

## **Influence of Stereotyping Thinking on Connotative Meaning of Phraseological Units in Indo-European Tradition**

**Olga Zhurkova<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract:** Stereotypes are collective attainment and can be identical and opposite in different cultures. The correlation of the ethnic consciousness with stereotyped thinking influences the decoding and reinterpretation of different cultural codes. Stereotypes, determined by culture, confirm the positive or negative experience of a certain ethnic group, which emphasizes the originality and uniqueness of national features.

**Keywords:** ethnic stereotype; archetype; symbol; connotative meaning; phraseological unit

Despite the existence of a number of trends in the study of connotation (semantic, stylistic, psycholinguistic, cultural, etc.), today there is no unique theory that would give a complete and adequate description of this complex phenomenon. The result is the lack of single terminology and clear typology, there is a difference in understanding the category borders, its features and functions.

There are many terms for denoting the phenomenon of connotation: in the semantic and stylistic aspect, it is a “stylistic value” (Sh. Balli, T. Vynokur, M. Kozhyna, G. Kolshanskyi); in the linguistic and ethnographic approach to the problem of meaning – “lexical background” of meaning (E. Vereshchahin, V. Kostomarov); in semasiology – “emotional stratification”, “expressive coloring” (D. Shmelov), “emotional value” (L. Novykov), “potential signs” (V. Hak), “hidden semas” (E. Hinzburh); at the linguistic psychological level – “semantic associations” (Y. Apresian); at the level of intercultural communication – “pragmatic value” (L. Kyselov, L. Barkhudarov).

Following V. Teliia, who defines connotation as “... a semantic entity that enters into the semantics of linguistic units and expresses the emotionally evaluative and stylistically marked relation of the subject of the speech to reality in its designation and the expression received on bases of this information expressive effect” (Teliia, 1989, p. 5), we understand the connotation as a component of the meaning that allows us to describe the signifier, classify it as a certain class, and also convey the relation of the subject to the words that affects reality in general. This definition

---

<sup>1</sup> Teacher, PhD, Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine, Corresponding author: zhurkovaolga@ukr.net.

most fully reflects the essence of connotation as a result of the interaction of various types of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, with the emphasis on the presence of denotative and signifying semantic components of meaning along with the connotative ones.

It is known that every language is a combination of denotative and connotative – such a dynamic reality of the semiotic system. The study of connotative meaning in the aspect of this thesis means the transition from the study of sign systems directly conscious and consciously used by people to unconscious sign systems, that is, to study the social unconscious. The center of this understanding is not the system of signs and denotative values, but the “field of connotative meanings” (Bart, 1994, p. 236), which arises in the process of communication. In other words, it is these connotative meanings that allow one or another society to distance itself from other societies in cultural and historical terms, with their special connotative meanings.

Thus, sharing the views of V. Teliia, we join to determine the connotative value as a complex and heterogeneous component, for which the motive is obligatory (figuratively and associative or sound and symmetric), axiological modality and stylistic marking (Teliia, 1996, p. 109). Therefore, for us, the connotative meaning is a secondary in relation to the denotative and signifying, which provides additional information in the form of semantic layers, which include emotional, evaluative, expressive and functional semantic components.

The connotative aspect of meaning is “hidden” information that complements the denotative content on the basis of associative and imaginative signals, which cause an emotional perception of language. The main function of connotation is a function of influence, which is intended to prove to the addressee the importance of value of the element of reality.

In phraseological discourse in the form of elliptic formulas the conceptual and cultural “genotype” of people, their moral, ethical, esthetic settings and norms, value orientations and priorities, psychological and cultural archetypes, stereotypes, myths, rituals, superstitions, scenarios of social and political life are fixed and passed from generation to generation. This is the very discourse that most represents the specifics of ethnic mentality and character, representing the collective experience of people and their culture.

Phraseological units are created not for the naming of any new phenomena, but for the specification, figurative and emotional evaluation of objects, things, actions, qualities already mentioned in the language. These units, obviously, correspond to the expressive function of the language. It is this connotative essence of the phraseological sign that determines its distinctiveness. The phraseological units, in contrast to the words, have phraseological meaning, which consists of a figurative representation of the metaphorical, metonymic or comparative types, through which the denotative meaning with its connotative characteristic is given.

So, we can conclude that the connotation in phraseological study differs from the connotation in the vocabulary. The connotation of the lexical unit simply layers on the denotative meaning, whereas the differentiation of connotative factors for the phraseological unit causes certain difficulties. It means that phraseological unit is a separately formed unit, which performs nominative and expressive function. Since the formation of the phraseological unit the relevant feature of its semantics is the presence of a connotative component. Despite the fact that connotative component is a part of the structure of the phraseological meaning along with denotative and significative components, the specifics of the phraseological meaning lies in the fact that the connotative component is the central component of phraseological unit's meaning.

The key to understanding the connotative meaning of phraseological units is the evaluative component. The phraseological unit includes two types of evaluation: objective and subjective. In the basis of the first one there is an idea of the value relatively to the norms which characterize a certain lingual consciousness, while the second one is related to the objective content of phraseological unit through an appeal to its emotional perception with the help of figurativeness, because it is the image that awakens emotional experiences.

Following O. Selivanova (Selivanova, 2012, p. 213), synergetic of phraseological discourse, which determines its stability and reproducibility in the ethnic consciousness, we see in four parameters: stereotyping, archotyping, symbolization and intersemiotics.

The first and main parameter underlying the formation of the connotative meaning of phraseological signs motivated by extralinguistic factors is ***stereotyping***. It is based on the human's natural ability to model the surrounding world and internal reflexive experience, categorizing them. Stereotypes act as a deep regulator of processes of perception and knowledge, while the mechanism of stereotyping is determined by the need for the preservation, transmission and accumulation of social and cultural information. In the basis of this process there is the psychological man's habit of returning to repetitive situations and reactions to them, fixed in consciousness in the form of certain patterns and models of thinking, to facilitate their perception, understanding and evaluation.

The functions of stereotypes have an effect on the consciousness of the individual in order to subordinate to social principles, preserve and transfer ethnic tradition, embodied in the system of cultural norms, values and attitudes. It is through the reference to the standards and stereotypes of the world perception of the linguistic and cultural community that the system of value orientation of a particular ethnic group is reproduced.

Stereotypes are not an individual projection of consciousness, but represent collective achievement, can be identical or opposite in different cultures.

Consequently, the *ethnic stereotype* is defined as well-ordered and fixed structure of ethnic consciousness, determined by culture, which personifies the result of reality's cognition by a certain ethnic group. Ethnic stereotypes establish in the human mind cultural traditions, rites, rituals, customs, beliefs, superstitions and peculiarities of verbal and nonverbal behavior; perform functions of identification of a certain ethnic group by preserving its social, cultural, historical and specific national experience.

Among the indicators of ethnic stereotypes there are figurativeness, symbolism, simplicity, sketchiness, integrity, evaluation, subjectiveness, categoricity, illusiveness. Because of ethnic stereotypes positive and negative experience of people is fixed in the form of reduced mind perception. It explains their sketchiness, limitedness and categoricity. In the sphere of ethnic stereotypes there are autostereotypes that summarize the ideas of the representatives of their own ethnic group and their evaluation, and heterostereotypes that assess the representatives of other ethnic groups, which does not always correspond to the real features of other ethnic groups. It is in this context that the subjective and illusive nature of ethnic stereotypes is manifested.

Comparison makes a significant impact on the formation of a stereotype – comparing itself with another object and figuring out how their own ethnic characteristics differ from the other. On this basis, an ethnic image is created – a standard according to which a person acts and expects certain behavior from representatives of other ethnic groups.

Stereotypes can interact with archetypes of the collective unconsciousness, but not to be identified with them. Indeed, unlike archetypes, which are complex, essential for the content nature of generic memory, the stereotype is a schematic, simplified way of a phenomenon that fixes only some of often insignificant features. A stereotype may acquire the status of a symbol, provided that this structure of consciousness is enriched with figurative content.

The correlation of ethnic consciousness with stereotypical thinking affects on decoding and reinterpreting various cultural codes, including sensory, zoomorphic, anthropomorphic, axiological, and others. British and Slavic cultures are identical in approving the evaluation of the sensory code, which is expressed by the positive perception of *light, bright, sweet, warm, silent, pleasant to taste and smell*; negatively perceived *black, dark, gray, sour, bitter, salty, cold, very hot, sharp, unpleasant to taste and smell*. The phraseological units, which have signs of spatial code in their composition: *upper, right, forward, deep*, while the vectors of the *bottom left, back, shallow, lateral* are disapproved.

The influence of the stereotypical thinking of the British and Ukrainians on the formation of the connotative meaning can be studied by example of the phraseological unit *blue stocking* (EUPD, 2006, p. 149).

Both linguistic and cultural communities are unanimous in providing connotations of disapproval and negative evaluation. In the basis of the image lies the stereotypical notion of an unattractive, callous woman dressed without taste. From a traditional point of view, a woman has to be gentle, tender, and elegant. Excessive rationality, hardness and rigidity of character, obtained as a result of active social or scientific activity, in an attempt to make a career, to climb the service ladder, as a rule, prevent the manifestation of purely female qualities, lead to loss of femininity and charm.

The image of blue stockings appeared in England in the 80s of the 18th century in the writer's salon of Mary Worley Montagu. The title "Meeting of Blue Stockings" came up with the Dutch admiral Boscawen, because a member of this literary circle was a famous scientist and translator Benjamin Stillingfleet, who, neglecting the fashion, wore blue stockings. Later, this nickname spread to all members of the circle, where conversations were held on scientific and literary topics.

In the modern sense, the image correlates with the notions of the old, forgotten times, when stockings were not only a compulsory fashion item of men's clothing, but also a luxury item indicating the social status of the owner. In I. Zykova's opinion, a number of facts takes part in the formation of the image: the metaphor for a woman, absorbed by her own interests, on the one hand, is likened to the man, which means to become mature and lose her femininity, and on the other – unattractive, old, unfashionable things (BPDRL, 2006, p. 637).

An additional shade of meaning is given by the component "blue", because it has its own symbolic meaning too. Blue in the color group means the person, who is, from a psychological point of view, concentrated on oneself, in one's own inner world, thoughts, and experiences. Therefore, "blue" here is associated with isolation, indifference, lack of interest in the surrounding world. In the system of natural colors, "blue" means a low temperature, cold. Hence there is the association with the image of a cold, unbreakable woman, very decent in the expression of feelings.

Every nation reproduces peculiar images, symbols, stereotypes in its language picture of the world. The language keeps only those phraseological units, which directly or indirectly correlate with the standards, stereotypes and archetypes of national culture – both material and spiritual. The cultural component of the language at the level of phraseology to a certain extent captures the culture of people – the native speaker, because the phraseological fund contains national and cultural component in its semantics. This component is a complete reflection of all aspects of a particular society's development and existence and it affects the choice of stereotype.

It is known that for the choice of a certain stereotype or the standard of the phraseological unit there is a motive, associated with experience, history and

general cultural specifics of the people. Because of that reason these linguistic units differ in their ethnic identity and individuality.

For example, the stereotype of the cultural and national worldview is motivated by the connotative meaning of English phraseological units with the component *Dutch*, which has a significantly negative connotation: *Dutch auction*; *Dutch bargain*; *Dutch courage*; *Dutch comfort* (*consolation*; *cold* (*sad, small*) *comfort*); *Dutch concert* (*cat's concert*); *Dutch defence*; *Dutch feast*; *Dutch heat*; *Dutchman's drink*; *Dutch reckoning*; *in Dutch*; *double Dutch*; *Dutch have captured* (*або taken*) *Holland* (EUPD, 2006, p. 296).

All of these phraseological units express general negative emotional evaluation for all kinds of "Dutch" from British side. It is explained by the fact that in the 17th century there was a tough competition between England and Holland for the possession of seas and colonies. It is clear that in the other languages there were not found any phraseological units with "Dutch" component.

Often the markers of specific ethno cultural content, indicating the symbolic motivation of the connotative meaning of phraseological units, there are actually anthroponyms.

Among the typical English anthroponyms, the most commonly used are the names *John* and *Jack* – the symbols of an ordinary guy or a man, often with a hint on his fraudulent nature. The combined image of the basic features of the typical Englishman is the phraseological unit with anthroponym *John Bull* (EUPD, 2006, p. 560), which became the personification of the British nation since 18th century. In the minds of an ordinary Englishman, *John Bull* acquires connotative meanings of "material wealth," "simplicity," "physical strength," "rudeness," "stubbornness," "certain littleness of mind".

For the first time used in the revealing political pamphlets of satirical physician John Arbetnon, this image is permanently fixed in the national British consciousness. It's rather interesting, that English people use this phraseological unit with positive meaning and approving evaluation of their own significance, strength, hardness, dignity, whereas the other language consciousness uses this unit with a connotation of irony and humorousness through persistent stereotypical associations with English stubbornness, indignation, vulgarity, and their national trait – contemptuous attitude to all "non-English".

Apparently, *Jack* in the minds of the British was endowed with more interesting character, because, since the 16th century, it almost completely replaced the anthroponym *John* from the texts, having taken the honorable first place among the most common English names: *Jack of all trades*; *Jack out of doors*; *Jack and Gill*, *Jack of (or on) both side*; *pop up like a Jack in-the-box*; *Jack pudding*; *Jack Johnson*; *Jack Sprat*; *Jack Raw* (or *Johnny Newcomer / Raw*); *Jack Frost*; *Jack Home*; *Jack Tar* (or *tar*); *Jack towel*; *Jack of the clock* (or *of the clock-house*); *Jack* (*або Tom*)

*o' (or of) Bedlam; cousin Jack; Jack (or John / Tom) Drum's entertainment (EUPD, 2006, pp. 558-559).*

The symbolization of anthroponym *Jack* in English is so high, that the main symbol of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is the state flag; the British are called *Union Jack* (EUPD, 2006, p. 979).

In the Ukrainian ethnic consciousness, there are also specific symbols-anthroponyms, which in the representations of the linguistic community express the following connotative meanings: *Marko* seems to be an object of humor and irony: *as Marko out of the nightshade* (PDUL, 2008, p. 367); *as Marko (or Khoma) on the wool* (PDUL, 2008, p. 367); or a man cursed by God for eternal lost: *as Marko in hell* (PDUL, 2008, p. 368); *Makar/Sydir* – a loser who is not adapted for difficult living conditions: [*there (in those places)*], *where Makar does not chase calves (or where Makar shepherds calves)* (PDUL, 2008, p. 365); *where Sydir sets the goat's horns* (PDUL, 2008, p. 355); *Martyn* – a greedy fool without sense of measure: *as (as if) Martyn (stupid, fool) to the soap* (PDUL, 2008, p. 368); *Havrylo* – an awkward, clumsy, impolite, ordinary, not quite intelligent man, object of mockery and irony: *seven bags of buckwheat Havrylo* (PDUL, 2008, p. 651); *Pylyp/Kuzma* – a fool who does everything untimely and awkwardly, and also a timid coward through the association with the personification of a hare, which Ukrainians called *Pylyp* (Zhaivoronok, 2006, p. 449): *jump out like Pylyp of the hemp* (PDUL, 2008, p. 85); *jump out like Kuzma (naked, kozak) of the poppy* (PDUL, 2008, p. 86).

Consequently, national consciousness, associating any character with a specific name or label, subconsciously expects it displays certain behavior, temperament and other features. The most striking result of this process is observed when, on the basis of some characteristic features, which are inherent in the prototype, there is a connotative meaning, which is then embodied in the secondary occasional use.

It is important to note that the stylistic connotation in the examples given is asymmetric in its essence; it means, that the absolute majority of connotative proper names are used with a pejorative evaluation, then the minority has a meliorative connotative character, and this specific feature is characteristic of both English and Ukrainian phraseological systems.

Often, an image-standard or image-stereotype embodies a certain symbol that is decisive for a certain ethnic consciousness. It is well-known that the symbol is an important part of the phraseological unit. Symbolism is the notion of universal, specifically national and ethno genetic. Symbol as a phenomenon, has common to mankind, universal character. At the same time it is expressed at the level of national consciousness of the people and is its general cultural acquisition, passed from generation to generation. It is the symbols that reflect national traditions, customs, rites, beliefs, national traits of character, history, etc. The verbal

symbolism of the people is an important factor in the creation of national and cultural picture of the world.

## References

- Bart, R. (1994). *Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics*/Избранные труды: Семиотика. Поэтика. Москва: Прогресс, 616 с.
- BPDR (2006). *Big Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language. Meaning. Usage. Cultural Commentary*/Большой фразеологический словарь русского языка. Значение. Использование. Культурологический комментарий. Отв. ред. В.Н. Телия. Москва: АСТ – ПРЕСС КНИГА, 784 с.
- EUPD (2006). *English-Ukrainian Phraseological Dictionary*/Англо-український фразеологічний словник. Укл. К.Т. Баранцев. Київ: "Знання", КОО, 1056 с.
- PDUL (2008). *Phraseological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*/Словник фразеологізмів української мови. Відп. ред. В.О. Винник. Київ: Наукова думка, 1104 с.
- Selivanova, O. (2012). *The World of Consciousness in Language*/Світ свідомості в мові. Мир свідомості в мові: монографічне видання. Черкаси: Ю. Чабаненко, 487 с.
- Teliia, V. (1986). *Connotative Aspect of Semantics of Nominative Units*/Коннотативный аспект семантики номинативных единиц. Москва: Наука, 141 с.
- Teliia, V. (1996). *Russian Phraseology: Semantical, Pragmatical and Linguistic Cultural Aspects*/Русская фразеология: семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. Москва, 288 с.
- Zhaivoronok, V. (2006). *Signs of Ukrainian Ethnic Culture: Dictionary-Guide*/Знаки української етнокультури: словник-довідник. Київ: Довіра, 703 с.