

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v7i2.1600

Citation: Alefirenko, N., Lagodenko, J., Chumak-Zhun, I., Goleva, N., & Zhilenkova, I. (2018). Ethnocultural Specific of Idioms: From Traditional to Innovative Paradigms. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(2), 708-714. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i2.1600>

Ethnocultural Specific of Idioms: From Traditional to Innovative Paradigms

**Nikolai F. Alefirenko¹, Julietta V. Lagodenko², Irina I. Chumak-Zhun³,
Natalya M. Goleva⁴, Irina I. Zhilenkova⁵**

Abstract

The ethno-cultural aura of phraseology is revealed in conjunction with the comprehension of the secrets of the linguistic mentality of peoples that generates the idiomatics of native languages. Since traditionally ethno-cultural specificity of phraseology was studied at the level of a country study description, an attempt was made to elucidate the work of cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms for the formation of phraseological imagery. The first method is aimed at revealing the ethno-cultural component in the value-semantic potential of phraseme building components, called culturally significant realia. However, the authors do not confine themselves to this method, which narrows the reference of phraseme building components. An integrated approach to the identification and description of the ethno-cultural component is proposed, using the analysis of the integrated configuration of the four factors of the formation of the axiological content of phrasemes.

Keywords: Phraseme, Worldview, Linguistic-cultural approach, Ethno-cultural component, Cognitive approach, Linguocreative thinking.

¹ Belgorod State University, Russia, Belgorod (Correspondent postal address: 14 Studenchenskaya Street, Belgorod, 308000, Russia). E-mail: alefirenko@bsu.edu.ru

² Belgorod State University, Russia, Belgorod (Correspondent postal address: 14 Studenchenskaya Street, Belgorod, 308000, Russia).

³ Belgorod State University, Russia, Belgorod (Correspondent postal address: 14 Studenchenskaya Street, Belgorod, 308000, Russia).

⁴ Belgorod State University, Russia, Belgorod (Correspondent postal address: 14 Studenchenskaya Street, Belgorod, 308000, Russia).

⁵ Belgorod State University, Russia, Belgorod (Correspondent postal address: 14 Studenchenskaya Street, Belgorod, 308000, Russia).

INTRODUCTION

The significance of the study is due to the growth of interlinguistic contacts and the affirmation of the principles of anthropocentrism in the science of language in general and in phraseology, in particular, which presupposes the study of the ethno-cultural aura of phraseology in direct relation with the comprehension of the secrets of the linguistic mentality of peoples – native-speakers of the languages compared. The very problem of ethno-cultural specifics of the phrasemes is not new. However, the ways and means of solving it still remain at the country specific level without clarifying the cognitive-pragmatic mechanisms of its formation (Alefirenko 2018).

In addition, before disclosing the nature of the ethno-cultural component in the phrasemes, it is necessary to determine what is meant by this mysterious phenomenon. Traditionally, two methods are used. The first of them prescribes the ethno-cultural component to identify according to the meaning of the phraseme building components that denote the culturally significant realities, which, as practice shows, leads to a narrowing of the subject area of the problem under study. The opposite approach recommends to include the widest possible range of axiological factors to the notion of "ethno-cultural component" (Alefirenko & Nurtazina 2018: 79).

Thus, V.N. Telia, admitting phrasemes as national in essence, suggests the ethno-linguistic idiosyncrasy of idioms to be considered in general categories of culture. This view attracts an increasing number of researchers. According to N.V. Titarenko (2008), in the notion of national linguoculture, she includes a wide range of linguistic phenomena associated with the idea of the inner form of the language and the embodiment of the spirit of the people in it (Humboldt 1984). The author's idea is not controversial. However, the inclusion of "a wide range of linguistic phenomena" inevitably blurs the subject of the research, and the embodiment in the inner form of a phraseme of the people's spirit needs a method for its definition and explication.

With the strengthening of the methodological foundations of cognitive phraseology and linguocultural studies, it became possible to concretize the methods of penetration into the phenomena hidden from surface observation, which determine the universal and unique properties of the various semantic groups correlated in different languages. To achieve such a difficult intention, we formulate the priority tasks: a) to form the correlated semantic groups of phrasemes with the national and cultural semantics; b) to reveal their discursive and pragmatic potential, since phrasemes as signs of indirectly-derived nomination are characterized by the figurative-situational motivation, which is directly connected with the worldview of the native speakers of the given language; c) to show the communicative activity of correlated phraseosemantic groups; d) to establish the degree of manifestation of the universal and unique in each phraseosemantic group. The solution of such problems is aimed at comprehending that "imaginative representation of reality that reflects the historical or spiritual experience of the speech community, which is connected with its cultural traditions, for the subject of nomination and speech activity is always a subject of national culture" (Telia 1996: 214-215).

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Generally, (see: Latypov 1989) the ethno-cultural component of the phraseme is revealed in three ways: 1) with the help of explication and arbitrary interpretation of the dictionary definition of the phrase; 2) extraction of the ethno-linguistic information contained in the lexical components of the phrase; 3) the projection of the discursively pragmatic content of the freely syntactical prototype to the meaning of the phraseme. In accordance with the chosen strategy of searching for ethno-cultural specifics of the phrasemes of the compared languages aimed at understanding the interdependent impact of cognitive

semantics and the intentions of the verbal and cognitive act (Alefirenko, Lagodenko, Papkov, Ozerova 2015: 1096), the following research steps appear relevant:

The classification of the phrasemes in phraseosemantic groups (FSG) - the most abstract categories of phrasemes, united by the criterion of their semantic community - is necessary because ***the more abstractly the phenomena under analysis are, the more likely the explication of phraseological universals is***. The converse is also true: ***ethno-cultural identity is mostly often found by private phraseological phenomena*** (cf.: Reichstein 1980: 133). The revealed regularity excludes expediency of research of universals at a level of separate phrasemes (Kapyshcheva 2009: 71).

The semantic space of the phraseological tier of each of the compared languages is divided into FSG, organized according to the principle of the field. This means that it can distinguish the core and periphery, in the determination of which, a well-known classification of phrasemes developed at the time by Ch. Bally, and then refined by V.V. Vinogradov. The core of FSG is formed by phraseological fusions, the meaning of which, due to the associative-semantic integration of the lexical semantics of components, have completely lost their direct lexical meanings, and hence, express the axiological dominance of this FSG. Thus, the phraseme *'втирать очки'* (*vtirat' ochki*) having lost material relations with the primary denotative, becomes a sign of the subject-semantic metaphor that extends its semantic field. This semantic expansion is due to both the social role of those collectives or social groups whose existence included the object, thing or action designated by the verbal expression, and the semantic possibilities hidden in the linguistic sign itself.

EMPIRICAL RESULTS

The awareness of the special national and cultural identity of phraseological units, initially intuitive and a priori, accompanied phraseology from the very beginning of this linguistic discipline at all stages of its development. Therefore, the development of various approaches to the identification of national-cultural phenomena in phraseology corresponded to the stages of the development of the language image in linguistics. Within the framework of the immanently-semiological direction, two approaches to the identification of the national and cultural originality of phraseological units were developed.

First of all, it is necessary to name a ***linguistic-cultural approach***. The linguistic-cultural direction in linguistics was based on the existence of an extralinguistic component in the meaning of the word due to extralinguistic factors (see Lado; Friesa; Naida; Komleva).

The interests of linguistic studies are concentrated on (a) ***background knowledge*** of native speakers and (b) on ***nonequivalent vocabulary***. O.S. Akhmanova defines background knowledge as "a mutual knowledge of realities by a speaker and a listener, which is the basis of language communication" (Akhmanova 2004). In the linguistic studies of phraseology, extralinguistic factors reflected in the component structure of phraseological units are distinguished and classified (see Vereshchagin, Kostomarov; Maltseva; Tomakhin). A particular attention to the plane of expression of phraseological units actualizes the significance of the historical and etymological interpretation of elements or the prototype of phraseological units. In the framework of a linguistic and cultural approach, the national and cultural originality of phraseological units is expressed in the reference of certain extralinguistic realities characteristic of the given culture and belonging to background knowledge of native speakers.

Linguo-study approach is the most superficial level of revealing the national and cultural component of phraseological units, rightly called "samovar" in later works, since the classical example of cultural reflection in phraseological units within the framework of a linguistic and cultural approach is the expression "to go to Tula with your samovar". The components of this expression "Tula" and "samovar" refer to the equivalent

vocabulary of the Russian language and, consequently, constitute the national identity of the phraseological unit.

The second approach to identifying the national idiosyncrasy of phraseological units also arose within the framework of a structuralist understanding of the language. It is a definite antithesis to the linguistic-cultural approach - it sharpens the researcher's attention not on the "nonequivalent" component of phraseology, but, on the contrary, on the presence in the analyzed phraseological unit of some or other correspondences in other languages. The comparison of the phraseological units of different languages initially provided the identification of phraseological internationalisms, the analysis of phraseological parallelisms in different languages, the study of the causes of their occurrence, the analysis of the types of equivalence of phraseological units.

It is commonly known that the category of national in the field of phraseology is in a dialectical unity with the category of international. The comparison of phraseological analogues of different languages with the purpose of revealing their national color, national and cultural features is the subject of a **contrastive approach** to the identification of the national and cultural originality of phraseological units. The comparison of phraseological equivalents occurs here for the purpose of revealing not the general, as in the classical comparative method, but for revealing the differences that constitute the national and cultural originality of the phraseological equivalents of the languages compared.

Traditionally, the types of interlingual phraseological equivalents, such as homonyms, paronyms, lexicogrammatical variants, the discrepancy of semantic volumes, synonyms, etc., traditionally distinguished in the literature, are seen in literature (see Arnold; Kirillova) are now considered as differences in a certain macro component of the meaning of phraseology - denotative, evaluative, emotive, stylistic, motivational. These differences are the reason for the emergence of national identity in cross-language phraseological equivalents, so far.

The emergence of relatively new approaches to the identification of national-cultural peculiarities of phraseological units occurs, as mentioned above, in the mainstream of the anthropological paradigm of linguistics, namely, within the framework of linguocultural studies and cognitive linguistics, which currently belong to the most intensively developing linguistic schools. The development of the linguocultural approach to the study of phraseology guides the researcher to the **study of the correlation of phraseological units and cultural signs** and actualizes the significance of the system of standards, stereotypes, symbols, etc. to describe the cultural-national specifics of the phraseological system.

In the framework of this approach, V.N. Teliya understands the deep meaning of the presence of phraseology in the system of any language as the ability of phraseological units to act as exponents of cultural signs, not only synchronously joining the existing system of cultural and national understanding of the world, but also transmitting its fragments from generation to generation, thereby participating in shaping the world view as a separate linguistic persona, and a language community. According to V.N. Teliya the main purpose of the linguistic and cultural analysis of phraseological units is to "identify and describe the cultural-national connotations that accompany meaning in the form of figurative associations with standards, stereotypes and other cultural signs and are correlated with each other through cognitive procedures that give meaning to these connotations" (Teliya 1996).

Thus, within the framework of **the linguistic and cultural approach, the national and cultural originality of phraseological units is seen in the fact that they contain a set of naive representations of native speakers about a certain standard, stereotype, concept of national culture.** Analysis of phraseology, somehow pointing to a certain concept of spiritual culture, reveals the national and cultural connotation of the analyzed concept, a kind of "stroke to the portrait", and a complex analysis of such phraseological units gives a complete picture of the concept under study in the "phraseological view of the world". Obviously,

for the analysis of this kind, the method of component analysis, typical of the linguistic-cultural approach, is not enough. To reveal the linguistic and cultural connotations of the concepts of spiritual culture, not only a deeper level of analysis of phraseology, but also a different methodological approach, a different understanding of phraseology is needed. Hence, linguocognitive procedures are needed for linguoculturological analysis.

In modern linguistics, the linguoculturological paradigm is inseparable from the cognitive-interpretational paradigm of research. Its development is also determined by the resorting of science to the "factor of man", as a result of which linguistics became closer with psychology, especially with the school of cognitive psychology. The center of attention of cognitive linguistics is the cognitive function of language (according to Humboldt, the primary function of a language).

Cognitive approach. In the cognitive paradigm *phraseology is considered as a microtext that is structured in the course of interpretation by a native speaker of all types of semantic information of phraseology in the semantic space of cultural knowledge* belonging to the subject of speech act (Kovshova 1996: 28). In this paradigm, the following types of cognitive procedures coincide with the macrocomponents of the value of the phraseological unit are highlighted: **denotative** processing that operates with knowledge of the properties of the designated, **axiological** interpretation of the meaning of the axiological worldview, **motivational** - operations with imaginable or speculative representational gestalt structures, **emotive** - estimated reaction to the figurative gestalt-structure as an imprint of the emotions experienced, **stylistic** - operations of social marking of the conditions of speech (Kovshova 1996: 22).

Each component of the meaning affects the other non-linearly: the interaction extends on all the information quanta, correcting and non-additive summing up their content, which expresses **the principle of self-organization and synergy**, characteristic for idiom building.

However, within the framework of cognitive linguistics, not only a new understanding of phraseology and the methods of analysis necessary to identify ethno-cultural connotations included in the plane of content or in the plane of expression of the phraseological unit were developed. Cognitive linguistics offers a special, cognitive approach to the identification of the national-cultural connotation of phraseological units.

Cognitive approach to meaning provides great opportunities in the field of linguistic modeling of the actual meaning of idioms. As it is known, idiomatic meanings are mostly metaphorical. This allows us to restore the complex of those conceptual transformations that underlie in the formation of the actual meaning of idioms. Modeling in phraseology at the present time is very promising direction, especially phrasemo-building modeling, based on the inner form of phraseology.

Understanding the cognitive process of phraseme building as associating a native speaker with a certain frame, and transfer of the descriptively estimated content of the given frame to a situation similar in some way or another to the world, pushes the boundaries of the phrasemo-modeling, showing the language in action.

Thus, the cognitive approach to the identification of the national and cultural originality of phraseological units provides the analysis of individual phraseological and semantic fields with the purpose of describing within their framework of phraseme building models, the totality of which shows both the national peculiarities of the linguistic division of the world and the features of linguo-creative thinking in the creation of each separate phraseology. **The cognitive approach is a way of studying the mentality of a nation.** The national-cultural distinctiveness of phraseology within the framework of this approach is the **features of the functioning of linguistic thinking, especially the figurative picture of the world.**

CONCLUSION

The above four approaches to the identification of the national and cultural originality of phraseological units are unquestionably an integral whole. They can be represented as steps of analysis of national phraseology: the identification of nonequivalent extralinguistic factors reflected in phraseological units - the identification of structural and semantic features of interlingual phraseological analogues - the identification of national and cultural connotations of key words and cultural concepts embodied in phraseological units - the identification of features of the national division of the linguistic worldview and features of the functioning of the national mentality as linguocreative thinking.

The complex application of linguistic, cultural, contrastive, linguocultural and cognitive approaches can give a complete picture of the national and cultural features of the phraseological system of a language.

REFERENCES

- Akhmanova, O. S. (2004). Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov. Moscow: Editorial URSS. (In Russian).
- Alefirenko, N. F. (2017). Kognitivno-pragmaticheskiye istoki frazosemiozisa: Monografiya. Moscow: Flinta-Nauka. (In Russian).
- Alefirenko, N. F.; Lagodenko, J. V.; Papkov, A. I. & Ozerova, E. G. (2015). Ethno-linguistic Mechanisms of Sense Formation. Home Journals the Social Sciences, 10(6): 1096-1100.
- Alefirenko, N. F. & Nurtazina, M. (2018). Culturally determined peculiarities of argumentative discourse. Vestnik "Nauka i zhizn Kazakhstana", 1: 78-89.
- Collins Cobuild Idioms Dictionary (2007). Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Humbol'dt, V. Fon (1984). Izbrannyye trudy po yazykoznaniyu. Moscow: Progress. (in Russian).
- Kapysheva, G. K. (2009). Frazelogicheskiye universalii. Vestnik Kazakhstansko-Amerikanskogo svobodnogo universiteta. Astana: Izd-vo KASU, 2: 71-75.
- Kirillova, N. N. (1988). Predmet i metody issledovaniya idioetnicheskoy frazeologii. L. (In Russian).
- Kovshova, M. L. (1996). Kul'turno-natsional'naya spetsifika frazeologizmov (kognitivnyye aspekty): Dis. kand. filol. nauk. Moscow.
- Latypov, L. N. (1989). Lingvostranovedcheskiy aspekt frazeologicheskoy yedinitsey (na materiale frazeologizmov russkogo i angliyskogo yazyka): Dis.kand. filol. nauk. L. (in Russian).
- Raykhshteyn, A. D. (1980). Sopostavitel'nyy analiz nemetskoy i russkoy frazeologii. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. (in Russian)

Ruiz, L. (1996). Sobre la fraseología coloquial: corpus e investigación. Actas del I Congreso Internacional de AESLA: El Español, Lengua Internacional. pp. 493-498.

Teliya, V. N. (1996). Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskiy, pragmaticheskiy i lingvokul'turologicheskiy aspekty. Moscow: Skola: Yazyki russkoi kultury. (in Russian).

Titarenko, N. V. (2008). Natsional'no-kul'turnyy komponent frazeologizma v sopostavitel'nom aspekte: na materiale russkogo, angliyskogo i ispanskogo yazykov: avtoreferat dis. ... kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Volgograd. (in Russian).