

LEGE ARTIS

Language yesterday, today, tomorrow

Vol. X. No 1 2025

Special issue: Cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and affective sciences

PHRASEOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION OF EMOTIONS AND FEELINGS IN SPOKEN DISCOURSE: CREATIVE BOUNDARIES AND PRAGMATIC EFFICIENCY

Irina Zykova 

Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

Received: 31.01.2025 Reviewed: 15.02.2025 and 24.02.2025

Similarity Index: 0%

Bibliographic description: Zykova, I. (2025). Phraseological representation of emotions and feelings in spoken discourse: Creative boundaries and pragmatic efficiency. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. Special issue: Cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and affective sciences, X (1), p. 214-228. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. ISSN 2453-8035 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34135/lartis.25.10.1.12>

Abstract: The paper elaborates an integrated methodology of studying the ways in which a speaker's emotional state can be represented with the help of phraseological means. The analysis of eight feature films has established that in spoken discourse the choice of phraseological units for conveying one's emotions and feelings depends on several main factors: their type, the conceptual foundation of their images, their emotional modus, their use in (non)conventional forms, communicative strategies of their modifications, and illocutionary shifts determining their pragmatic efficiency in interpersonal interaction.

Keywords: phraseological unit, cognitive linguistics, spoken discourse, creativity, pragmatics, film.

1. Introduction

The issue of how human emotions and feelings can be represented by language means in the process of communication has been studied in numerous investigations. According to Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, words evoke certain emotions, the intensity of which ranges from highly negative to highly positive. Scholars introduced a special term for the emotional strength of words – "word valence" (Osgood et al. 1957). In Langacker's opinion, every instance of language use "has conceptual import involving four dimensions: descriptive, expressive/emotive, interactive, and discursive" (Langacker 2012: 100). As Foolen states, "emotion drives and determines language use to a considerable extent" (Foolen 2018). Ponsonnet discusses various reasons why emotional language is so relevant to explore, and one of them is as follows: "...since emotions are everywhere in our lives



and everywhere in our language, understanding how humans use emotional language is crucial to any "anthropological study", broadly understood as "the study of human life" (Ponsonnet 2022).

Research into the "emotion-feeling lexicon" (EFL) faces many challenges. The main challenge stems from its heterogeneity, resulting from the extremely complex human perceptual system. EFL heterogeneity, in its turn, brings up terminological, theoretical, and methodological problems.

The terminological problem manifests itself in the fact that one and the same unit of the EFL may have different terminological names depending on the theoretical field within the framework of which it is studied. For example, the unit *Good morning(!)* (that expresses the speaker's certain positive feelings) may be termed as an interjection, or as: an exclamation phrase, a speech act, a conversational routine, a trite metaphor, a discourse marker/expression, a phraseological unit, or a situational set-phrase. This can be illustrated by dictionary definitions, cf., e.g.: *Good morning*: 1) 'it should be used as a greeting or salutation to wish someone a pleasant morning. It's a polite and friendly way to acknowledge someone's presence and show them that you care about their well-being' (<https://thecontentauthority.com/blog/how-to-use-good-morning-in-a-sentence>); 2) 'conventional expression of greeting or, less commonly, farewell used during the morning (i.e., before noon)' (FDI).

The key theoretical issue of the EFL, which remains rather challenging and still defies solution, is its classification and is also closely connected with the problem of terminological variability. Modern investigations take into account different properties of the EFL and, correspondingly, distinguish various classes and subclasses (types and subtypes) that in some cases have no clear-cut boundaries. For instance, Shahovskij claims that the emotional state or attitude can be represented in language by (i) direct naming (*fear, love, anger*), (ii) direct expression (*interjections, invective vocabulary*, etc.), and description (*postures, some voice characteristics, gaze*, etc.). Thus, the scholar makes a distinction between emotion denotation, emotion expression, and emotion description (Shakhovskij 2009). Gak identifies two main groups in the EFL: units that express emotions and feelings (e.g., *Ouch!; What horror!*) and units that describe them (e.g., *I don't like it*). Besides, he singles out three degrees of "zero expression" of emotions and feelings (in ascending order): inadequate utterance, glossolalia, and silence (Gak 2016). In his turn, Foolen (2012: 363-364), exploring the relevance of emotions for language and linguistics, has drawn the following deductions:

"Emotions are (a) conceptualized in languages by a variety of word forms, with "literal" and figurative meaning, (b) can be expressed in a more direct way by prosody, morphology, syntactic constructions and by the use of figurative speech, and (c) are foundational for processing language and its ontogenetic and phylogenetic genesis and development".

In present-day linguistic literature, much attention is paid to the study of phraseological units (PhUs) as a special class of the EFL. The significant interest in PhUs is explained by their inherent capacity to convey in both a figurative way and in an explicit or implicit manner the speaker's attitude to reality. As Teliya claims, one of the basic constituents in phraseological meaning structure is the emotive macrocomponent, which renders subjective modality, some "feeling-attitude" (чувство-отношение) in addition to what is denoted by a PhU. For instance, the use of the idiom *to lead a cat and dog life* entails the expression of the speaker's negative "feeling-attitude" to someone's family relations. In all PhUs, emotions and feelings are encoded and represented through the images (in most cases based on metaphor, but also on metonymy, hyperbole, etc.) that underlie their semantics. Teliya (1996: 213) also emphasizes that:

"To use an idiom in speech means to intentionally commit a speech act, because the figurative gestalt structure commands use due to analogy, and this analogy is in order to inform listeners about the speaker's intention and evoke in them this or that feeling-attitude to a certain fact in order to change their opinion or behavior".

Finally, due to EFL heterogeneity, a whole range of methods is required to arrive at a satisfactory in-depth account of structural, grammatical, semantic, functional, and pragmatic peculiarities that units of EFL have as elements of both a language system and discourse. Nowadays, such units are explored by methods coming from such fields as cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, linguopragmatics, cultural linguistics, discourse analysis, computational corpus linguistics, neurolinguistics, amongst others [see, e.g., (Kövecses 2000; McEnery 2006; Niemeier 2022; Niemeier & Dirve 1997; Panasenکو et al. 2018)]. However, it might be possible to gain deeper insights into the relation between language and emotion, as Foolen (2012) puts it, only by strengthening "the interdisciplinary contacts" in research.

In this paper, I set out to propose an integrated approach to studying the specificity of representing emotional information in spoken discourse with the help of emotional PhUs (E-PhUs). This approach brings together a number of theoretical assumptions developed in cognitive linguistics and phraseology, and also rests on some of the notions elaborated nowadays in linguistic pragmatics and linguistics of emotions. My research aims to establish the methods of and relevant factors in bringing out E-PhUs' creative potential and their pragmatic efficiency in the course of interpersonal communication.

2. Key theoretical assumptions, sources of material, and methodology

In the given work, I regard creativity and pragmatics as mutually influencing phenomena. My earlier findings showed that linguistic creativity might be graded, but irrespective of what the degree of its

manifestation in discourse is, it always leads to this or that pragmatic impact (Zykova 2015; 2020; 2021). The phraseological representation of emotions and feelings is understood in my investigation as a communicant's deliberate choice of certain phraseological means for transmitting emotional information in the process of interpersonal communication. The choice of E-PhUs in discourse is pragmatically dependent. By using them, the speaker intends not just to denote, express, or describe what (s)he is feeling, but to evoke a particular reaction on the part of the addressee.

For the study, I have selected seven feature films, which were released in the period from the 1990s up to the present time. The films are popular comedies from Russian film directors:

- "Патриотическая комедия" ("A Patriotic Comedy", directed by Vladimir Khotinenko; released in 1992);
- "Мама не горюй" ("Mama Don't Grieve", directed by Maksim Pezhemsky; released in 1997);
- "Артистка" ("The Actress", directed by Stanislav Govorukhin; released in 2007);
- "Мужчина в моей голове" ("The Man in my Head", directed by Aleksey Pimanov; released in 2009);
- "Новогодний детектив" ("New Year Detective Story", directed by Aleksey Bobrov; released in 2010);
- "Холоп" ("A Serf", directed by Klim Shipenko; released in 2019);
- "Отель Белград" ("The Hotel Belgrade", directed by Konstantin Statsky; released in 2020).

Feature films have one characteristic that is of particular importance for my research: they are artistic (fictional) works and convey an artistic model of reality, which reflects the worldview of a certain author, his/her personal stance toward what is narrated in the film. This characteristic (which I would further call "fictional authenticity") implies two main inferences. On the one hand, the communication that takes place in feature films cannot be regarded as real-life communication. On the other hand, film personages' speech is drawn from real life, it is based on spoken-discourse patterns that are typical of various real-life communication situations, both informal (everyday) or formal (official, professional, etc.). For instance, if a film narrates a story of a bank manager's life the characters' speech will be the closest possible replica of what is natural for the people of this social stratum and professional sphere. Therefore, feature films reproduce basic communication regulations and, therefore, can be regarded as valid sources for investigating spoken discourse in all its variety.

Unlike other types of feature films, comedy films are deliberately designed to entertain and amuse. This can be achieved by the creative use of language means, E-PhUs in particular.

In the monograph (Zykova 2015), I elaborated the cognitive culture-oriented approach to the study of phraseological meaning and phraseological creativity on which I rest in the present paper. According to this approach, the phraseological meaning is a two-strata structure. It includes (1) the surface (or semantic) stratum and (2) the deep (or conceptual) stratum [see also (Beliaveskaya 2007)]. The surface stratum is constituted by semes forming what is known as the actual phraseological meaning registered in dictionaries. The deep stratum encloses two interdependent constituents: the phraseological image (the 1st level of the deep stratum) and its underlying conceptual foundation (the 2nd level of the deep stratum). The conceptual foundation proved to be a rather complex conceptual structure. Its formation starts with simple (archetypal) concepts (e.g., UP/DOWN, RIGHT/LEFT, FORWARD/BACKWARD, etc.) and then is further developed synthesizing more and more intricate non-metaphorical and metaphorical concepts into its general set up. As a result a macro-metaphorical conceptual model (MMCM) is formed.

In detail, the reconstruction of MMCMs is highlighted in (Zykova 2016). As an example, I will consider the results of reconstructing the MMCM that underlies the E-PhU *наводит тоску на кого-либо* used in the following context:

(1) *А сейчас иди, Босякин. Тоску на меня наводишь.* ("The Actress") – [Eng.: *And now leave me, Bosyakin. You make me bored*].

The actual meaning (i.e. the surface stratum) of *наводит тоску на кого-либо* is 'to depress someone; to evoke despondency in someone; spread gloomy mood' (Lubensky 2013: 646). The meaning stems from the image (i.e. the 1st level of the deep stratum) that is based on the perception of boredom in terms of an object that can be moved from one place to another – Eng. lit. '*to direct the feeling of intense boredom towards someone*'. The image construction is provided by means of synthesizing into an integral whole a number of conceptual constituents, from the elementary (archetypal) constituents DIRECTION, FORWARD, LOCATION to form more complex concepts that render a number of correlated ideas: 1) of the feeling as: a material object; a moving object (vehicle); a dangerous object; a controlled object; an object that intends to reach a certain destination; 2) of the actors as: a "feeling (boredom)" sender and "feeling (boredom)" receiver; 3) of the change in the mood as: movement in a particular direction; a targeted movement; violation of space integrity/boundaries; departure from one place; arrival at a certain place. All these elementary and more complex (metaphorical) concepts are integral parts of such MMCM (i.e. the 2nd level of the deep stratum) as EMOTIONAL STATE (MOOD CHANGE) IS A TRAVEL.

This particular macro-metaphorical conceptual model (like any other MMCM) underlies images of multiple PhUs in the Russian language, cf., e.g.: *пребывать в каком-либо настроении* [Eng: lit. 'stay in some (good/bad) mood'], *пребывать/находиться в хорошем расположении духа* [Eng: lit. 'stay/be in a good frame of spirit/mind']. It is important to state that any MMCM regulates PhUs' usage in discourse (both traditional and occasional). Thus, due to its inner conceptual (metaphoric) complexity it is the MMCM that gives rise to the creativity of PhUs.

Proceeding from these findings, I elaborated two interrelated definitions of phraseological creativity. Firstly, the phraseological creativity is the ability of MMCMs to systemically create PhUs so that the phraseological subsystem of language is formed and further enlarged. Secondly, the phraseological creativity is the ability of MMCMs to adapt any PhU in communication to certain pragmatic tasks set in a particular discourse. Thus, phraseological creativity may be of two types: system creativity and discourse creativity.

As was established, five main strategies can be used to modify PhUs and, hence, to produce and/or intensify a needed pragmatic effect: the inbuilding strategy; the accretion strategy; the recombination strategy; the decomposition strategy; the combination strategy. In example (1), the E-PhU *наводит тоску на кого-либо* is modified by means of the recombination strategy, i.e. by the change of the arrangement of its components to form *тоску на меня наводишь*.

E-PhUs generated by different MMCMs can have different illocutionary charge. In my research, I proceed from Teliya's assumption that (1996: 118):

"An emotive assessment is rewarded with illocutionary charge: it encourages one to experience a certain feeling-attitude and provides the realization of a certain illocutionary intention, causing, in case of communicative success, a corresponding perlocutionary effect".

According to Teliya, the illocutionary charge of PhUs can be of two kinds, forming the opposition 'approval – disapproval' with corresponding further subdivisions conveying more specific personal assessments, such as: 'approval' > delight, admiration, support, etc.; 'disapproval' > contempt, disdain, humiliation, censure, etc. For instance, using the E-PhU *наводит тоску на кого-либо* means to express one's disapproval of what another person has said or has done, which is perceived as an act of ending the conversation.

The creative use of E-PhUs, "sanctioned" by their underlying MMCM, can alter their illocutionary charge in the course of spoken communication and can produce particular pragmatic effects. For

instance, the modified use of PhU *наводит тоску на кого-либо* makes the word *тоска* more salient, which signals the speaker's intensifying irritation with regard to the addressee and serves as an indirect request to stop the conversation. So, the pragmatic efficiency of the modified E-PhU is determined by the illocutionary shift from expressing one's emotion (irritation) to requesting someone perform a definite action. This pragmatic efficiency can be detected through the addressee's (non)verbal reaction: in the film analyzed the addressee is leaving despite his intense desire not to do so.

The phraseological creativity and pragmatic efficiency of E-PhUs in discourse may depend on the type to which they belong. Taking into account Shakhovskij's classification of the EFL as well as structural-semantic and functional peculiarities of phraseological units, I will differentiate between two types of E-PhUs: the expressive type (e.g. *Боже мой!* [Eng.: 'My God!']; *Черт возьми!* [Eng.: 'Damn it!']) and the mixed – denotative-expressive – type (e.g. *наводит тоску на кого-либо* [Eng.: ~ 'make someone feel sad']; *как последняя дура* [Eng.: ~ 'like an absolute fool']).

Resting on the aforementioned theoretical aspects, my study addresses three main research questions (RQ 1, 2, 3) with corresponding three sub-questions (a, b, c).

- RQ1: What is the distribution and the frequency of occurrences of two types of E-PhUs in the comedy films under study?
- RQ2: What macro-metaphorical conceptual models underlie the E-PhUs used in the comedy films? (a) Is there any variation in their phraseological representation of emotions and feelings in the spoken discourse of films? (b) What is the proportion of the E-PhUs with positive, negative, or neutral emotional modus?
- RQ3: How do the macro-metaphorical conceptual models realize their discourse phraseological creativity in the comedy films under consideration? (c) What defines the pragmatic efficiency of modified E-PhUs?

These research questions entail a three-step procedure of analysis with the application of the following methods: the method of phraseological identification, the method of conceptual analysis based on the theory of metaphorical concepts by Lakoff–Johnson and the theory of phraseological creativity; the quantitative method, the semantic and discourse analysis aimed at establishing the emotional modus and illocutionary charge of E-PhUs in the comedy films.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Distribution of E-PhUs and frequency of occurrences of the two types singled out (RQ1).

The selected seven comedy films introduce patterns of imitated natural spoken discourse with an overall running time of 710 minutes (11h 50 min). The analysis has revealed different E-PhU distribution and different ratio of use frequency of their two types across the comedy films under consideration. The results of my observations are presented in table 1 (see table 1).

Table 1. The distribution specifics and ratio of two types of E-PhUs used in the comedy films
Source: Own processing

Title of a comedy film	Absolute frequency of occurrences	E-PhUs of the expressive type (per cent)	E-PhUs of the mixed type (per cent)
1. "A Patriotic Comedy"	30	57 %	43 %
2. "Mama Don't Grieve"	21	38 %	62 %
3. "The Actress"	52	52 %	48 %
4. "The Man in my Head"	50	34 %	66 %
5. "New Year Detective Story"	38	21 %	79 %
6. "A Serf"	41	22 %	78 %
7. "The Hotel Belgrade"	12	83 %	17 %
Overall quantity / percentage	244	39 %	61 %

In three comedy films (1, 3, and 7), the occurrence percent of E-PhUs that refer to the expressive type is higher than the percent of occurrences of E-PhUs that belong to the mixed type. E-PhUs of the expressive type involve such lexical-syntactic classes as phraseological interjections, phraseological parenthesis, phraseological adverbial or adjectival intensifiers, phraseological formulas, phraseological particles, e.g.: *боже мой!* [Eng.: 'Oh my God!']; *ради Бога (извините, простите)* [Eng.: 'for God's sake (excuse someone)']; *побойся бога* [Eng.: 'have you no fear of God?']; *к чертовой матери* [Eng.: 'to the devil's mother']; *да ладно* [Eng.: 'okey then']; *какого черта* [Eng.: 'what the devil']; *как назло* [Eng.: 'ill luck would have it']. In the other four comedy films (2, 4, 5, 6), E-PhUs of the mixed (denotative-expressive) type occur more frequently. These are lexical-syntactic varieties of E-PhUs such as verbal, substantive, adjectival, adverbial collocations and idioms, paremias, e.g.: *выкинуть кого-либо (что-либо) из головы* [Eng.: lit. 'get someone/something out of one's head'], *все равно* [Eng.: 'one does not care']; *кого-либо как подменили* [Eng.: 'someone became a different person'], *тихий омут* [Eng.: 'still waters']; *как последняя дура* [Eng.: 'like a complete fool']; *оставлять кого-либо в покое* [Eng.: 'leave someone alone']; *кусать (себе) локти* [Eng.: lit. 'bite one's elbows'].

The overall percentage of distribution and frequency of use reveals the predominance of the mixed type of E-PhUs in the comedy films under analysis.

3.2 Macro-metaphorical conceptual models: a variation in the phraseological representation of emotions and feelings and the ratio of E-PhUs according to their emotional modus (RQ2)

The conceptual analysis undertaken has resulted in establishing eight macro-metaphoric conceptual models that underlie all the E-PhUs used in the comedy films under study. These are the MMCMs of: TRAVEL, MEDICINE-RELATED ACTIVITY, COMMERCE, SOCIAL ACTIVITY, PLAY, CRAFT, GASTRONOMY, RELIGION-RELATED ACTIVITY. The reconstruction of these MMCMs can be observed in the following examples:

(2) *Иди ты к бесу* ("A Serf") – [Eng.: lit. '**Go to the devil**']: ONE'S IRRITATION CAN SEND ANOTHER PERSON TRAVELLING OVER A VERY LONG DISTANCE > the MMCM of TRAVEL.

(3) *Все мужики рты пооткрывали* ("The Man in my Head") – [Eng.: lit. '**All men are with their mouths opened**']; *А ты знаешь, время лечит* ("The Man in my Head") – [Eng.: lit. '**You know, time heals**']: SURPRISE / FEELING OF GUILT IS SOMETHING THAT CAUSES A DISFUNCTION / ILLNESS / INJURY WHICH CAN BE HEALED > the MMCM of MEDICINE-RELATED ACTIVITY.

(4) *Сил моих нет!* ("The Man in my Head") – [Eng.: lit. '**I can't endure this any longer!**']: PATIENCE IS A DWINDLING RESOURCE; *Ты возьми и выкинь его из головы!* ("The Man in my Head") – [Eng.: lit. '**Just get him out of your head! (showing resentment)**']: RESENTMENT IS A USELESS OBJECT THAT ONE SHOULD GET RID OF > the MMCM of COMMERCE.

(5) *Бабы есть бабы!* ("Mama Don't Grieve") – [Eng.: lit. '**Women are women!**']; *Мистицизм, бабушкины сказки* ("A Patriotic Comedy") – [Eng.: lit. '**Mysticism, grandmother's tales**']: DISAPPOINTMENT / DISBELIEF IS SOMETHING ATTRIBUTED TO A DEFINITE SOCIAL GROUP > the MMCM of SOCIAL ACTIVITY.

(6) *Зализывала раны и давала клятву, что больше никаких мужчин* ("New Year Detective Story") – [Eng.: lit. '**I was licking my wounds and swearing that there would be no more men**']: LOVE IS A WEAPON THAT HURTS (LOVE IS A WAR); *Так-то мне, конечно, все равно, но... чтобы я не ходил, как дурак* ("A Serf") – [Eng.: '**Well, I don't really care, of course, but... so that I wouldn't look like a fool**']: LOVE IS SOMETHING THAT ENTERTAINS (LOVE IS A THEATRICAL PERFORMANCE) > the MMCM OF PLAY.

(7) *Ну что, все в порядке?* ("The Man in my Head") – [Eng.: '**So, are you alright?**']; *Ты, Коль, с катушек не слетай* ("Mama Don't Grieve") – [Eng.: lit. '**You, Kol', don't go off the rails**']: EMOTIONAL STATE / ANGER IS AN OBJECT THAT CAN BE IN/OUT OF ORDER [AND MUST BE REPAIRED/FIXED] > the MMCM of CRAFT.

(8) Ну... **не в моем вкусе** мужчина ("Mama Don't Grieve") – [Eng.: 'Well... **not my type** of man'];
Вы **черте что на постном масле!** ("The Man in my Head") – [Eng.: lit. 'You are **devilry cooked**
in vegetable oil']; DISLIKE / ANTYPATHY IS BADLY COOKED FOOD WITH AN
UNPLEASANT TASTE > the MMCM of GASTRONOMY.

(9) Простите **ради Бога** ("The Actress") – [Eng.: lit. 'Forgive me **for God's sake**']; Еще раз **спасибо**
большое за гостеприимство! ("The Actress") – [Eng.: lit. 'And again, **thanks a lot** for your
hospitality!']; GUILT / GRATITUDE IS SOMETHING EVOKED / GRANTED / CONTROLLED
BY GOD > the MMCM OF RELIGION-RELATED ACTIVITY.

The conceptual analysis has allowed me to discover that the phraseological representation of the interlocutors' emotions and feelings in the comedy films is carried out in the majority of cases by means of the E-PhUs based on the MMCMs of TRAVEL (25%), COMMERCE (22%), and RELIGION-RELATED ACTIVITY (13%) (overall per cent – 60%). The E-PhUs based on these models are chosen to express and/or denote emotions and feelings more frequently than the PhUs based on the other five MMCMs (overall per cent – 40%).

According to my research findings, the MMCMs give rise to phraseological images of emotions and feelings that are of negative, positive, as well as neutral modus. Their correlation in the comedy films is as follows: negative – 54%; positive – 37%; neutral – 8%.

Rather remarkably, any MMCM can underlie E-PhUs that represent emotional states of all the three modi: positive, negative, or neutral. For example, the PhUs *приходить в себя* [Eng.: lit. 'come into oneself'], *сойти с ума* [Eng.: lit. 'leave one's mind'], and *развелась и развелась* [Eng.: lit. 'divorced and divorced'] render such emotions as: 'coming out of the state of intense nervousness, fright, worry', 'strong emotional tension, stress', and 'lack of interest, concern'. These positive, negative, and neutral emotions are perceived through the phraseological images in terms of such concepts as LOCATION CHANGE, LEAVING, RETURNING, GOING IN OPPOSITE DIRECTIONS that are the constituents of one and the same MMCM of TRAVEL.

3.3 Macro-metaphorical conceptual models: discourse phraseological creativity and pragmatic efficiency of modified E-PhUs (RQ3)

As noted above, the discourse phraseological creativity is rooted in the capacity of MMCMs to adapt PhUs to the pragmatic tasks of discourse and can be determined through the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the E-PhUs' (non)modified use in the comedy films under study.

According to my research findings, 51 E-PhUs (i.e. 21%) have modified forms, while 193 E-PhUs (i.e. 71%) are used in their usual (or conventional) forms. In the comedy films, the discourse creativity of MMCMs might take different forms. The proportion of the modified E-PhUs based on different MMCMs is as follows (in descending order): TRAVEL – 33%; MEDICINE-RELATED ACTIVITY – 21%; PLAY – 17%; COMMERCE – 15%; CRAFT – 10%; SOCIAL ACTIVITY – 2%; GASTRONOMY – 2%; RELIGION-RELATED ACTIVITY – 0%.

As was established, in oral communication the E-PhUs of the mixed (denotative-expressive) type are modified much more frequently than those of an expressive type, cf. their ratio: 47 cases (92%) vs. 4 cases (8%), correspondingly. This can be explained by the fact that the E-PhUs of the expressive type are characterized by a lower degree of figurativeness in comparison with the E-PhUs of the mixed type, where figurativeness is usually rather high. In the majority of cases, the images of denotative-expressive E-PhUs are based on original metaphors (or metonymies, etc.) that are a rich source of their creativity. Metaphoric figurativeness makes the E-PhUs more liable to changes in the process of communication in order to achieve certain pragmatic aims. As was pointed out above, to modify the E-PhUs of both types, five strategies are used in spoken discourse in the comedy films. The frequency of occurrence of each strategy varies, and the corresponding ratio is given in table 2 (see table 2).

Table 2. The ratio of strategies used to modify E-PhUs in spoken discourse
Source: Own processing

Modified E-PhUs		
Strategies	Expressive type (4 cases)	Denotative-expressive type (47 cases)
Inbuilding	1	22%
Accretion	---	14%
Recomposition	1	36%
Decomposition	2	20%
Combination	---	8%

As is shown in table 2, the recomposition strategy is used most frequently in the characters' speech, e.g.:

(10) *Между прочим, большие виды на нее имеет.* ("The Actress") – [Eng.: *By the way, he has big hopes of marrying her*].

The E-PhU *иметь виды на кого-либо* [Eng.: lit. *'have designs on someone'*] is modified in the conversation with the help of the recomposition strategy, that consists in changing the arrangement

of the components of the E-PhU. This strategy is accompanied by the inbuilding strategy that implies the insertion of new components into the base-form of the E-PhU. In the example given above the adjective *большие* [Eng.: 'big'] is inserted to emphasize the intensity of one's hope and the strength of intention to openly speak of one's love (deep sympathy). The application of these strategies results in changing the illocutionary intention of the E-PhU's use, from informing about particular relationships between two people to warning about them. This illocutionary shift intensifies the pragmatic efficiency induced by the use of the phraseological modification under consideration.

As my research has shown, the pragmatic efficiency varies (decreases/increases) depending on illocutionary shifts caused by the application of this or that strategy of modifying E-PhUs in spoken discourse, e.g.:

(11) *Черт подери!* – 'used to express indignation, vexation, astonishment: *Черт, говорю, вас подери, а!* ("A Patriotic Comedy") – [Eng.: *Damn, I say, you, ah!*].

(12) *убрать улыбку с лица* – 'stop rejoicing': *Ты извинишься за халдея и убереешь эту гадкую ухмылку со своего лица.* ("New Year Detective Story") – [Eng.: *You'll apologize for calling me hash-slinger and get that nasty grin off your face*].

In example (11), the application of the decomposition strategy results in mitigating the character's indignation and in the illocutionary shift from expressing a strong negative emotion to requesting one to pay attention to it, that is to simply informing about the speaker's emotional state. In example (12), the E-PhU is modified by means of the inbuilding strategy that causes the illocutionary shift from a request to a threat or an intimidation. These examples demonstrate the decrease and the increase of pragmatic efficiency of the E-PhUs in question, correspondingly.

4. Conclusion

Through the analysis of eight feature films, I sought to explore the specifics of the phraseological representation of emotions and feelings in spoken discourse. My research was particularly focused on the distribution, frequency, and variation of E-PhUs in oral communication depending on (1) their reference to one of the two main types (expressive or denotative-expressive), (2) the macro-metaphorical conceptual models that generate their images, (3) their emotional modus, (4) their use in traditional or modified forms, (5) their pragmatic impact determined by both the strategy that is applied to modify them and by the illocutionary shifts resulting from these modifications.

The methodology that has been elaborated in my research on the basis of a number of assumptions coming from cognitive linguistics, linguistic pragmatics, phraseology, and linguistics of emotions, has let me obtain valid empirical data and reach the following deductions.

In the spoken discourse of the comedy films under consideration the interlocutors prefer to use the E-PhUs of the mixed (denotative-expressive) type to convey their emotions and feelings. The choice of such units provides them with broader opportunities to both express their emotional state and describe it, and, thus, to get a certain response or a target reaction from the addressee. In the majority of cases, the interlocutors use E-PhUs to render their negative emotions. To achieve a higher degree of pragmatic efficiency, the speaker modifies E-PhUs. The possible range of discursive modifications is provided by the conceptual foundations (i.e. MMCMs) that underlie the E-PhUs' images and semantics, and by the kind of communicative strategy applied (inbuilding, recombination, combination, decomposition, accretion). The MMCMs generate phraseological images that can be conceived by the speaker as most appropriate in representing his/her feelings. The discourse creativity of E-PhUs may be low, moderate, or high in degree. But irrespective of the degree of discourse creativity, the E-PhUs' modifications evoke certain illocutionary shifts resulting in the increase or the decrease of pragmatic efficiency of conveying interlocutors' emotions and feelings with the help of phraseological means.

Overall, the results obtained have made it evident that the use of E-PhUs, especially their modified use in film discourse, should necessarily be considered when studying pragmatic value of speech acts. The research conducted can contribute to the study of deep-lying links between cognitive and pragmatic aspects of interpersonal communication. The issues raised could be explored further in future research on other types of discourse and languages.

Note

Translation from Russian into English was done by the author.

Abbreviations

EFL – emotion-feeling lexicon

E-PhU(s) emotional phraseological unit(s)

MMCM – macro-metaphorical conceptual model


PhU(s) – phraseological unit(s)

References

1. Beliaevskaya, E.G. (2007). Conceptual analysis: A modified version of structural linguistics methods? In *Conceptual analysis of language: modern research directions*. Moscow-Kaluga: Eidos, p. 60-69. / Beliaevskaya E.G. *Konceptual'nyj analiz: modifitsirovannaya versiya metodov strukturnoj lingvistiki?* In *Konceptual'nyj analiz jazyka: sovremennyye napravleniya issledovanij*. Moskva-Kaluga: Eidos, p. 60-69. / Беляевская Е.Г. Концептуальный анализ: модифицированная версия методов структурной лингвистики? In *Концептуальный анализ языка: современные направления исследований*. Москва-Калуга: Эйдос, p. 60-69.
2. Farlex dictionary of idioms. Available at: <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/good+morning>.
3. Foolen, A. (2012). The relevance of emotion for language and linguistics. In *Moving ourselves, moving others. Motion and emotion in intersubjectivity, consciousness and language*. Foolen, A.P., Lüdtke, U.M., Racine, T.P. & Zlatev, J. (eds.). Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 349-368.
4. Foolen, A. (2018). Review of Laura Alba-Juez and J. Lachlan Mackenzie, 2016. *Pragmatics: Cognition, context & culture*. Madrid: McGraw Hill. In *Russian journal of linguistics*, 22 (1), p. 195-199. DOI [10.22363/2312-9182-2018-22-1-195-199](https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2018-22-1-195-199).
5. Gak, V.G. (2016). *Language transformations. Types of language transformations. Factors and spheres of implementation of linguistic transformations*. Moscow: LIBROCOM. / Gak V.G. *Jazykovyye preobrazovaniya. Vidy jazykovyh preobrazovanij. Faktory i sfery realizatsii jazykovyh preobrazovanij*. Moskva: LIBROKOM. / Гак В.Г. Языковые преобразования. Виды языковых преобразований. Факторы и сферы реализации языковых преобразований. Москва: ЛИБРОКОМ.
6. Kövecses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture and body in human feeling*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
7. Langacker, R. (2012). Interactive cognition: Toward a unified account of structures, processing, and discourse. In *International journal of cognitive linguistics*, 3, p. 95-124.
8. Lubensky, S. (2013). *Russian-English dictionary of idioms*. Revised edition. New Haven – London: Yale University Press.
9. McEnery, T. (2006). *Swearing in English: Bad language, purity and power from 1586 to the present*. London – New York: Routledge.
10. Niemeier, S. (2022). *26 Emotions and figurative language*. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
11. Osgood, Ch.E., Suci, G.J. & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). *The Measurement of meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
12. Panasenko, N., Greguš, E. & Zabuzhanska, I. (2018). Conflict, confrontation, and war reflected in mass media: Semantic wars, their victors and victims. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Warsaw: De Gruyter Poland, III (2), December 2018, p. 132-163. DOI: [10.2478/lart-2018-0017](https://doi.org/10.2478/lart-2018-0017)
13. Ponsonnet, M. (2022). Emotional language: A brief history of recent research. In *Approaches to language and culture (handbook)*. Völkel, S. & Nassenstein, N. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 307-335. Available at: <https://hal.science/hal-03835591/document>
14. Shakhovskij, V.I. (2009). Emotions as an object of research in linguistics. In *Questions of psycholinguistics*, 9, p. 29-42. / Shahovskij V.I. Emotsii kak ob'ekt issledovaniya v lingvistike. In *Voprosy psiholingvistiki*, 9, s. 29-42. / Шаховский В.И. Эмоции как объект исследования в лингвистике. In *Вопросы психолингвистики*, 9, с. 29-42.

15. Teliya, V.N. (1996). *Russian phraseology: Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. / Telija V. N. *Russkaya frazeologiya: Semanticheskiye, pragmaticheskiye i lingvokul'turologicheskiye aspekty*. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury. / Телия В. Н. *Русская фразеология: Семантические, прагматические и лингвокультурологические аспекты*. Москва: Языки русской культуры.
16. *The language of emotions: Conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundation*. (1997). Niemeier, S. & Dirven, R. (eds.) Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing House.
17. Zykova, I.V. (2021). Linguistic creativity in film discourse. In *Linguistic creativity in different types of discourse: Limits and possibilities*. Moscow: R.Valent, p.100-189. / Zykova I.V. *Lingvisticheskaya kreativnost' v kinodiskurse*. In *Lingvokreativnost' v diskursakh raznykh tipov: Predely i vozmozhnosti*. Moskva: R.Valent, s. 100-189. / Зыкова И.В. *Лингвистическая креативность в кинодискурсе*. In *Лингвокреативность в дискурсах разных типов: Пределы и возможности*. Москва: Р.Валент, с. 100-189.
18. Zykova, I.V. (2015). *The conceptual sphere of culture and phraseology: Theory and methods of lingocultural studies*. Moscow: LENAND. / Zykova I.V. *Konceptosfera kul'tury i frazeologiya: Teorija i metody lingvokul'turologicheskogo izuchenija*. Moskva: LENAND. / Зыкова И.В. *Концептосфера культуры и фразеология: Теория и методы лингвокультурологического изучения*. Москва: ЛЕНАНД.
19. Zykova, I. (2016). The phraseological meaning construal in the traditional vs. cognitive culture-oriented perspectives. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2016, I (2), December 2016, p. 253-286. DOI: [10.1515/lart-2016-0015](https://doi.org/10.1515/lart-2016-0015)
20. Zykova, I. (2020). Verbal sources of cinematic metaphors: From cinematic performativity to linguistic creativity. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, V (1), June 2020, p. 499-532.

Contact data

	<p>name: academic title / rank: department: institution: e-mail: fields of interest:</p>	<p>Irina Zykova DSc. (Philology) Professor, Leading Researcher Yuri Stepanov Department for Theory and Practice of Communication Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences 1 bld. 1 Bolshoy Kislovsky Lane, 125009 Moscow, Russia irina_zykova@iling-ran.ru Cognitive linguistics, phraseology, pragmatics, multimodal studies, corpus linguistics, lexicography</p>
---	--	--