

METAPHORICAL MODELS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ATTITUDE COMPONENT IN MARI AND FRENCH

T.A. Soldatkina,¹ S.L. Yakovleva^{2*},³ K.Yu. Vavilova,⁴ G.N. Kazyro

¹Prof, Mari State University, Russia, stata@rambler.ru

²As.Prof, Mari State University, Russia, zavkaf1@gmail.com

³Prof, Mari State University, Russia, vuk_2004@mail.com

⁴As.Prof, Mari State University, Russia, galinarfa@yahoo.com

*Corresponding author

Abstract

The article deals with metaphorical models of phraseological units (PU) with an attitudinal component in Mari and French. The objective of the research is to analyse the samples of PU selected by a continuous sampling method to find out the prevailing type of metaphors used to express an attitudinal meaning. The works of V. V. Vinogradov, A. I. Smirnitsky, I. I. Chernyshev and A. P. Chudinov form a theoretical basis of the present paper. The methods of continuous sampling, of linguistic description and the comparative method have been a highly important tool for the research. 90 phraseological units from *The Phraseological Dictionary of the Mari Language* by F. T. Gracheva [Gracheva, 1989] and *The Dictionary of Mari proverbs and sayings* by A. E. Kitikov [Kitikov, 1991] were under study in the present article. 150 French phraseological units were found in M. Ashraf's *Dictionnaire des expressions idiomatiques françaises* [Ashraf, 1995] and *Dictionnaire des expressions et locutions* by A. Rey [Rey, 1997]. Theoretically, the present paper is of some interest due to the description of PU formation containing metaphors belonging to a specific class. In the French language the most frequently used ways of PU formation with negative colouring are the zoomorphic and sociomorphic metaphors, while anthropomorphic and naturomorphic metaphors contain neutral and ambivalent coloring.

As for the Mari language, the metaphorical models such as MAN is a TREE, MAN is a BIRD prevail in the group of naturomorphic metaphors. The zoomorphic metaphors are expressed by the images of birds, domestic and wild animals. The anthropomorphic metaphors in the Mari phraseology are presented by somatic PU. In turn, the artifact metaphors are embodied in the images of household goods (tools, ware) and structures. In this group comparisons with the objects having negative character are more common. The ontological metaphors of the Mari language are characterized by prevalence of the metaphorical models TIME is a MOVING OBJECT; BREAD is a VALUE, the metaphors denoting the state are also widespread.

Keywords: metaphor; metaphorical models; assessment; semantics; phraseological units.

1. INTRODUCTION

Phraseological units (PU) express peculiar features of the language and specific characteristics of the people speaking its language. Stylistic connotation, colouring and figurative expression are the main characteristics of PU. Most PU not only describes the reality but characterize it in a definite way. Metaphorical modeling theories and specific examples of metaphor description have been the subject of numerous research sources. The variant under study goes back to the classical work by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson *Metaphors We Live By* [Lakoff and Johnson, 1990].

American researchers came to the conclusion that 'metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature' [Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:3].

Metaphorical model is viewed as a scheme of connection between conceptual spheres existing or being formed in people's consciousness and which can be presented in the form A is B. It should be noted that in metaphorical models all the components are built on analogy but not on a direct identity.

2. METHODS OF STUDY

The methods of continuous sampling, of linguistic description and the comparative method have been used in the research.

3. DISCUSSION

The sphere of metaphorical attraction developed by A.P. Chudinov can serve as a basis of metaphorical models classification [Chudinov, 2015:10].

Thus, metaphors can be classified in the following way:

1. The anthropomorphic metaphor is a type of metaphor in which objects and phenomena of the objective reality are represented in an associative connection with the parts of human body. While using this type of metaphor the man is modeling a real-life situation according to his own image and likeness. The anthropomorphic metaphor is most commonly used in somatic PU containing the nouns *family, illness, arm, hand, leg, head*, etc.
2. The naturomorphic metaphor is a type of metaphor in which objects and phenomena of the objective reality are represented in an associative connection with organic and inorganic nature. The man, using this type of metaphor, is modeling a real-life situation according to phenomena taking place in nature. The naturomorphic metaphor is revealed in the concepts connected with the names of animals, plants and such natural phenomena as thunder, lightning, etc.
3. By using the sociomorphic metaphor the man is modeling a real-life situation according to constant ways people interact in society. Most vividly it is reflected in the concepts of *love, hate, jealousy, friendship*, etc.
4. The artifact metaphor is the type of metaphor in which the man realizes himself in the objects that he creates. The concepts containing the notions *bread, house, table, chair*, etc. can serve as examples of the artifact metaphor.

It should be noted that in all these types the main rule works – the man is the hub of the universe.

At present, assessment has been developed in detail in the lexical system of the language rather than phraseology. Phraseology, in its turn, represents an extensive material to study axiological regularities and assessment strategies existing in the language since PU themselves contain a great volume of additional information about human's character of actions and behaviour. It follows therefrom that revealing PU axiological potential is of great importance for phraseology as a branch of science.

90 phraseological units from *The Phraseological Dictionary of the Mari Language* by F. T. Gracheva [Gracheva, 1989] and *The Dictionary of Mari proverbs and sayings* by A. E. Kitikov [Kitikov, 1991] serve as the material for study.

S.L. Yakovleva and G.N. Kazyro paid attention to the fact that 'an organistic way of thinking is typical for Mari consciousness reflected in the paroemiological fund. In contrast to rational, mechanistic ones, organistic metaphors have deep historical roots which is reflected in human consciousness and, therefore, in paroemic and phraseological pictures of the world. Man, nature and objects represent widely spread cognitive sources of paroemic metaphorisation. The objects of immaterial world are not of similar demand in Mari paroemic picture of the world,' [Yakovleva and Kazyro, 2014:649].

In the present article, the expressiveness of utterances has been studied through their attitudinal component, precisely, through its optional one – figurative which makes expressions emotionally coloured and rich. Widely used means to embody expressiveness in Mari PU are the following:

1. Comparative structures and comparisons: *тӧтырет пуч гай* – (literally): *it is pouring as from the tube*; *пуйто шинча почылтын* – (literally): *as if I have my eyes open*.
2. Metaphors: *кыдым колтен шинчаш* – (literally): *with arms folded*, which means *being lazy, wasting time*; *йоғым пышташ* - (literally): *to lay laziness*, which means *being lazy*;

3. Epithets: *пушкыдо кумыл* – (literally): *soft attitude*, meaning *kindness*.

Comparisons are used to compare objects having common features in a figurative way: *уқи мучаш гай* – (literally): *like the end of a tree branch*, meaning *a distant relative*. The structures containing a word or word combination with comparative conjunctions are most commonly used: *пуйто* (like, as): *пуйто мланде йымач лектын* – (literally): *as if from under the earth appeared*, meaning *suddenly appeared*. Nouns with the comparative word *гай* (as): *чыра гай* – *thin as a toothpick*. PU with comparative structures and comparisons built up 32 % of all the PU under study.

Metaphors occupy a central place among expressive means and stylistic devices since with the help of them a colourful image based on surprising associations is created. The similarity between different features of objects: colour, shape, volume, their use can lay in the basis of the metaphor. In PU analysis four types of metaphors have been observed: anthropomorphic, naturomorphic, sociomorphic and artifact in accordance with the abovementioned classification of A.P. Chudinov [Chudinov, 2015].

Being a part of nature, the person perceives events in relation to already existing phenomena and objects of organic and inorganic nature. This fact is reflected in naturomorphic metaphors. Such metaphoric models as MAN is a TREE, MAN is a BIRD belong to this group. Zoomorphic metaphors with images of domestic and wild animals and birds are the most numerous. The images of *cow* (*ушкал*), *horse* (*имне*), *pig* (*сӧсна*), *cat* (*пырыс*), *lamb* (*пача*); among wild animals such as *fox* (*рывыж*), *wolf* (*пуре*), *bear* (*маска*), *snake* (*кишке*); among birds – *hawk* (*вараш*), *owls* (*тумна*), *chicken* (*чыве*), *cock* (*агытан*), *the crow* (*корак*) are noted among domestic animals. The wolf in the Mari phraseology traditionally represents evil, violence; the fox stands for being guile and cunning: *пуре вӱр ўпшым шижеш гын, ушыжым йомдара* – (literally): *wolf loses his head if he hears blood*. A man accustomed to evil seeks only evil. *Рывыж пеш мотор, да шылжым нугӧм ок коч* – (literally): *the fox is beautiful but nobody eats its meat*. It means that vicious people can hide their identity behind a beautiful appearance.

Anthropomorphic metaphors in the Mari phraseology are represented by PU, using names of body parts, organs and products of their activities (*eye* (*шинча*), *hands* (*кид*), *the head* (*вуй*), *mouth* (*умша*), *tongue* (*йылме*), *breast milk* (*ава шӧр*), *sweat* (*пӱжвӱд*)): *ава шӧр дене* – (literally): *with mother's milk*, *кид модеш* – (literally): *light-handed, skillful*.

Artifact metaphors are introduced through the images of household items (tools, utensils) and buildings. More common comparisons with the subjects of negative characteristics are typical for this group (*арва вуй* – (literally): *the head is stuck with straw*, *чыра гай* – (literally): *skinny as a torch*).

Ontological metaphors that allow seeing the events, actions, emotions, ideas, etc. are also productive. The following metaphorical models are found among them: TIME is a MOVING OBJECT: *жап мемнам ок вучо* – (literally): *time is not waiting for us*, *жап* – *йӧгын вӱд* – (literally): *time is a river*; BREAD is VALUE: *кӱнде мемнан поянлыкна* – (literally): *bread is our wealth*. Metaphors of state are also common: *кеч пырыла урмыж* – (literally): *howl like a wolf*, *шер теммешке* – (literally): *up to complete pleasure*.

Epithet, as the most common form of stylistic device, has also found its place in the Mari language phraseology. Adjectives are used as epithets more often: *кадыр кидан* – (literally): *dishonest*, *пушкыдо кумыл* – (literally): *soft-hearted*; nouns are less common *тегым шӱргӧ* – (literally): *shameless*.

Реже встречаются другие тропы, такие как метонимия, гипербола, литота: *чай совла вӱдешат колаш лиеш* (можно и в чайной ложке захлебнуться). Such stylistic devices (SD) as metonymy, hyperbole, litotes are less common: *чай совла вӱдешат колаш лиеш* – (literally): *one can sink in the teaspoon*.

The most frequently used expressive means in the Mari phraseology have been defined in the course of PU analysis. Comparatives and metaphors turned out to be the most numerous ones. This fact helped to identify the main metaphorical models and images.

The most frequently used expressive means in the Mari phraseology have been defined in the course of PU analysis. Comparatives and metaphors turned out to be the most numerous ones. This fact helped to identify the main metaphorical models and images. Metaphorical way of thinking and the expressive means widespread use allow us to come to conclusion that figurative world perception in the Mari people consciousness prevails.

In general, phraseological units' analysis allows us to conclude about the axiological potential of the Mari phraseology. Assessment is always anthropocentric in phraseology, i.e. a man with his daily activities is its object.

This fact allows us to trace ethical standards development both in the past and at present; to determine the

peculiarities of people's mentality, and to identify its linguistic picture of the world.

Before analyzing 150 French phraseological units, selected with the help of continuous sampling methods from the French phraseological dictionaries, let's define characteristic features peculiar to the French phraseology:

- 1) Many French phraseological units lack in the Russian language;
- 2) The sentence structure is changed when translating French idioms into the Russian language;
- 3) The French language is analytical in structure. The whole phrase can be translated into the Russian language as a word;
- 4) Semantic feature of the phraseological fusions is that their meaning is not deducible from the meanings of their components. This aspect is characteristic not only of the French language.

Speaking of the French phraseological units with an assessment component, it is worth noting that zoomorphic metaphor (59/150) referring to naturomorphic metaphors is the most common type of metaphor. This phenomenon may be explained in the following way. Most of the phraseological units under study were included into the phrasicon many centuries ago. Assessing people's qualities men were associated with the image of a particular animal. There are the following examples of such phraseological units: *têtu comme un âne* – (literally): *to be stubborn as a mule*; *méchant comme un âne rouge* – (literally): *wicked as a red ass* in the meaning *angry as a devil*; *rusé comme un renard* – (literally): *cunning as a fox*; *léger comme un papillon* – (literally): *light as a butterfly* symbolizes somebody frivolous, inconsistent; *fier comme un pou* – (literally): *conceited as a peacock*; *credule comme un mouton* – (literally): *naive like a lamb* refers to a naive, gullible person; *fort comme un boeuf* – (literally): *as strong as an ox*.

Etnosemisms and types of metaphorical modelling characteristic of the English, French and Russian languages are thoroughly analyzed in a separate article by Svetlana Yakovleva, who concludes that HUMAN-ANIMAL transfer is the most common type of modeling when an animal is compared with person's activity, his way of life or behavior' [Yakovleva and Kazyro, 2014:139]. Analyzing the above-mentioned phraseological units, we can conclude that associations with animal images in the French language are similar to the same images in the Russian language. For example, the trickery is transferred through the fox image, for example: *fin comme un renard* – (literally): *cunning like a fox*. Frivolity is associated with the image of a butterfly: *leger comme un papillon* – (literally): *light-minded like a butterfly*. The image of a bull manifests great strength: (*fort comme un boeuf* – (literally): *strong like an ox*, while the image of sheep stands for a naive person *credule comme un mouton*, and dexterity and agility are correlated with the image of a monkey *maline comme un signe* – (literally): *agile as a monkey*.

Discrepancy in the images of the language picture of the worlds typical for the French people and the Russian still exists. The image of the goat in the Russian language is similar to the image of the donkey in French. It is credited with the same qualities: stubbornness bordering on the bottomless stupidity. This animal image is also inextricably linked with meanness, the human moral decline. This animal image carries a negative connotation in both languages. The discrepancy associated with the image of an ape is also found in the language world pictures observed. If the monkey is the embodiment of agility, dexterity (*maline comme un signe* – (literally): *agile as a monkey*) in the French language picture of the world, then this animal image is used in negative connotation in the Russian language picture of the world. The following phraseological units of the Russian language: *ape, monkey; a monkey with a grenade; monkey's work*, etc. prove of it.

The above analysis of phraseological units (PU) makes us think that the monkey image transferred to the man image attributes to him such as qualities as stupidity and affectation. Perhaps this cognitive dissonance in two languages was due to the fact that the European people are better familiar with monkeys' character and habits. The French phraseology covers the images of those animals who live in the area (this is typical for phraseology of any language). Such animals living in this territory of Russia as fox, bull, wolf are the most typical animal images and the main characters of folklore in the Russian language.

A large number of selected phraseological units was formed with the help of zoomorphic metaphors (59 phraseological units from 150). So the prevailing images might be highlighted as the following:

1. The image of the dog (7/59) is the most common way used to describe something aggressive, unkind: *chien galeux* – (literally): *angry dog*.
2. The image of the sheep (7/59) – is also one of the most frequently used images in the selected phraseological units. It is used to describe someone lamblike, shy, timid: *doux comme un agneon* –

(literally): *timid as a lamb*. However, it is necessary to distinguish *the lamb (agneau)* from *sheep (mouton, brebis)*. The fact that the lexeme *agneau* is used more often to transfer the more negative traits (excessive naivety, simplicity), while the concept of *mouton* and *brebis* has positive connotation: *les boucs et les brebis – (literally): the wicked and the righteous*, where the lexeme *brebis* carries a very positive evaluation.

3. The image of the cat (6/59) comes up rather frequently in the French phraseology: *vendre le chat en poche – (literally): sell pig in a poke*. It should be noted that in this case it is complicated to determine the assessment in the animal image. However, most often it is a negative assessment that describes the deceit, the desire get rid of something annoying, restless.

4. The image of the fish (6/59) conveys self-possession and absolute indifference to everything. In this case, indifference and excessive composure is rather negative than a positive trait: *muet comme une carpe – (literally): mute as a carp*.

Bird images are frequently used. They are associated with wisdom and broad outlook. It should be noted that this comparison is not typical of the Russian and English language world picture.

However, the following associations are typical of the language picture of the world. The image of the bull is perceived as strength: *fort comme un boeuf – (literally): strong like bull*; the image of the fox with being cunning: *rusé comme un renard – (literally): deceiver*. The image of mouse stands for caution, cautious: *être un petit souris – (literally): be invisible like a small mouse*.

Floromorphic metaphor that is a subclass of naturomorphic metaphor was not so numerous (11/150): *solide comme un chêne – (literally): strong as an oak* describes a tough nut to crack, mentally strong people; *être fleur bleu – (literally): blue flower* symbolizes a very shy person. About an extremely shy person the French say *timide comme une violette – (literally): shy as a violet*.

Floromorphic metaphor as assessment means is quite rare in the French phraseology in comparison with zoomorphic, anthropomorphic, and social metaphors.

The image of fragility and tenderness is conveyed through the image of any plant, especially a flower in the French and Russian phraseologies: *fraise comme la rosée du matin – (literally): fresh as a morning rose*.

Lexeme *cactus* possesses negative connotation to describe a truculent, quarrelsome person: *avoir un esprit epineux – (literally): to look in every difficulty*. This comparison is typical for the Russian language that was used as a meta-language for this study: *prickly as a cactus*.

The following phraseological units have been formed directly through naturomorphic metaphor: *être libre comme l'air – (literally): to be free as the wind*. When we mean someone unearthly handsome: *être beau comme un astère – (literally): to be beautiful like a star*. About a mean person the French say *terre-à-terre – (literally): earth to earth*, etc.

Some phraseological units reflect three natural elements and contain such lexemes as *earth: la terre; terre-à-terre, tomber plus bas que terre; water: "l'eau", C'est le feu et l'eau, Ne trouver pas l'eau dans la rivière; air: l'air, cracher en l'air, en l'air*. They can express positive, negative, and ambivalent meanings. The image of wind in the French language picture of the world, as well as in the Russian one, is associated with freedom and will. The image of a star stands for something fine, but inaccessible – *être beau comme un astère*.

The following phraseological units are formed by means of natural metaphors: *être jolie comme un cœur – (literally): to be fine as heart – to be very pretty; avoir la main heureuse / malheureuse – (literally): to have a happy/ unhappy hand – to be successful/unlucky; de bon cœur – (literally): the correct heart – to be on the right side, to follow the right path*.

The most common phraseological units in this class are somatisms: *blood, nails, head, legs, eyes*. It is necessary to emphasize that the following phraseological units are formed by means of sociomorphic metaphors: *A chose faite pas de remède – (literally): having made something, you should not regret – having removed the head, you should not cry about hair; fendre le cœur à quelqu'un – (literally): to wound someone's heart – fret over someone, to cause grief to someone; gens de la même farine – (literally): people from one flour – the one of our kind; they make a pair; cut from the same cloth*.

Formation of phraseological units by means of sociomorphic metaphors is often connected with animal images, and the somatisms that are frequently used in naturomorphic metaphors. However, they contain the meaning that defines them as the group formed with the help of sociomorphic metaphors.

A separate group is represented by the phraseological units containing biblical expressions. Scientists emphasize that these biblical expressions are used in different languages, but the phrases may be different in semantics, component structure, grammatical construction, inner form, emotional and expressive colouring. The research shows that the same phraseological unit containing the biblical expression presented in one language can be translated into another one without the biblical expression.

While applying the method of continuous sampling to the list of phraseological units, we have revealed some phraseological units with the component of the biblical expressions. The images of God and the Devil (God's antipode): *Beau comme un Dieu* – (*literally*): as beautiful as God; *Avoir le diable au corps* – (*literally*): to be a tomboy.

In the French phraseology the image of God is mainly connected with something pure and clean, sacred, sublime while the image of a devil is associated with deeds of horror, inexcusable offenses and the worst human qualities. For example, the proverb *Ange à l'église et diable à la maison* – (*literally*): *An angel is in public, the devil is at home* characterizes negatively the person and his behavioral pattern. The expression denotes the hypocritical person who is able to make a good impression in society, however, he tyrannizes the family members, without allowing them to lead a full-fledged life, he does it cunningly so that nobody will reveal his crimes.

The image of God in the French phraseology is mentioned much more often than the image of his antipode. This phenomenon is explained by the fact that the main part of the selected phraseological units was created in ancient times. At that time concepts about the good and evil were extremely categorical. Thus, the good was associated with forgiving God father, God primogenitor, the defender, and the evil was connected with the Devil who was capable of any meanness. People of that time divided the world into "black" and "white"; they did not have any deep comparisons and they used the abovementioned expressions. For example, in the phraseological unit *Les Dieux de la terre* – (*literally*): *powers of this world* we see that the positive image of strong, powerful people is connected with the image of God. In the phraseological unit *feu sacré* – (*literally*): *the God's spark, talent* we also see the positive characteristic of the person where the image of divine and something saint is used (*sacré* – (*literally*): *the Saint, spiritual, sacral*).

It should be stressed that the phraseological units with the biblical component are frequently used in French. The images used in this type of phraseological units are typical for the Russian language picture of the world as well.

4. CONCLUSION

Thus, having analyzed the phraseological units of the French language, we can conclude that the most frequently used ways of formation of the phraseological units with negative colouring are the zoomorphic and sociomorphic metaphors, while anthropomorphic and naturomorphic metaphors contain neutral and ambivalent coloring.

As for the Mari language, the metaphorical models such as MAN is a TREE, MAN is a BIRD prevail in the group of naturomorphic metaphors. The zoomorphic metaphors are expressed by the images of birds, domestic and wild animals. The anthropomorphic metaphors in the Mari phraseology are presented by somatic PU. In turn, the artifact metaphors are embodied in the images of household goods (tools, ware) and structures. In this group comparisons with the objects having negative character are more common. The ontological metaphors of the Mari language are characterized by prevalence of the metaphorical models TIME is a MOVING OBJECT; BREAD is a VALUE, the metaphors denoting the state are also widespread.

REFERENCE LIST

- Gak, V. G. New French-Russian Dictionary / V. G. Gak, K. A. Ganshina. – M.: Russkij yazyk, 1994.
- Gracheva, F. T. Marij Frazeeologij Muter / F. T. Gracheva. – Yoshkar-Ola: Marij Kniga Izdatelstvo, 1989. – 328 p.
- Zhirnov A. V. Means of Attitude Expression in the Mari Phraseology / A. V. Zhirnov // Student Science and XXI Century: Papers of the Scientific and Practical Conference on the Results of Scientific and Research Work in 2014. – Yoshkar-Ola: Mari State University, 2015. – Issue 12. – P. 314-316.

- Kitikov, A. E.* Marij kalykmut muter. / A. E. Kitikov. – Yoshkar-Ola: Marij Kniga Izdatelstvo, 1991. – 336 p.
- Kovalenko, L. I.* Semantic and Syntactical Means of Expressing Attitude Modality in the Russian and English Languages / L. I. Kovalenko. – Abstract of the Dissertation...Candidate of Philological Sciences – Krasnodar, 1997. – 23 p.
- Lakoff, J.* Metaphors that We Live with / J. Lakoff, M. Jonson. – M.: Editorial, URSS, 2004. – 253 p.
- Russian-French Dictionary / Ed. by Shcherba L. V., Matusevich M. I. – M., 1969.
- Soldatkina, T. A.* Attitude Semantics in Phraseology of the French Language / T. A. Soldatkina // Vestnik of Mari State University. – 2015. – № 19. – P. 95-99.
- French-Russian Phraseological Dictionary / Ed. by Ya. I. Retsker. – M., 1963. – 243 p.
- Chudinov, A. P.* Cognitive and Discourse Description of the Metaphoric Model [Electronic Resource] / A. P. Chudinov. – Access: <http://www.studmed.ru/docs/document34767/cc1?page=9>.
- Yakovleva, S. L.* Metaphorical Meaning of Names of the Invertebrates in the French and Russian Languages / S. L. Yakovleva, E. S. Bushkova // Vestnik of Mari State University. – 2012. – № 10. – P. 135-140.
- Yakovleva, S. L.* Comparative Analysis of the Concept “Family” in Mari and Finnish Paroemiology / S. L. Yakovleva, G. N. Kazyro // Fundamental Researches. – 2014. – № 5. – P. 649-652.
- Ashraf, M.* Dictionnaire des Expressions Idiomaticques Françaises / M. Ashraf, D. Miannay. – Paris, 1995. – 414 p.
- Rey, A.* Dictionnaire des Expressions et Locutions / A. Rey, S. Chantreau. – Paris, 1997. – 1084 p.