

**FUNCTIONAL AND EVALUATIVE SEMANTICS OF BEHAVIOR IN FRENCH
AND GEORGIAN IDIOMS****Natalia Surguladze**

Doctor of Philology,

Professor of Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University,
Batumi, 32/35 Rustaveli/Ninoshvili Str, Batumi, 6010, Georgia,

+995593394181, natalia.surguladze@bsu.edu.ge

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6868-5398>

Abstract. The present article deals with the study of the semantic features of animalistic somatisms and phezoonyms denoting behavior in French and Georgian phraseological units and identification of their place on the modal rating scale.

One of the active areas of the phraseological composition of the language are idioms denoting behavior and expressing the subjective evaluative and emotional attitude of the speaker to a person or story being described. Due to the complexity of the semantics, the synthesis of the descriptive component, deontic, axiological and emotional modality determines the fulfillment of the expressive function of language by idioms.

Phraseologisms refelecting behavior are mainly used to describe not a typical behavior of a person or an animal, but mostly to express attitude towards conflict situations, offensive behavior, all kinds of negative actions (such as lies, slander, threats, physical violence).

The specificity of idioms expressing behavior, in comparison with lexical units, as well as their expressiveness are directly related to the expression of that normative world image of a given people, which reflects the historical experience of the people, the national specificity and the special worldview determined by it.

Keywords: Idioms, Evaluation, Behavior, Opposition, Zoonyms.

Introduction. Language reflects the world from different sides. First of all, language represents objective reality, things existing in the world, actions and of course a human, with his thoughts, feelings and behavior, that is a descriptive side of language. Language also reflects the interaction of reality and people in completely different aspects, one of which is evaluative: the objective world is divided by speakers according to its value character, for example, good and evil, harm and benefit, etc. This is a secondary division, socially conditioned, very expressed in complex ways in linguistic structures.

Methods. The descriptive, comparative and analytical methods have been used in the work. We have collected authentic materials in both languages, French and Georgian, from various sources: dictionaries, literature, folklore, media and everyday communication.

Discussion and results: A very important feature of assessment is that it always contains a subjective factor that interacts with an objective one. An evaluative expression, even if the subject of evaluation is not directly reflected in it, presupposes a value relationship between the subject and the object. In any valuable thought there is implied a subject of reasoning, i.e. the person (individual, society) from whom the assessment comes, and its object, that is, the object or event to which the assessment relates. According to A. Ivin, assessment is the establishment of certain relationships between a subject, subjects and an object of assessment (Ivin, 1970: 12-13). V. Vasilenko believes

that, eventually, the criterion for evaluating all existing things is a person himself with all the manifestations of his activity. This person can be represented as “a specific historical personality, a certain social group, human society as a whole” (Vasilenko, 1966: 5).

The modal basis of evaluation includes three types of elements, namely: explicit elements (object of evaluation), implicit elements (aesthetic evaluation - beautiful-ugly, attractive-disgusting, etc.).

Emotional modality, based on the internal form associated with the speaker’s image of the world, is such a component of the semantics of phraseological units that contributes to the creation of the expressive effect of the utterance. The semantic structure of idioms denoting behavior is more complex: a deontic modality is subject to rational assessment, which indicates the compliance/incompatibility of X’s behavior with the norms accepted in a given society and is expressed by the corresponding axiological predicates “good” / “bad”. The denotative component and the associated deontic and axiological modalities have a certain impact on the listener. The presence of emotional modality creates an emotional feeling in the form of a feeling-attitude, and the image is actualized in the mind of the listener.

It should be noted that the study of idioms denoting behavior in the Georgian language has shown us that there are much more evaluative speech acts aimed at the corresponding perlocutionary effect. There is no doubt that we deal with an evaluative speech act in which there is a special illocutionary force associated with the emotional affect of evaluation. The emotional state of the listener, changing as a result of the speech act, determines the perlocutionary effect of evaluative speech acts. Moreover, as J. Ciorel notes, the reaction to “expressive means” is not immediate, it is only the result of emotional influence. In other words, evaluative expressions, in our case phraseological units denoting behavior, can be considered as a special type of illocutionary acts with specific illocutionary forces, the purpose of which is to evoke a perlocutionary effect in the listener - a scale (evaluative stereotype, aspect of evaluation) and elements, both explicit and implicit (subject of evaluation, axiological evaluations, motivation for evaluations).

As E.Sapir notes, if implicitness or explicitness does not play a significant role for the logic of assessments, then this issue is of paramount importance for the linguistic analysis of assessments.

The rating scale itself is a very complex structure. She has a set of characteristics that can move by increasing/decreasing, often independently of each other. This is a subjective (“emotional”) aspect of assessment, when the descriptive characteristics of the objects themselves in their increase/decrease are focused on these characteristics. In addition, the scale assumes movement according to affectivity, as well as intensification/deintensification of characteristics (both subjective and descriptive), taking into account the presence/absence of the last point for a given characteristic and, possibly, a number of other parameters.

The rating scale is characterized primarily by an increasing sign. It is dynamic and breaks down in two directions - to increase and decrease the given characteristic. On the other hand, the semantic complex <good-bad> belongs to the class of gradational concepts. Each of their antonyms shows a scale extending to opposite infinities, separated by an axis of symmetry. An increase of one characteristic on the scale of “good” and “evil” leads to a decrease of another (Arutjunova, 1983: 332-333).

It would be impossible to compare units located on both a private and a general evaluative scale if there were no idea of an evaluative stereotype that has a standard “set” of common characteristics for all or most members of a given society. The stereotype itself is a rather complex, multifaceted structure. It is assumed that stereotypical ideas are based on both perceptual and functional information and correspond to their associative connections. For example, the stereotypical idea of “water” includes such characteristics as: colorless, transparent, tasteless, thirst-quenching, etc. Assessment for each of these characteristics implies their compliance with the norm, and the overall assessment of water as good/bad - compliance with the standard of all these characteristics or one of them, if the assessment is given on a certain aspect; for example, water can be assessed by transparency or suitability/unsuitability for drinking, etc. In other words, stereotypes about water in general, clean water, and good water only partially overlap. In the first case, the stereotype includes a number of characteristics, in the second case - only transparency, in the third case - the general assessment refers to that part of the descriptive characteristics of water that underlies the assessment.

According to a number of researchers, representations of stereotypes of characteristics correspond to prototypes or standards, i.e. those objects for which these characteristics or a set of characteristics are more typical in the “picture of the world”. For example, Leibniz explained the characteristic “sweet” as “something that tastes like sugar”. These representations are revealed in established comparisons (white as snow, yellow as lemon, etc.). Standard representations of natural language do not correspond to scientific ones. Standards, even very “vague” ones, can be characteristic only of descriptive features that, in their semantics, relate to certain objects: annoying (as a fly). Some authors believe that there is no need to identify standards; they can be reduced to stereotypes and norms on a rating scale (Volf, 1985: 5), the latter having a “set” of characteristics to the extent that most closely matches the stereotype.

Stereotypes include standard descriptive properties of objects, their relationship to the rating scale, which is revealed by partial assessment of features in semantics.

So, for example, a “stupid” can be interpreted as having a number of qualities: a) limited in mind, frivolous, slow-witted, a person deprived of any ability of understanding, expediency: “stupid question”, “stupid article”, “stupid behavior” (Ozhegov, 1957: 10), any position in the negative part of the rating scale can be presented as <“this is also bad” >.

According to the evaluative picture of the world, a certain position can be assigned to a characteristic that contains in its semantics an assessment: stupid <<->> (“this is bad”), dirty <<->>, lazy <<->>, honest <<+>> etc., but the stereotypical evaluative meaning of a word may not coincide with the evaluative meaning of a statement or expression, comp.: he never did anything stupid - “stupidity” has the sign <<->> (“and this is bad”), and the expression has the sign <<+>>, comp.: as well as oxymorons: holy lie, good envy, etc. As we see, the expression can refer to several stereotypes of different levels.

The assessment is associated with a specific “set” of descriptive characteristics. So, for example, a “good horse” means a horse that has a number of descriptive properties, including functional ones, comp.: for Aristotle, the quality of a “good horse” in itself makes it noble, and also implies its ability to run well, carry a rider well and resist the enemy well. It is worth noting that stereotypes are historically and situationally changeable, for example: today a horse is valued more for demonstration of its appearance than for its ability to resist an enemy (Volf, 1985: 60).

The nature of the stereotype, of course, depends on the object of evaluation and is manifested in the semantics of the corresponding features. Shifting the meaning of a word by replacing the denotation leads to a change in the entire structure of the stereotype. This is especially noticeable when used metaphorically. So, for example, the lexeme “pig” (in the literal sense) presupposes an evaluative stereotype with such characteristics as breed, weight, etc., and the evaluation can be either “good” or “bad”; while this word is used in a figurative sense, it denotes a person who behaves rudely, impolitely, and in its semantics contains the evaluative meaning “bad”.

The idea of a stereotype implicitly forms the psycholinguistic basis of evaluative statements. The rating scale assumes some basic variable, i.e. a general feature containing both the part and other features located on this scale. Such variables are easy to detect, first of all, by their parametric characteristics. For example, “size” or “volume” for “big/small” features, “height” for “tall/short” features, “length” for “long/short” features, etc. The ability to evaluate on a given scale presupposes that the object has the corresponding feature; comp.: a long/short stick, but not a long/short grain of sand, a good/evil dog, but not a good/evil lizard.

General evaluative words replace a certain range of private evaluative properties included in stereotypical ideas about objects, comp., sharp - about a good knife, caring - about a good father, and so on. There is no doubt that the range of these features, on the one hand, is very “extended”. On the other hand, in the “totality” of features of objects (and, accordingly, in the semantic structure of their characteristics), it is possible to distinguish evaluative components and those that are not related to evaluation, for example, the property of a knife, which is a physical object with a handle, is not relevant to evaluation (Volf, 1985: 64).

In this article, our goal is to study the semantic features of phezoonyms and “animalistic somatisms” that denote behavior, and to assign them a certain place on the modal rating scale.

One of the active themes of the phraseological composition of the language is phraseological units denoting behavior that express the subjective evaluative and emotional attitude of a speaker to the person or story being described. Due to the complexity of their semantics, the synthesis of the

descriptive component, deontic, axiological and emotional modality determines the fulfillment of the expressive function of language by phraseological expressions.

Idioms denoting behavior are mainly used not to describe behavior, but usually to express attitudes towards conflict situations, offensive relation and various kinds of negative situations (such as lies, slander, threats, physical violence).

The specificity of idioms expressing behavior, in comparison with lexical units, their expressiveness are directly related to the expression of the picture of the normative world of a given people, which reflects the historical experience of the people, the national specificity and the resulting special worldview.

The deontic norm is associated with the standard of individual behavior and the rules necessary for the functioning of society; they are fixed in the individual consciousness and manifest themselves in the form of more necessary regulations of behavior. Mental activity is regulated by moral norms, which are strict regulators of human behavior. They make the object of regulation not only external action, but also internal one, as well as not only physical action, but also mental activity (Vol'f, 1991: 136).

Behavior is associated with ethical standards and is therefore considered on an ethical scale, the opposite points of which are the concepts of "good" and "evil". The question of what is "good" and what is "evil" has always worried humanity, starting from the early stages of its development. I. Kant connects "good" with something that should be useful and suitable. He defines "good" as something that conforms to the moral law.

Phraseologisms, like most lexical units, indicate a deviation from the norm, subject to negative rational-emotional classification. Compliance with the norm is considered as a deviation from the usual position and is enshrined in the semantics of idioms (to have one's mind, to stand one's ground, not to break one's word); compliance with the norm is accompanied by a positive rational and emotional assessment. The latter is directly related to the internal form of idioms, which evokes in the mind of a native speaker images of a certain typified situation and appropriate associations, in which there is a positive or negative emotional assessment, "developed" by the collective consciousness of previous generations (Vol'f, 1991: 151).

Individual actions aimed at causing moral or physical harm to another person are subject to sharp negative axiological and emotional criticism, which is so clearly expressed in the semantics of phraseological units. Regulatory law involves the prohibition of socially vicious actions such as bribery, theft, blackmail, living at the expense of others, loitering, wasting time, gossip, etc.

Deontic norms of a native speaker include moral norms that mean the prohibition of such behavior as lying (averting one's eyes), boasting, causing suffering to others, bankrupting someone, destroying someone's source of livelihood, embezzling other people's money, squandering property, etc. In the linguistic picture of the world, violation of the norms of protecting individuals - betrayal of a loved one (slander) - is sharply criticized.

A negative assessment is given by such personal qualities as recklessness, stupidity, dullness, capriciousness, idleness, obsession, indirectness, cunning, changeability of thoughts and opinions. The condition of the subject, such as poverty, is also assessed negatively, which is undoubtedly associated with such human quality as clumsiness, as well as a lack of desire (Vol'f, 1991: 153).

In the linguistic picture of the world, such traits of a subject as talkativeness (scratching with the tongue, a long tongue, what the human tongue cannot say, the tongue has no bones) are negatively characterized. In addition, it is negatively assessed and considered a deviation from the norm when a person does not know how to speak correctly – ორ სიტყვას ვერ გადააბამს, ენა არ უჭრის (cannot connect two words); forgetfulness (absent-mindedness) – ბუზების ჭერში თვლა (verbatim: counting flies on the ceiling), frivolity – უჭრის (თავში), თავქარიანი (wind in the head); flattery - კუდის ქიციანი, ფეხქვეშაგაგება (verbatim: wagging its tail, spreading out under your feet); giving oneself a high rating, dishonesty - ხელმრუდობა, etc.

The normative law of linguistic personality is presented in the semantics of phezonyms, reflecting the personal negative qualities of a subject. In contrast to the socionormative culture that regulates the behavior of individuals, the normative instructions implicitly reflected in idioms are not characterized by variability. They are more general in nature and are aimed at a representative of a

given culture - a “person” in general. From a functional-semantic point of view of evaluation, the phezoonyms we have examined in French can be classified as follows:

a) moral and ethical assessment:

Greed: FR: Vendre qch crins et Queue - to benefit from everything;

Egoism: Fr: Se servir de la patte du chat pour tirer les marrons du feu - to do your business through somebody else;

Cover tracks: FR: Plumer la poule sans la faire crier - steal without leaving a trace;

Waste other's money: Fr: Manger la grenouille - throw other people's money down the drain;

Betrayal: FR: Vendre la poule au renard - stab in the back;

Cowardice: FR: Craindre pour sa peau - afraid of one's own shadow;

Bribe: FR: Graisser les Pattes – take a bribe;

Gluttony: FR: Se refaire le bec – overeat, gobble up;

Drunkness: FR: Avoir le bec sale - a bottomless barrel, pour out even the last drop;

Revenge, reprisal: FR: Avoir la peau de qn – deal with someone, kill;

Extreme stinginess: Fr: Il écorcherait un pou pour avoir sa peau - stingy, mean person;

Arrogance: FR: Se parer des plumages de paon - show off;

Hypocrisy: FR: Chausser la peau de... – pretend; Mordre la peau de qn – torment someone.

b) moral and intellectual assessment

High self-opinion: FR: Faire le Lion - imagines oneself as a “lion from high society”;

Self-confidence: FR: Avoir un aplomb boeuf - too confident in oneself;

To deceive someone, to swindle: Fr: Faire l'âne pour avoir du bran - deceive someone by pretending to be a fool;

Force someone to do something in one's own way: FR: Sous la patte de qn – trick, deceive (verbatim: pull someone by the ears);

Find fault: FR: Chercher des poux dans la tête à qn - get into trouble;

Jealousy: FR: Jaloux comme un tigre - jealous like Othello.

c) Intellectual assessment

Stupidity: FR: Il est bien âne de naturel qui ne sait lire son écriture - he is such a stupid and stubborn ass that he doesn't even understand what he's writing; Il est sorcier comme une vache - he is not smart;

Confusion: FR: Chercher son âne quand on est dessus - look for something that is just in front of your nose;

d) Hedonic assessment

carelessness, indifference: Fr: Etre là comme rat en paille - live without worries;

e) Utilitarian assessment:

Idleness: FR: Trainer sa peau - wander idly.

Unlike French, Georgian phezoonyms denoting behavior are combined only in the field of moral and ethical assessment with the sign <<->> (negative assessment), namely:

Scam, extortion, deception: GE: ობობას ქსელის გაბმა -obobas kselis gabma (verbatim: getting caught in the net) - capture by cunning and extortion;

Hypocrisy: GE: კუდის ქნევა - kudis kneva (verbatim: wagging the tail) – caress, stroke;

Ingratitude: G.E.: –მადლი მატლად გადამიქცია -madli matlad gadamiktsia - do not appreciate kindness, treat ungratefully;

Dislike: GE: მგლის თვალზე დანახვა - mglis tvalze danakhva (verbatim: seeing with wolf eyes) - hate;

Talkativeness: GE: კრუხის თავი უჭამია - krukhis tavi utchamia - talk a lot, be tongue-tied;

Idleness: GE: ბუზების ყლაპვა; დაზარალება, გატიალება; ვირის აგორება; ახირება, დაჯინება - buzebis klapva, dazaraleba, gatialeoba, viris agoreba; akhireba, daJineba - whim, laze, mooch, wander around idle, persist).

Stubbornness: GE: ჯორზე შეჯდა - jorze shejda (stubborn like a mule); თხები აუშვა - tkhebi aushva - get impudent;

Disturb somebody (by begging, pleading, complaining): GE: პირზე ტყავის აძრობა - *pirze tkavis adzroba* (verbatim: move the skin of the tounge) – complain too much; ზურგზე ტყავის აძრობა - *zurgze tkavis adzroba* (verbatim: tear off the skin on the back) – severely beat, beg, complain;

Disgrace oneself: GE: ძაღლის დაპურება ვინმეს გულზე - *dzaglis dapureba vinmes gulze* – disgrace yourself ; გველი შემოიწვა - *gveli shemitsva* – not spare someone;

Reveal a secret: GE: სანამ ყვავსა და ყორანს ფრთებზე არ დაეკიდებათ- *sanam kvavsa da korans prtebze ar daekidebat*;

Make someone suffer immeasurably: GE: გველის კბენა - *gvelis kbena* - snakebite;

Bribe someone: GE: გამოხრული ძვლის გადაგდება (ვისთვისმე) – *gamokhruli dzvlis gadagdeba (vistvisme)* (verbatim: throw (to someone) a crooked bone);

Stinginess: GE: რწყილს ატყავებს - *rtskils atkavebs* (verbatim: rob a flea) – be extremely greedy;

Selfish attitude: GE: ჭიის გახარება - *chiis gakhareba* - live with pleasure, satisfaction, carelessness (hedonic assessment);

Fiction, invention: GE: კუდის გამობმა - *kudis gamobma* - make up tall tales.

Thus, from a functional and semantic point of view, phezoonyms are located on the rating scale as follows: <<->>

<u>French Language</u>	<u>Georgian language</u>
cowardice, arrogance, -1 hypocrisy, self-indulgence, stupidity, bothersomeness, confusion, self-doubt, idleness, uselessness	whim, stubbornness, talkativeness, invention, hypocrisy, laziness, annoyingness
Greed, selfishness, stinginess -2 Arrogance, self-righteousness, jealousy; covering one's tracks, bribing; -3	Ingratitude, public shame, self-indulgence, greed, carefree living (selfishness). causing harm, appropriation of someone else's property, hostility, revealing a secret
Drunkenness, cheating, spending other people's money Betrayal, physical violence -4 (murder), stab in the back	Immeasurable suffering, bitterness, betrayal, physical violence, extortion, deception

Conclusion. the deontic picture of the world that exists in the mind of a native speaker displays a “hierarchy” of behavioral norms. They represent an ontologically reflected attempt, partially enshrined in the linguistic picture of the world, corresponding to the content “prohibited”, “not allowed”.

Deontic modality is an important component of the semantics of a number of idioms, the descriptive component of which is associated with the designation of individual behavior. Deontic modality is one of the main components of phraseological units, which are used not to describe human behavior, but to characterize it. In this case, a rational-emotional assessment is given to the behavior or personal qualities of the subject that do not fit into the norm (deviating from the deontic norm).

The assessment is associated with a specific “set” of descriptive characteristics. The nature of the stereotype depends on the object of evaluation and is manifested in the semantics of the corresponding features. Shifting the meaning of a word by replacing the designation leads to a change in the entire structure of the stereotype.

A very important feature of assessment is that it always contains a subjective factor that interacts with an objective one. The criterion for evaluating all existing things is a human himself.

The deontic norm is associated with the norm of individual behavior and the rules necessary for the functioning of society; they are fixed in the individual consciousness and manifest themselves in the form of very necessary rules of behavior. Mental activity is regulated by moral norms, which are strict regulators of human behavior. They make the object of regulation not only external action, but also internal one, as well as not only physical action, but also mental activity.

We have examined the semantic features of phezoonyms and “animalistic somatisms” denoting behavior, assigning them a certain place on the modal rating scale.

The analyzed examples of phezoonyms in French (about 100 in French and 100 in Georgian) were grouped as follows: a) moral and ethical assessment; b) moral and intellectual assessment; c) intellectual assessment; d) hedonic assessment; e) utilitarian assessment with the sign <<->>.

Unlike French, in the Georgian language phezoonyms denoting behavior are united in the main moral and ethical evaluation sphere by the sign <<->>.

REFERENCES

- bibileishvili, ts., darashvili, l., & ghach'ava, r. (2010). *prangul-kartuli prazeologiuri leksik'oni [French- Georgian phraseological dictionary]*. Tbilisi: Publishing House „Diogene“.
- oniani, a. (1966). *kartuli idiomebi [Georgian Idioms]*. Tbilisi: Publishing House „Nakaduli“.
- sakhok'ia, t. (1979). *kartuli khat'ovani sit'qva-tkmani [Georgian iconic word-saying]*. Tbilisi: Publishing House „Merani“.
- surguladze, n. (2005). *zoonimta da animalur somat'izmta shemtsveli prazeologizmebi prangul da kartul enebshi [The system of phraseologisms containing zoonyms and animal somatisms in the French and Georgian languages]*. Batumi: Batumi Shota Rustaveli State University Publishing House.
- t'er-minasova, s. (2017). *ena da k'ult'uratashorisi k'omunik'atsia [Language and Intercultural Communication]*. Tbilisi: Publishing House „Universali“.
- tsetskhladze, n. (2018). *prazeologizmta k'vlevis asp'ekt'ebi [Aspects of Phraseologism Research]*. Tbilisi: Publishing House „Iverioni“.
- Planelles, G. (2014). *Les 1001 expressions préférées des Français*. Paris: les éditions de l'Opportun.
- Arutjunova, N. D. (1983). *Russkoe predlozhenie. Bytijnyj tip. (Struktura i znachenie) [Russian proposal. Being type. (Structure and Value)]*. Moscow: Publishing House «Nauka».
- Arutjunova, M. D. (1988). *Tipy jazykovyh znachenij. Ocenka. Sobytie. Fakt [Types of language values. Evaluation. Event. Fact]*. Moscow: Publishing House «Nauka».
- Vasilenko, V. A. (1964). *Cennost' i ocenka [Value and Valuation]*. Kyiv.
- Vol'f, E. M. (1985). *Funkcional'naja semantika ocenki [Functional semantics of evaluation]*. Moscow: Publishing House «Nauka».
- Vol'f, E. M. (1991). *Chelovecheskij faktor v jazyke [Human Factor in Language]*. Moscow: Publishing House «Nauka».
- Ivin, A. A. (1970). *Osnovaniya logiki ocenok [Basis of evaluation logic]*. Moscow: Publishing House «MGU».
- Ozhegov, S. I. (1957). O strukture frazeologii [On the structure of phraseology]. *Leksikograficheskij sbornik [Lexicographic collection]*. Vol. III. №2. Moscow.