

**DYNAMICS OF VALUE SYSTEMS IN ANGLO-AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN  
CONCEPTUAL WORLD VIEWS: A TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE****Prof. Dr. Vera Zabolkina****Assoc. Prof. Maria Konnova**Russian State University for the Humanities, **Russian Federation****ABSTRACT**

The article analyzes complex cognitive mechanisms which underlie multiple changes that have affected value systems of English and Russian speaking communities throughout the centuries. It is assumed that values permeate conceptual world view at all its levels and changes in axiological system are bound to have far-reaching consequences – sometimes even posing a threat to the viability of a community. In the present paper changes in axiological underpinnings of Anglo-American and Russian world views are examined building on the example of socio-temporal concept of "everyday life". The method employed is that of conceptual analysis, which is still viewed as quite authoritative and reliable. Drawing on diverse empirical data from the English and Russian languages the authors argue that general vector of everyday life perception dynamics is that of successive devaluation. The latter is thought to be caused by the shift of the concept's basic reference value that might be prompted by universal cognitive mechanisms of metaphoric, metonymic and metaphonymic mapping. Leading to a common result – elimination of some or all of the conceptual value features – the process of devaluation in each language has a number of unique characteristics. These culture-specific features reflect a direct correlation between main tendencies in temporal experience categorization and various non-linguistic factors.

**Keywords:** cognitive analysis, value system, threat, categorization, time**INTRODUCTION.**

Integral outlook of a nation as well as overall dimensions of its cultural evolution and potential ways of its future development do ultimately depend upon the type of value system that is prevalent in a given community. It is fair to say that values constitute the core of what we traditionally call "culture" defining its distinct uniqueness "from within", from the hidden depth of individual and social existence. This relation between culture and its values seems to be bilateral. It is the degree to which values are actualized in various spheres of people's activity that predetermines the potential of culture to preserve the unity of a nation, a state and a community. This capacity to unify makes nation's culture prior to its economics, politics, law and ethics. In the course of time, cultures change, as do their value systems. Shifts in axiological systems are bound to have far-reaching consequences – sometimes even posing a threat to the viability of a community.

In the present paper we use integrated methodology of cognitive linguistics to examine transformations in axiological underpinnings of Anglo-American and Russian outlooks. We build on the example of how English and Russian linguistic world views have

evolved in terms of their capacity to explicitly name and variously assess the phenomenon of “everyday life”. The method used in the paper is that of conceptual analysis, which is still viewed as quite authoritative and reliable. Drawing on lexicographic data and historical corpora from the English and Russian languages we prove that general dynamics of everyday life perception is that of successive devaluation.

The latter manifests itself in pejorative (if not derogatory) meanings that are over time acquired by adjectives describing the macroconcept of “everyday life” in English (*workaday*, *quotidian*, *everyday*) as well as in Russian (*обыденный*, *будничный*, *повседневный*). This semantic shift is shown to be caused by the cognitive shift of the concept’s basic reference value. Leading to a common result – elimination of some or all of the conceptual value features – the process of devaluation in each language has a number of unique characteristics.

#### **The macroconcept of “everyday life” in Anglo-American conceptual world view: a historical perspective**

The studies into the development of the macroconcept “everyday life” in the English world view based on the lexicographic data and historical corpora shows that initially the concept is shaped around the temporal-action concept “workday” and is affected by the cognitive mechanism of metonymic mapping (projecting) along the lines of the conceptual scheme ACTIVITY *instead of* the PERIOD OF TIME OF CONDUCTING THE ACTIVITY. In the middle and new English period the “workday” concept is expressed by the lexemes *workaday* (c.-a. *werkedagz*, variants *werkeday*, *worky-day*, *work-a-day*), *working day*, *work-day*, e.g., “Forr zure wuke gifepþ zuw Agz sexo *werrkedazgess*” (Ormin, circa 1200) [2].

The leading conceptual feature of the “workday” concept is its characteristics as full of labour activity. The latter is reflected, on the one hand, in the meaning of the root ‘work-’, on the other, in the semantics of the immediate context of the words *workaday*, *working day*, *work-day*, e.g., “On the *werkeday* zif that thou be About thi *labor* treuly” (Audelay, Poems, 1426) [2].

The traditional world view does not impart full cognitive autonomy to the “workday” concept, though it is actualized in the frame of temporal-action dichotomy *workdays* – *feast days* (*holidays*). In the middle English period a complementary character of the concept “workday” is manifest at the morphological level. The variants of the noun *workaday* are coined similarly to the words nominating the concept “feast day (holiday)”. The noun *workyday* is traced back to the model underlying the word *holiday* (*holy day*), while the word form *werkeday* to the words *sunnedei*, *messedei*. The categorial interrelation between the concepts “workday” – *feast day* (*Christian holy day*) is proven by the frequency the language units verbalizing these concepts function jointly in the text, e.g., “That divers preachers within your diocess... do preach as well the *worky days* as the *holy days*” (Eccl. Mem. II. I. Xxvii, 1550) [2]; “She paid the Labourers their Wages on *Work-days*, and took a Jigg with them on *Holy-days*” (Centlivre Mrs. Platonic Lady, 1706) [2].

The second concept that belongs to the “everyday life” macroconcept is that of “daily routine”. The leading conceptual feature of this concept is the temporal classifier: *smth that happens every day*. This feature is reflected in the semantics of the lexeme *everyday*. The lexeme *everyday* that came into the language usage as a single compound

word in the second half of the 14<sup>th</sup> century has the hyponymic meaning “*a week-day, as opposed to Sunday*”, along with the collective meaning “*every other day*”, e.g., “Ask him for an *every-day*, he cannot come on a Sunday. Sunday and *every-day* are alike to him” (Elworthy, W. Somerset Word-bk., Mod. Sc., 1888) [2].

In the 17<sup>th</sup> century the conversion formed the adjective *everyday* with two meanings. Its first meaning “*daily*”, “*day-to-day*” describes phenomena as filling the aggregate space of the day, e.g., “An *every-day care* for the drying up the great fountain of leprosie in the heart” (Hammond R. 1648) [2]. Its second meaning “*mundane*” is a result of a poly-component metonymic transfer: “*quality inherent to an activity extended in time*” → “*time*” and is actualized by the adjective *everyday* in the constructions with nouns denoting clothes items, e.g., “Few great ladies going to a masque... outshine our’s in their *every-day habits*” (Massinger, City Madam, I. 1, 1632) [2].

The conceptual feature “*happening/occurring every day*” is reflected in the semantics of two other temporal adjectives: native English lexeme *daily* and the Roman word *quotidian* borrowed in the middle English period (Old French *cotidien*, *-ian*, French *quotidien*, Latin *quotidiē*: *every day, daily*), e.g., “Ȝif þei preien, þat is... comunly for ofþrynge & *cotidian distibucion*” (Wyclif J. Works, 1380) [2]; “Though your sinnes be *daily* and *quotidian*, let not them be deadly” (Veronm Godly Sayings, 1550) [2]; “Proued... by *dayly experience*” (Eden Treat. Newe Ind., 7, 1553) [2].

In the world view of the middle English period the conceptual feature “*happening/occurring every day*” is not compounded by qualitative associative axiological relations. With the conceptual feature “*full of labour activity*” relating it to the macroconcept “activity”, the mental image of everyday life does not have any axiological tagging.

During the Renaissance the mentality of the English language speakers changes the cognitive basis of the conceptualization. The cognitive dissonance triggered by a mismatch between the reality of the daily routine and the humanistic notions about limitless capabilities of human beings and, indirectly, about their needs, leads to a shift in the axiological structure of the macroconcept “everyday life”. The temporal classifier “*happening/occurring every day*” receives a new metonymic interpretation as “*happening/occurring every day* → *recurring* → *monotonous*”. As a result, a new axiological feature “*uninteresting, dull*” is reflected in the meaning “*common, commonplace/trite*” received in the 16<sup>th</sup> century by the temporal adjective *quotidian*, e.g., “Tully treateth of two maner of speches, the one after the rhetoricyen eloquent, the other *quotyidian* and vulgare” (Whitinton, Tullyes Offices, 1534) [2].

In its new axiological meaning the lexeme *quotidian* describes a qualitative dimension of the reality, rather than the temporal one. Verbalizing the conceptual value feature “*uninteresting*”, “*dull*” the lexeme *quotidian* has shifted from the class of relative adjectives to the class of qualitative adjectives acquiring the collocation models typical of the latter, for example, the ability to combine/collocate with the qualitative adverbs of degree *so*, *very*, e.g., “This (adds Wieland) is *very quotidian scepticism*” (Taylor W. Monthly Mag. XLII. 423, 1816) [2]. In the texts of the 17<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century the adjective *quotidian* refers to the negatively marked pole of the scale “*high – low*” describing usual life (for example, the daily routine, daily physical labour) as opposed to the domain of the exclusive (arts and sciences), e.g., “Common and *quotidian thoughts* are

beneath the grace of a Verse" (Spencer J. Vulg. Proph., 1665) [2]; "To scorn *quotidian scenes*, to spurn the bliss of vulgar minds" (Shenstone W. Economy, 1763) [2].

At the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the cognitive shift affects the prototypical concept "workday" causing transformations in its conceptual structure. The descriptor "non-festive" acquired by the concept "workday" in the frame of the binary opposition *feast day (holy day) – workday* receives a metonymic psychological interpretation as "usual", "uninteresting". The features' structure of the concept "workday" is supplemented by the evaluative classifier "mediocre, common". The lexical system of the English language undergoes the cognitive shift that is reflected in a new qualitative meaning "common", "nondescript (unexceptional)" of the lexeme *workaday, working-day*, e.g., "With such a *Workiday-rough-hewn face* too!" (Dryden. Assigment III, 1672) [2]. The substantive constructions with metonymically reinterpreted attribute *workaday (working-day)* used in speech show a subjective evaluative attitude of the speaker, rather than the properties of objective reality.

Profound psychological shifts triggered by the aggravated erosion of the Christian values' basis of the world view, which took place in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, led to the loss of cognitive unity of "workaday (everyday)" structures. The opposition of time and duration shapes the contradistinction between the daily routine (common, uninteresting) and holiday (unusual, exceptional, interesting). *Workaday, quotidian* is used to describe the way of life, mentality and conduct of those whose existence is confined to the pursuit of material needs. The antithesis is presented by the *festive* way of life of aristocracy not constrained by daily household cares, ostensibly luxurious and exuberant. This opposition makes a profound impact on the conceptualization of the everyday life/daily routine in the late 18<sup>th</sup> – early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries [3, p. 27 – 28]. The language reflects this process through the emergence of a new metonymic meaning "occurring every day", "common", "mediocre" of the adjective *everyday* in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Alongside with with objective, axiologically neutral meaning, the adjective gradually acquires distinctly negative pejorative connotations. The adjective *everyday* starts to function as a descriptive attribute in the constructions with the names of persons and personal qualities. In this context the semantic structure of the adjective loses cognitive temporal features, as they are replaced by the pragmatic content. The word *everyday* acquires an emotive evaluative meaning "common", "nondescript", "mediocre", e.g., "Things of common concern ... make no slight impression on *everyday minds*" (Shenstone W. Economy, 1763) [2]; "Persons of no *every-day powers and acquirements*" (Coleridge S. Biog., 1817) [2]; "She had shrunk from the *every-day people* in the parlour of the public-house" (Smith Alb. Chr. Tadpole xxxii, 1847) [2].

### Cross-linguistic perspective: Russian data

The process of de-axiologization of everyday life in the world view of the Russian language uses the same conceptual model as the world view of the English language, though it starts much later, in the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The metonymic shift singles out a slot of "negative mental condition (boredom, fatigue)" from the frame "workaday". Later this slot is projected into the frame *ACTUAL REALITY (AMBIENT REALITY)*, which becomes *EVERYDAY LIFE/DAILY ROUTINE* through metaphoric transfer.

As a result, this leads to the emergence of the concept "daily routine" that has a lowered axiological status. At the language level the development of the concept "daily routine" is reflected in the emergence of the qualitative non-temporal meaning "mediocre" of the lexemes *обыденный, будничный, повседневный* ("workaday"). Shifting from the class of relative adjectives into the class of qualitative ones, they acquire an extended morphological paradigm (compared to the original one): the comparative and superlative degrees (*обыденнее / более обыденный, самый обыденный; самый будничный* – "more quotidian", "the most quotidian", "the most mundane"); specifying qualitative adverbs (for example, *весьма, слишком, совершенно* – "quite", "too", "absolutely") and conjunctive-adverbial combinations (for example, *до того..., что...* – "so... that"). At the level of the world formation the cognitive shift is manifest in the emergence of the substantive derivatives *обыденность, будничность, повседневность* ("mundanity", "everydayness", "daily routine") in 1840 to 1870 used to convey a lowered qualitative meaning "mediocrity", "ordinariness". In the 1870-ies a negative attitude displayed by the nihilistic progressive public towards everyday life/daily routine were becoming more prevalent. The Russian intelligentsia started to use a generalized pejorative noun *обыденщина* ("commonness/commonplaceness") to describe everyday life.

The change of the axiological vector categorizing everyday life in the Russian world view goes hand in hand with setting the content boundaries of the macroconcept "everyday life" in its present format as an abstract existential temporal one. This is proven by the words and their semantics, as the semantic structure of the noun *повседневность* has finally shaped up. It emerged in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century as a synonym of evaluative words *mediocrity, commonness*, while in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century it acquired a new abstract existential temporal meaning: daily existence. The lexical level shows that the macroconcept has a broad conceptual framework as it can enter into a great semantic variety of adjective collocations with the noun *повседневность*. They include such heterogeneous areas as **space**: geographic (for example, *венская, датская, русская повседневность* – "Viennese, Danish, Russian everyday life"); social (for example, *городская, сельская повседневность* – "urban and rural everyday life") and political (*диссидентская повседневность* – "dissident everyday life"); **time** (for example, *нынешняя повседневность* – "current everyday life"), **activity** (*литературная повседневность* – "literary everyday life"). At present the vector of axiological categorization of everyday life is gravitating towards a low pole of the scale, which is proven by the semantics of the adjectives used with the substantive *повседневность* in the discourse (for example *трудная, заурядная, прозаическая, светлая, утомительная* – "difficult, ordinary, prosaic/mundane, trivial, wearisome") [1].

## CONCLUSION

Summing up the results of this research we would like to highlight that the value systems of English and Russian speaking communities are undergoing considerable changes in the course of historical development. The article makes an analysis of this process on the bases of the macroconcept "everyday life". The analysis of lexicographical and corpora data shows that the general trends in the development of the macroconcept lead to its consistent de-axiologization brought about by changes in the basic values, which serve as a reference for the English and Russian speaking communities in the course of categorizing the reality. The process of de-axiologization (of losing value) is universal and affects temporal axiological sphere of both English and Russian world views. Deaxiologization is prompted by cognitive mechanisms: metaphoric, metonymic and metaphonymic mapping. Though it has led to a common result, that is, elimination of the value component, the de-axiologization has its own lingua-specifics in each language, which can be attributable to the impact made by various extra-linguistic factors on categorizing the reality. A gradual erosion of the value status of everyday life started back in the past is becoming even stronger now, which can also be attributable to global devaluation of human life. This process poses a real **threat** both for individual and national identities of English and Russian speakers.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The article is prepared with financial support of Russian Science Foundation grant 17-78-30029

## REFERENCES

- [1] National corpus of the Russian Language. <http://ruscorpora.ru>
- [2] Oxford English Dictionary Online. <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry>
- [3] Rosenberg N. Culture of Everyday Life in Povolzie: Philosophical and Hermeneutic Analysis. Penza: PGU Publishing House, 2010.

## F0 CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH SPONTANEOUS AND READ-ALoud SPEECH

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yulia Filyasova

Bachelor Degree student Andrey Shubin

Saint-Petersburg Mining University, Russia

## ABSTRACT

Distinctive prosodic features of spontaneous and read-aloud speech are difficult to determine due to several degrees of spontaneity, individual speaking styles, and a variety of emotional states, registers, and communicative situations. Nevertheless, scientists have been making a number of attempts in pursuit of this goal. The article presents the results of comparative analysis of spontaneous and read-aloud speech, obtained on identical material, characterized by neutral pronunciation style – from the perspectives of perception and fundamental frequency (F0). Spontaneous speech (monologue) was produced and then read by a native speaker of British English. Hesitation pauses, filled and unfilled, were later deleted. F0 of words in the positions of tonal nuclei and under prominent pitch accents were analyzed as the most significant parts of tone units. Such characteristics as pitch interval, F0 slope and pitch direction were in the focus of attention. It was found that spontaneous speech was characterized by narrower pitch intervals, flatter F0 slopes and more rising-falling pitch contours; while read-aloud speech – by larger pitch intervals, steeper F0 slopes and more level tones.

**Keywords:** spontaneous speech; read-aloud speech; pitch contours; F0 slope; pitch intervals.

## INTRODUCTION

Comparison of acoustic and perceptual correlates, typical of spontaneous vs. read-aloud speech, has been performed by a number of scientists. Spontaneous speech and reading aloud are different kinds of speech activity; however, neither of them has any particular distinctive prosodic characteristics. Spontaneous speech is traditionally opposed to reading aloud as they presume different degrees of control over speech production: whether produced at the moment of speaking or while reading a text.

It is widely accepted that spontaneous speech is «more noisy» because of hesitation pauses and grammatical inconsistencies. However, it is incorrect to state that spontaneity is a binary characteristic of speech. It is possible to distinguish several degrees of spontaneity. The level of preparedness can vary from a very well rehearsed official presentation, such as public speech on television or radio, to an informal conversation among friends or family members. The former is characterized by a controlled structure, determined by the informational content of speech and in many cases – by a reliance on a written text, specially prepared for public speaking. The latter is based on shared information, known for each interlocutor, and due to this fact, the