

INTERJECTION IN A NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION OF YAKUTS

МЕЖДОМЕТИЕ В НЕВЕРБАЛЬНОМ ОБЩЕНИИ ЯКУТОВ YAKUTLARIN

SÖZEL OLMAYAN İLETİŞİMİNDE ÜNLEM

Tatyana NIKOLAEVA*

ABSTRACT

The paper attempts to clarify the semantic differentiations of polysemantic interjections in the Yakut language, depending on the situation of communication and general context. Intonation, gestures and facial expressions of communicants are particularly important for an adequate perception of diffused interjections which in their turn can also be polysemantic. Fiction literature is a rich source to define more exactly not only the meanings of interjections, but the description of the sphere of these units' functions.

Keywords: Interjection, Non-Verbal Communication, Emotional State, Context, A Communicant.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье предпринята попытка уточнения смысловых дифференциаций многозначных междометий якутского языка в зависимости от ситуации общения и общего контекста. Для адекватного восприятия диффузных междометий особое значение приобретают интонация, жесты и мимика коммуникантов, которые, в свою очередь, могут быть тоже многозначными. Художественная (классическая) литература является богатым источником для уточнения не только значения междометий, но и описания сферы функционирования данных единиц.

Ключевые Слова: Междометие, Невербальное Общение, Эмоциональное Состояние, Контекст, Коммуникант.

ÖZET

Makalede ilişkiler ve genel iletişim bağlamında Yakutça'nın çok anlamlı ünlemin farklı anlamlarının tespiti üzerine durulmuştur. Farklı ünlemlerin aynı şekilde anlaşılması için konuşmacıların çok anlamlı olabilen cümle tonlamaları, jestler ve mimiklerine dikkat

* PhD, Associate Professor NEFU

etmeleri önem kazanmaktadırlar. Klasik edebiyat gerek ünlemin anlamını tespit etmek ve gerekse anılan kaideleri açıklamak için kaynak olarak kullanılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ünlem, Sözel Olmayan İletişim, Heyecan Durumu, Anlam, Bağlam.

The Yakut interjections are defined as *sana allayyy*, i.e. they are the inalterable words which serve for direct expression of emotional and volitional reactions of the subject to the reality (1:386). The intonation, gestures and facial expressions as well as the context and the overall situation are particularly important for the structure and design of the semantic content of interjections. This is due to the fact interjections are used for emotional expressions (often involuntary) and volitional impulses the subject having at any given time under the influence of a strong stimulus. Having a real, conscious public semantic content interjections have a communicative function and serve as means of communication between people. Like other parts of speech interjections have the property of reproducibility although they are quite unstable in their phonetic structure.

This article attempts to define the interjections accompanied by such kinds of non-verbal communication as gesture, facial expression, and motion of the body. In fact, non-verbal forms of communication include all forms of human expression, in spite of the language and culture. People of any cultures use gestures and tactile movements, and facial expressions, but the role of non-verbal communication can be quite different.

As already mentioned, the interjection can interact with other non-linguistic phenomena involved in the information transmission. One and the same interjection can express approval and disapproval, fear and joy, admiration and contempt, etc.

To define the differentiations of polysemantic interjections more exactly about 150 of contexts with interjections were analyzed. The interjections in the book "Stories and Essays" and the novel "Springtime" by People's Writer of Yakutia N.E.Mordinov (Amma Achchygyya) served as material for the study of the functioning of these interjections. This collection and the famous novel "Springtime" were issued exactly 30 years ago.

Approximately 500 of interjections are available in these works and more than 100 interjections are accompanied by various types of non-verbal means of communication. The author used mostly non-derivative interjections such as *aa, a, oh-oh, oh, e-eh, eh, i-i, uh-uh, yh-yh, yh, uo*. The most frequent of them are *e-eh, eh, oh-oh, oh, i-i*.

The following one-, two- or even three-syllable interjections are non-derivative. They are: *dje!, eh, paa!, tyyh!, chee!, es!, e-eh!, nuo!, ok-sie!, pakhay!, tui-sie!, ar-djaalyh!* etc.

There are often "doꞑor" (friend), "өлүү" (death, misfortune, bad luck) among the derivatives of interjections. They are usually nouns which in certain speech situations partially or completely lose the function of naming and can express different feelings and volitional emotions.

The most frequent interjections can be named are *e-eh, chee, oh-oh, tyyh, dje* which express various emotions and the will of the speaker.

According to the semantic function all interjections in the Yakut language can be divided into the following semantic-level functionality:

- 1) interjections expressing emotions and feelings;
- 2) interjections expressing subject relationship to the environment.

It is believed the interjections expressing emotions and feelings belong to the largest group of interjections. Many of these interjections are ambiguous. But ambiguity of these interjections depends on the situational context which reflects the lexical-semantic nature of direct feelings and emotions of the speaker. Depending on the intonation, facial expressions, gestures, these interjections are able to express a wide variety of meanings.

Setting clear boundaries between invariants of the interjections subclass mentioned is sometimes associated with certain difficulties, because the majority of them are characterized by the semantic context-dependence, i.e. one and the same interjection can transmit different intonations, often contrary emotions due to the ambivalence of the emotions themselves. Therefore, for a complete description of interjections in terms of expression and in terms of content Parsieva L. K.' classification was used. This classification distinguishes 3 categories of interjections: emotional, volitional and cognitive ones (*Parsieva: 19*).

Most interjections were both frequent and polysemantic. However, the ambiguity of interjections has no difficulties for native speaker because it becomes clear from context, intonation and paralinguistic means.

For example, the interjection *e-eh* expresses an emotional state at the positive tone of the words of admiration, praise, clearly made with high spirits, which is accompanied by an additional interjection **dje**: *e-eh dje maladyas kihi, doḡor!* - *Ohonoos haуḡaan saḡa allaya tyste*. Well done, my boy! - Afanas exclaimed praising. The interjection *doḡor* gives the increased meaning, it usually takes a final position in such proposals and thus loses its original meaning "friend".

The negative attitude of the character can be expressed through this interjection too, but it is very important to identify the key of the context. For example: *e-eh, buollaḡa ... - Aramaan tobugun imerimmehteete, saryuh tireḡseleeh tiḡileḡinen siri toḡsuybahtaata, sa ata suoh taḡnary eḡeуen olorbohtooto*. Well ... - Roman rubbed his knee and tapped the back of the torbasa (national type of shoes) down the ground, sat silently with his head down. In this example, the interjection expresses despair, anxiety, and is accompanied by gestures such as hand stroking the knee, tapping the ground with heel part of torbasa and silent posture that reinforce negative reaction to the incident of the hero.

This interjection can be included in the category of cognitive interjections as it reflects a certain perception of the information for the subject. For example: *e-eh, soluuta suoh baḡ ayy! .. - Diete korøechchy don innileriger siis tuttan turbut Ohonoos*. A little help! - Afanasy said, standing with his hands crossed behind his back to the audience. Interjection *e-eh* expresses a negative emotional-evaluative attitude towards the situation of communication, as in the present context posture - standing with his hands crossed behind his back in front of someone – which means dissatisfaction with something or expresses disapproval and condemnation.

Sometimes the interjection *e-eh* may be volitional, i.e. expressing an appeal to anyone. It may take a soft tone, depending on the situation: *E-eh, chee, doḡoor, baryahha!* - *Kirgieley orguuy syarḡaḡa olordo*. Well, my friend, let's go! - Gregory sat quietly in his sleigh. In this case, the location of the characters felt good to each other, although the

appeal enhanced by the presence of another interjection *chee*, the context itself containing this kind of non-verbal communication and the pose to "sit in silence," confirms a calm tone of a given situation.

Another example of the same volitional interjection is a call in a rough manner accompanied by an appropriate gesture - a sharp movement of the back of the hand.

E-eh, lakhsyyyma! - *Emeehsin iliitin tahynan tuora sadyytalaan kebiste.* Ah, shut your mouth! - the old woman flapped with her hand sharply aside.

The interjection *chee* occupies a special place in Yakut language, having mainly a function of influence the recipient or the communication partner. As the material shows this interjection can be classified as volitional kind according to its semantics: *Emeehsin kyryytynan kōrōn olorbohtoon ram kytaanahtyk ette:* - *Jae, kyrda aas, ereydenen kōr.* The old woman, glancing sideways, sat for a while, then strictly said: Well, old man, agonize. This example of volitional interjection *chee* expresses the speaker's appeal to their partner, which is supported by facial expressions, posture, and the harsh tone in his voice. One can also observe the imperative variant of *chee, chee*, prompting to any action or interaction: *Chee-chee, adjaray, iyeḡer dylly syreḡeldeēn, sybe bulun turum, taḡys ... Haya, noho!* - *Holloj, kuolutuman, syrdeeh baḡayytk ørø kōbyōlḡy tyste.*

Come on, come on, come out, hell, don't dare to do anything, you're a couch potato as a mother ... Well, you! - Holloy began to scream in his usual manner.

Interjection *chee* can be considered as cognitive interjection expressing conjecture, guess, doubt:

Chee, kim biler onu! - *dee-dee, beyetin kytta sehergeher kurduk, botuguruu ispitee.*

Well, who knows! – he went talking to himself.

Thus there is an emotionally estimated interjection *chee* shows the subject's attitude to the reality: *Chee, iti tyllara iti baar ...* - *Nicholas keleybittii antah hayysta.* Well, that is what they've said... - Nicholas turned away disappointed. The gesture – “turn away from someone” with a sense of disappointment gives greater expressiveness to the negative tone of the interjections.

In its emotional potential interjection *oh-oh* unlikely gives way to another interjection. Since this is a polysemantic interjection expressing a variety of sometimes conflicting feelings, you should catch the light tone, raising or lowering the tone, as well as the situation itself. There are the example of exclamations with a positive tone: *Habyryys hara a wattana, wattana, kepseen debiliter.* - *Oh, noholoor, dje dulaan kyys!*

Gabriel's eyes lit up and he began to talk excitedly: Oh, guys, it's a terrible power!

The negative tone is achieved through the use of additional interjections, for example, can be accompanied by *oo* derivatives of interjections *ōlḡy* and *doḡor*:

Onton uol alta hommutugar ys syḡhy kōrdyyllerin isten sheep, Keene de yksyy tyste. - *Oh, ōlḡy ebit doḡor!*

When he heard that six nights cost three hundred, he was seriously confused. - Oh, woe!

The combination of this meanings can express regret, resentment, frustration or irritation: *Oh, dje, barys, baryta!* - *Maabyra emeehsin saḡata oronuttan kutaalana tyher.*

Well, all sorts of things! - old woman Mahrs' voice was hearing from the bed.

Depending on the speech situation, this pronoun can contain both cognitive and emotive components of meanings: *Oh, hahan ere oy kiirer buolla? Atyn don oḥoloro ɵyderɵ, kɵssyɵlere toḥo ƳchƳgeƳey!* - Dianne baran aḥalara balaḥanygar kiiren haalar.

Oh, when will grow wiser? How smart and quiet the other people's children are! - said the father enters the hut.

In this example the interjection *oh* expresses the reaction of disagreement with the situation, it becomes clear from the context. The feeling of irritation and displeasure reflected in this example, underlines with the fact that the hero, expressing his annoyance, leaves and enters his hut, which can be estimated as a failure to communicate, to continue the communication.

Saahyn tuhary Suudap hammachchya Sappyyrap oḥonnor, tyryttybyt kulun tiriite bergehedin kɵḥnachchy uurunan turan kychchaḥar harahtaryn kyryylarynan wal sireyiger ɵ ɵɵldyyde: - *Oh, boo dyhymmytynen ohsuharbyt baar uh yeah!*

Old servant Sapyrov with his old foal torn hat cocked to one side, peered his slanted eyes in the face of the boy: - Oh, are you going to fight this way!

In the example of irony and contempt mentioned above, one can observe the diffused functions of interjections, expressed not only by his slanted eyes, but with the movement of the head to one side.

The combination of two non-derivative *oh-oh*, and one derived *dje doḥor* interjections can be considered normal linguistic phenomenon for the Yakut native speaker and means disappointment, reproach, even irritation: *Oh, dje bystybyt kihigin, doḥor!* - *suruyan badaalata oloror harandaahyn talyr gyna byraḥaat, oyon turan erchimneehtik ergillimehten kebiher.*

Oh, poor are you, friend! - he jumps up and turns vigorously snapping his pencil sharply.

Interjection *tyyh* is considered as expressing different emotional states of a person depending on the situation of communication. For example, this interjection expresses great surprise, amazement, fear and even fright: *Tyyh, doḥoor!* *Yrbaahya suoh ebikkin duo?* - *Uybaan uchuutal sohuya tyste, onton toḥo ere kulgaaharyn tɵbɵlɵrytten saḥalaan iedestere, moonno bytynny ɵtɵn kytaran bardylar.*

Ugh, you! Without a shirt or what? - Master Ivan wondered then for some reason started to blush at first edges of ears, and then to his cheeks and neck.

Tyyh, metodikata suoh satammat! It is absolutely clear! .. - Inspector olus sohuyan-dulayan, saharhay haraḥyn tiere kɵrɵn tahaarda.

No, you can not work without methodology! It is absolutely clear!.. - with astonishment and surprise, the inspector widened his brown eyes.

Tyyh da, bu tylyn! - *Daaryya emeehsin uolun tylyttan dulayar.*

Oh, what way are you speaking! - Daria was afraid of the words of his son.

Non-derivative interjection *ok-sie* expresses great surprise, astonishment, indignation, outrage, sometimes a hint of sarcasm. Sardonic tone of this interjection becomes clear through intonation, gestures, for example, of the current context:

Uybaan, tuohtan ere sohuybut kurduk, chineris gynaat, kuyuurun sulbu tardan ylan baran erø kŷlybyryy tyste: - ok-sie, bu djahtar akaaryta tugun sŷrey, doḥor!

Ivan, as if afraid of something, sat up straight, pulling your fishing sak, quickly rattled: - Oh, how stupid is this woman!

Mocking tone and at the same time irritated one in the words and the voice of the character enhances by the presence of another interjection *doḥor* that usually takes the final position, but carries the load, enhancing the emotion of the recipient.

As the material demonstrates this interjection is used more often for evaluation of a state in men's speech.

For example: *Ok-sie! .. Min kordohpyne, Arai, bihiehe uun-utaaryh... Ikki iher uol ... – trumo sierkileḥe orguuy tiyen, tarbaḥyn tøbötynen taaryyan kerdø. - De, sierkileleh don ebikkit, doḥoor! .. Bihigi halḥammytynaḥar ulakhan.*

Eh ma! .. I see two guys go to us... –he carefully approached to the mirror and touched it with the tip of his finger. - Well, what a mirror you have! It is bigger than our wooden door.

Oksie, doḥor! - Døgyer kiniteḥer orduk sohuyda.

Oh my god! - Yegor was more surprised than he.

The interjection *dje* is functionally active and it depends on the context and the speech situation expressing the mental state of the speaker and at the same time his emotions.

Dje, bu doydu djono olohtooh øgytyn bulummukkt ... - Dianne homuruyan hotoot, maaḥyḥytyn kurduk chonoybokko ere, nyksygyldyyn aan dieki baran iste.

Well, my countrymen grew wiser I think... –he said sarcastically, stooped and walked to the door.

The above mentioned context demonstrates the possibility of the interjection to express anger, disaffected hero status, it becomes clear not only from his words, but his description of a frustrated look and changed gait. At the same time, his words would have found the opposite meaning in another context, for example, against praising situation.

The same can be transferred interjection feeling of disappointment, frustration, even with a share of a loss, and sometimes surprising. For example: *Dje ølyy buolar ebit da! .. - Døgyørdeen yøhe tyynar.*

Oh, how awful! - Egordan sighs.

In this example, a combination of semantic interjections *dje + ølyy* is used and it enhances the function of verbalization of negative human emotions.

Dje, dje. Dyalalar etiler dee, - diete Keene uomma, sapsyyan kebiheet, taḥnary, antah dieki ergilinne.

Well, well. It happened in some way,- he waved his hand and turned his back.

Repetition of this interjection means the emotional state of the speaker, it express his opinion distracting about the incident. The fact that the speaker is dissatisfied with something, or even upset underlines with a hand gesture.

Dje, bu kihibit adjas tradesman buolan erer - Dianne ram ilgisten kebiher. Ebeter saḥ ata suoh tiihin byyhynan chypchyrnan kebihen baran sannyn ygdachchy tuttari.

Well, our man is turning into quite a petty bourgeois - he said, shaking his head and shrugs splitting through his teeth.

This context makes it clear modal-logical assessment of the situation. in connection with the expression of the negative tone of the speaker's emotions. The way he shook his head, shrugged his shoulders, silently split through clenched teeth, all movements that express criticism, resentment of a person.

Interjection *dje* can mean the moment of idea concentration in order to appeal to the attention of the interlocutor. In the following context raised shoulders express surprise of a speaker, maybe even with a hint of resentment or indignation:

Dje, ochchoḥo en kimḥiny? - Suudar sannyn ygdachchy tuttubutunan oyono turda.

Well, then who are you? - Sudov jumps with his shoulders raised

Noteworthy function of non-derivative interjection that expresses more with irony and sarcasm is accompanied by certain phonetic, graphics and kinetic means.

For example: *i-i, saḥara oloroohotoohhun yeah! - oḥonnor ohsurḥalanan kebiher.*

Oh, you have something to say! - The old man shuddered.

I-i, dögȳörketten baḥas tugu tuhanaary! Sobus-soḥotoh ynahtaah - diete dieleeh emeehsin.

Uh-uh, what is the use of Egordan? A single cow - said the woman.

Dögȳörkeḥ soḥotoh ynahtaahrȳn diebet, hut toyottorgo dorḥoyor! - Oḥonnor siileen saḥarda. Egordan does not cry that he had a cow, it is still fresh with the heads! - Said the old man scornfully.

I-i! - Ohonoos Olus omnuolaabytyk yyylyy tȳste uonna hamsatȳn umatȳna oḥusta.

Uh-uh! - Afanas surprised accusingly and lit his pipe.

In the examples mentioned above the use of interjections is justified in order to give the speaker ironic attitude, impish mockery towards the object of conversation. The operation of this interjection is necessarily accompanied by certain kinetic means and is pronounced almost always stretched with a certain sardonic tone, thus, as it were uttered through clenched teeth interjection *i-i* always contains negative meaning depending on the context and situation. Sometimes it can be used to express affection and tenderness toward a very close person, for example:

I-i, oḥom Mikiite baar ebikkin duo!? .. - Oḥonnor taḥna ohson, harbyalahan kelen Mikiiteni sannytan harbaabytȳnan oloro tȳheet, kulgaar sibigineyen aḥylastaabytȳnan barda.

I-i, Nikita, son, here you're! - Old man, quickly dressed and hurried to Nikita, grabbed him by the shoulders and just sat down and began to whisper in his ear.

Interjection *i-i* highlights a certain distance between the speaker and the addressee, which, in its turn, is determined primarily by the speaker in relation to the interlocutor. It can be assumed that the interjection *i-i* contains the meaning of "small" and context directs to the meaning either positive or negative emotional relationship to the object.

Thus, in this article we examined the most frequent polysemantic interjections which are widely used both in the spoken language of communicators and in the written language of the Sakha people. To understand and clarify the interjection semantics units was drawn to illustrate. The context was used to understand and clarify the interjection semantics units with proper verbal communication gestures, facial expressions and body movements of a speaker. The main function of the analyzed interjections in Yakut language is the verbalization of emotions. Among emotive interjection units the interjections have positive or negative connotation that's why they can bear the contrary meanings. The kinetic means following these interjections may be gestures, facial expressions, body movements that are "tied" to the different feelings, and a state of speakers. More precise interjection definition is very important in the context because the gestures may have different meanings, i.e. they can be used for expression of two or more of the senses, emotions, etc.

The concrete interjections like *oh, but, nuo, bay da*, expressing surprise or astonishment; *kor ere manyyh, ar-djaaly, uh-uh, tuysie* expressing anger, frustration, resentment may be studied further. They may also be followed by certain kinetic means appearing in the situation of the communication.

References:

- The grammar of modern Yakut literary language. - Moscow: Nauka, 1982. 496 p.
- Parsieva LK The system of interjections in general paradigm language: Author. dis. ... Doctor. filol.nauk. - Vladikavkaz, 2010. P.43.

Sources of illustrations

1. Amma Achchagyya (Mordinov N.E.). Saasky Cam: A Novel - Yakutskay: Kinige Vaught-ed, 1983. - 752 p.
2. Amma Achchagyya. Kepseenner, ocherkalar. - Yakutskay: Kinige Vaught-ed, 1983. - 296 p.