to say that the emotional world of the speaker is firmly, indivisibly connected with such a characteristic of PU as evaluativity. Emotional evaluation of something, the attitude to something can be demonstrated by transmitting by the speaker’s various feelings reflected in the semantic structure of the PU. In phraseological dictionaries there are special marks indicating the emotional connotation of the PU: “ironic”, “disapproving”, “contemptuous”, “dismissive”, “humorous” and others. Here are some examples of such Russian PUs: “*как баран на новые ворота*” – to come into a dead end, to face something new, unexpected (dism.) [4, p. 15]; “*бары растабаривать*” – to talk meaninglessly (disapp.) [4, p. 16]; “*черная душа*” – a person capable of low, reprehensible acts (cont.) [2, p. 210]; “*разбираться как свинья в апельсинах*” – not to understand completely smth. (iron.) [2, p. 629]; «*как в аптеке*» – absolutely precisely (hum.) [4, p. 10].

In French it is also possible to distinguish PUs expressing emotional attitude to the designated object of speech. For example, such PUs as «*un bouillon d’onze heures*» (lit. “broth, drunk at eleven o’clock”) – a poisonous potion, poison (colloq.) [8, p. 52]; “*faire les ablutions*” (lit. “to bathe”) to wash (hum.) [10, p. 5]; «*courier l’aiguillette*» (lit. “run with a lace”) to have love affairs (vulg.) [3, p. 29], “*ami de tout le monde*” (lit. “friend of the world”) universal friend (iron.) [10, p. 52], “*bander mou*” (lit. “bandage gently”) to be afraid, be a coward (rude) [10, p. 119].

Based on the above examples, it can be concluded that such categorical properties of PU as evaluativity, expressiveness and emotional evaluation are a correlating, interrelated aspect of the PU’s semantics, which gives the right to associate this commonality of properties with the stylistic characteristics of PU in general [12, p. 331].

Despite the fact that most PUs are evaluative, not every one of them can convey valuable information. The second facet of the axiological aspect of phraseology is actualized by the explication of general cultural (universal) and national cultural (unique) values of Russian and French ethnic groups.

By general cultural values we mean those that exist in the material and spiritual life of the predominant number of linguistic and cultural communities or any specific (in our case, Russian and French) ethnic groups. At the same time, it seems appropriate to introduce the concept of axiological phraseological dyad, actualizing the set of two opposed groups: PU with the meaning associated with conventional values, and PU whose content plan marks the conventional anti-values [1, p. 82]. The examples of such dyads are: life – death [“*вдохнуть жизнь*”] [2, p. 223] and “*redonner la vie à qqn*” (lit. “to give life to someone again”) [10, p. 1594] in the sense of “to revive, to return to life, to make viable” – “*накладывать на себя руки*” and “*mettre fin à ses jours*” (lit. “to put an end to your days”) meaning “to commit suicide” [6, p. 138], courage – cowardice [“*смотреть в лицо (опасности)*” meaning “not to be afraid of something, to be courageous” [4, p. 264] and “*aller au combat comme à la noce*” (lit. “to go into battle as a wedding”) meaning “to go with a smile into danger” [10, p. 343] – “*бояться собственной тени*” and “*avoir peur de son ombre*” in the sense of “to be very fearful, timid, scared” [6, p. 19], wealth – poverty [“*бешеные деньги*” and “*un argent fou*” in the sense of “a huge sum of money” [6, p. 16] – “*зол как сокол*” and “*pauvre comme Job*” (lit. “poor as Job”) meaning “a person who is absolutely deprived of means to exist” [6, p. 142], etc.

National cultural values in this study are understood as important, significant realities of the objective world, either existing within one nation and absent within others, or prevailing in one nation relatively to others. The analysis of a phraseological fund of two languages showed that national cultural values can be actualized by means of PUs, having unique semantics, internal form or lexical-component structure, which are lacunary in phraseology of another language. For example, the unique plan of the content of PU speaks about the national cultural value or anti-value of the described reality: “*Северная Пальмира*” (lit. “Northern Palmyra”) in the meaning of “St. Petersburg” [2, p. 514], “*пошел березки считать*” (lit. “went to count birches”) (about the transportation to Siberia) [2, p. 49], “*l’abbaye de monte-à-regret*” (lit. “Abbey of a sorrow mountain”) in the meaning of “guillotine” [10,

p. 3], “*la bergère de Domrémy*” (lit. “cowgirl from Domrémy”) in the meaning of “Joan of Arc” [10, p. 144].

PU with a unique internal form also mark national cultural values or anti-values: “*как Мамай прошел*” [2, p. 415] and “*C’est la Bérézina*” [6, p. 169] (lit. “this is Berezina” – a complete defeat, disaster, defeat, ruin), “*дым столбом (коромыслом)*” [2, p. 213] and “*la cour du roi Pétoud*” [10, p. 411] (lit. “the court of king Peto” – a place of disorder, turmoil, madhouse).

In accordance with the quantitative approach to the composition of the phraseological fund the ideographic areas are allocated, indicating the accentuation of the nation in a certain sphere of the universe, which implicates the value of a particular reality for a certain linguistic and cultural community. For example, the analysis of the PU meaning reveals that in Russian phraseology more relevant are such moral values as the preservation of family traditions, loyalty, chastity, hospitality, generosity, cordiality [“*Филемон и Бавкида*” in the meaning of “the inseparable couple of old spouses” [2, p. 722], “*зайти на огонек*” in the meaning of “go to visit friends without warning, easily” [2, p. 489], “*пир на весь мир*” in the meaning of “a crowded, rich feast” [2, p. 535], etc.]. French phraseology is dominated by such national and cultural values as freedom of sexual relations, the ease of betrayal of one’s partner, as well as the finance, the politics, the gastronomy, and the various types of entertainment which have the importance for Frenchmen: [“*aller à la cour des aides*” (lit. “to go to the court of assistants”) in the meaning of “to change her husband” [10, p. 411], “*faire suer son argent*” (lit. “to make your money sweat”) in the meaning of “to take large interest on a loan” [10, p. 72], “*des discussions de Café du Commerce*” (lit. “discussions of a commercial café”) in the meaning of “empty political discussions” [10, p. 239], “*donner de l’air à une bouteille*” (lit. “give the air to the bottle”) in the meaning of “uncork the bottle” [10, p. 33], etc.].

Finding unique components in the composition of PU and their distribution by ideographic areas also makes it possible to distinguish national and cultural values on the basis of the analysis. For example, in Russian phraseology the components of units represent such conceptual spheres

as rural life and crafts, cultural and ritual sphere, folklore and mythology, etc. [*“перековать лемех на свайку”* in the meaning of “about people changing their working life for idleness” [2, p. 380], *“как бабушка отшентала”* in the meaning of “everything passed, disappeared without a trace (about illness, troubles)” [2, p. 39], *“богатырь на распутье”* in the meaning of “the choice of the direction of movement; the choice of the solution” [2, p. 59], etc.].

In French phraseology lexical components determine the following value-based ideographic areas: economics, finance, gastronomy, entertainment, etc. [*“marquer à l’actif”* (lit. “mark as an asset”) in the meaning of “to consider as an advantage, to recognize as dignity, merit” [10, p. 14], *“passer bail avec qn”* (lit. “pass the rent with someone”) in the meaning of “to make friends, to engage in an affair with anyone” [10, p. 110], *“donner à qn son biscuit”* (lit. “give your cake to someone”) in the meaning of “send someone away” [10, p. 160], *“comme l’as de pique”* (lit. “as an ace of spades”) in the meaning of “bad, awkward; an utter fool” [10, p. 80], etc.].

Thus, axiology is the science of values, while axiological linguistics studies representations of values through the prism of language. The concepts of evaluation and value are not identical. The most part of PU is characterized by an evaluative rather than a value aspect. The axiological aspect of phraseology can be transmitted through its semantics due to a set of particular values. Evaluativity is inseparable from expressive and emotional evaluation, and in general they correlate with the stylistic characteristics of the PU. The axiological aspect of phraseology is actualized due to the representation of general cultural and national cultural values in it. Cultural values are objectified by axiological phraseological dyads. National cultural values are manifested by means of PUs having unique semantics, image component, and component composition.

References

1. Bajramova L.K., Bagautdinova G.A. Aksiologizm chelovecheskih emocij (smekh – plach) i ego otrazhenie v yazyke [Axiologism of Human Emotions (Laughter – Crying) and its Reflection in the Language]. *Filologicheskie nauki*. 2006. № 1, pp. 81–89.

2. Birikh A.K., Mokienko V.M., Stepanova L.I. *Russkaya frazeologiya: istoriko-etimologicheskij slovar'* [Russian Phraseology: Historical and Etymological Dictionary]. M.: Astrel'; AST: Lyuks, 2005. 926 p.
3. *Filosofskij enciklopedicheskij slovar'* [The Encyclopedic Dictionary on Philosophy]. M.: INFRA-M. 2009. 570 p.
4. *Frazeologicheskij slovar' russkogo yazyka* [The Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language]. M.: YUNVES, 2003. 608 p.
5. Komlev N.G. *Slovar' novyh inostrannyh slov* [The Dictionary of New Borrowed Words]. M.: MGU, 1995. 144 p.
6. Kravtsov S.M. *Francuzsko-russkij slovar' frazeologicheskikh sootvetstvij*, [The French-Russian Dictionary of Phraseological Correspondences]. Rostov-n/D: Rostizdat, 2009. 250 p.
7. *Lingvistika i aksiologiya: etnosemiometriya cennostnyh smyslov: kolektivnaya monografiya* [Linguistics and Axiology: Ethnosemiometry of Value Meanings: Collective Monograph]. M.: TEZAURUS, 2011. 352 p.
8. Nazaryan A.G. Semanticheskaya modeliruemost' frazeologizmov: real'nost' ili fikciya [Semantic Modelability of Phraseologisms: Reality or Fiction]. *Filologicheskie nauki*. 1983. № 6. P. 34-40.
9. *Novaya filosofskaya enciklopediya* [The New Philosophical Encyclopedia]: V 4 t. M.: Mysl', 2010. T. 1. 744 p.
10. *Novyj bol'shoj francuzsko-russkij frazeologicheskij slovar'* [The New Unabridged French-Russian Phraseological Dictionary]. M.: Russkij yazyk – Media, 2005. 1624 p.
11. Ozhegov S.I. *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo yazyka: 80000 slov i frazeologicheskikh vyrazhenij* [The Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language: 80,000 Words and Phraseological Expressions]. M.: OOO «INFOTEKH», 2009. 944 p.
12. *Sovremennyj russkij yazyk. Teoriya. Analiz yazykovykh edinic* [The Modern Russian language. Theory. Analysis of language units]. Part 1. *Fonetika i orfoepiya. Grafika i orfografiya. Leksikologiya. Frazeologiya. Leksikografiya. Morfemika. Slovoobrazovanie* [Phonetics and orthoepy. Graphics and spelling. Lexicology. Phraseology. Lexicography]. M.: Izdatel'skij centr «Akademiya», 2006. 480 p.

Список литературы

1. Байрамова Л.К., Багаутдинова Г.А. Аксиологизм человеческих эмоций (смех – плач) и его отражение в языке // Филологические науки. 2006. № 1. С. 81–89.
2. Бирих А.К., Мокиенко В.М., Степанова Л.И. Русская фразеология: историко-этимологический словарь. М.: Астрель; АСТ: Льюкс, 2005. 926 с.
3. Философский энциклопедический словарь. М.: ИНФРА-М. 2009. 570 с.
4. Фразеологический словарь русского языка / Под ред. И. В. Федосова, А.Н. Лапицкого. М.: ЮНВЕС, 2003. 608 с.
5. Комлев Н.Г. Словарь новых иностранных слов. М.: МГУ, 1995. 144 с.
6. Кравцов С.М. Французско-русский словарь фразеологических соответствий / Под ред. П. Кабаньольса. Ростов-н/Д: Ростиздат, 2009. 250 с.
7. Лингвистика и аксиология: этносемиотрия ценностных смыслов: коллективная монография. М.: ТЕЗАУРУС, 2011. 352 с.
8. Назарян А.Г. Семантическая моделируемость фразеологизмов: реальность или фикция. // Филологические науки. 1983. № 6. С. 34–40.
9. Новая философская энциклопедия: В 4 т. М.: Мысль, 2010. Т. 1. 744 с.
10. Новый большой французско-русский фразеологический словарь / Под ред. В.Г. Гака. М.: Русский язык – Медиа, 2005. 1624 с.
11. Ожегов С.И. Толковый словарь русского языка: 80000 слов и фразеологических выражений. М.: ООО «ИНФОРТЕХ», 2009. 944 с.
12. Современный русский язык. Теория. Анализ языковых единиц: учебник для студ. высш. учеб. заведений. В 2 ч. Ч. 1. Фонетика и орфоэпия. Графика и орфография. Лексикология. Фразеология. Лексикография. Морфемика. Словообразование. М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2006. 480 с.

DATA ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Maximets Sergej Viktorovitch, Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor
Don State Technical University
1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, Rostov region, 344000, Russian Federation

smaksimets@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-7838-7618

Pudeyan Lyudmila Arcvikovna, senior lecturer
Don State Technical University
1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, Rostov region, 344000, Russian Federation
l.pudeyan@mail.ru

ДАННЫЕ ОБ АВТОРАХ

Максимец Сергей Викторович, кандидат филологических наук,
доцент кафедры «НТПиПК» ДГТУ
Донской государственный технический университет
пл. Гагарина 1, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Ростовская обл., 344000,
Российская Федерация
smaksimets@gmail.com

Пудеян Людмила Арцвиковна, старший преподаватель кафедры
«НТПиПК» ДГТУ
Донской государственный технический университет
пл. Гагарина 1, г. Ростов-на-Дону, Ростовская обл., 344000,
Российская Федерация
l.pudeyan@mail.ru