

THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SOMATIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH, GERMAN, RUSSIAN, ARMENIAN AND IN THE KARABAKH DIALECT

Ani Harutyunyan

*ASU, English and literature, 3th year
Scientific director-Varduhi Gabrielyan*

Key words: *language, dialect, phraseological unit, structure, equivalence*

Language has literal and figurative meanings. The literal meaning is the direct reference of words or sentences to objects. The figurative sense, however, is different from the literal one in the sense that it is used for giving an imaginative description on a special effect. In linguistics, idioms are usually presumed to be figures of speech contradicting the principle of compositionality. This principle states, that the meaning of the whole should be constructed from the meanings of the parts that make up the whole. Modern linguistics is inconceivable without comparisons of the investigated objects. The mutual correlation, comparison and opposition of units, forms, types and other language phenomena act as an obligatory condition for the characteristic of each of them and for the establishment of essential, formal and semantic relations between them. These criteria are entirely relevant in the research of phraseological units.

The actuality of this article is supported by the fact that today the activities of the European Society of Phraseology (EUROPHRAS) and the European Association of Lexicography (EUROLEX) with their regular conventions and publications attest to the prolific European interest in the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural research in phraseology. Names of body parts are among the most frequently participating words in the formation of phraseological units that are part of mastering any language and providing answers to the given questions, the problem of understanding phraseological units will be simplified for those, who deal with English, German, Armenian, Russian and the Karabakh dialect.

The aim of the current paper is to carry out a comparative analysis of the somatic phraseological units of the English, German, Armenian and Russian languages and the Karabakh dialect, revealing the degree of interlingual phraseological equivalence and defining the factors influencing it.

Phraseological units represent what can probably be described as the

most picturesque, colorful and expressive part of the language's vocabulary. However, phraseological units in any language belong to the most difficult area of lexicology to define, grasp and categorize. As G. Lakoff puts it: "The characteristic feature of phraseology and idiomatics as a discipline is that traditional and well-tested procedures, criteria and methodological approaches mostly fail here, and that is for the simple reason that these procedures, criteria and methodological approaches have been created for regular language and its phenomena. However, what is in principle valid for phraseology is that it is always somehow anomalous, irregular." [20, 321]

In her book "Idioms and Idiomaticity", Ch. Fernando gives the definition of idioms as referring only to "those expressions which become conventionally fixed in a specific order and lexical form, or have only a restricted set of variants, acquire the status of idioms and are recorded in idiom dictionaries". [14, 31]

Today most Russian scholars base their research work in the field of phraseology on the definition of a phraseological unit offered by Professor A. V. Kunin, the leading authority on problems of English Phraseology: "A phraseological unit is a stable word-group characterized by a completely or partially transferred meaning". [9, 8]

The German Krüger-Lorentz Dictionary side by side with the generally accepted phraseological units includes the so-called tale expressions, and that is irrelevant, because the mentioned expressions are nothing else but contracted German jokes, i. e. they are completely humorous passages. [12, 13]

Armenian linguists also have controversial opinions concerning the definition of a phraseological unit and the determination of its boundaries. V. Arakelyan, A. Murvalyan and A. Sukiasyan observe sayings, proverbs, blessings and various tale expressions as a subtype of phraseological units, while E. Gevorgyan, P. Bediryan and Kh. Badikian are the supporters of the theory of narrow perception of phraseological units according to which only set phrases with a transferred meaning are called phraseologisms.

According to P. Bediryan, a phraseological unit is a fixed ready-made unit with a partially or completely transferred meaning, "where the independence of constituent parts is formal, the syntactical connection obscure". [2, 5]

M. Khamoyan defines phraseological units as follows: "Phraseological

units are nominations of objects of reality in the form of word-combinations and sentences, based on the principle of description and evaluation". [3, 7]

Thus, it can be concluded, that phraseological units are word-groups conveying a single concept, consisting of two or more words distinguished by the recurrence, by the wholesomeness of their meaning and by the fixed nature of their structure and components.

Names of human body parts (somatismis) belong to one of the most ancient layers of the word stock of different languages and serve as basis of somatic phraseology. It may be accounted for by the fact that parts of the body fulfill universal functions. Somatismis viewed as a part of somatic code of culture, as a cultural sign which transfers cultural information on whose basis the image of phraseological unit is perceived.

According to their phrase-forming activity words denoting *hand, eye, head* have the widest application in the contrasted languages. The mentioned components directly correspond to the perceptive (eyes) and the logical (head) stages of cognition and to its manifestation of practice (hand).

As A. Blume states, somatic phraseological units make up a large group in Modern English. The most frequently occurred somatism is *hand*. Further come *head, eye, face, foot, nose, finger, heart*. The rest of somatismis (*leg, arm, back, bone, brain, ear, tooth, skin, shoulder, neck, tongue*) are less used, however their phrase-forming activity is rather high. According to M. A. Pekler and A. D. Rachstein, among seventeen nouns most frequently occurred in the structure of Russian phraseological units eight lexical somatismis and among the corresponding seventeen German nouns eleven of them are found. This comes accordingly in succession: *глаз, рука, голова, нога, язык, нос, ухо, сердце, кровь, плечо, Hand, Kopf, Auge, Herz, Ohr, Fuss, Mund, Bein, Nase, Finger*. According to the "Phraseological Dictionary of the Armenian Language" by A. Sukiassyan and S. Galstyan the following "body part" names as the dominant component of the phraseological unit occur most frequently in Armenian: *գլուխ (կրիօխ), աչք (աշկ), ձեռք (ժրճրք), ոտք (վրճննր), բերան (պերան), սիրտ (սրճրտ), լեզու (լուզու), ականջ (անզուճ), քիթ (քրճթ)*. Less frequent are the components: *Zunge, Blut, Rücken, Zahn, рот, палец, лицо, волосы, зубы, шриուն (шриուն), մազ (մազ), մատ (մաննր), ատամ (կրռէք), ուտեր (ջրնրդնէ)*.

Today phraseology has become one of the most widely investigated

and analyzed spheres of linguistics. Between June 9-11th, 2006, an International Conference was organized by the Institute of German Studies at the Pannonian University Veszprem and the European Society of Phraseology (EUROPHRAS). The main subject discussed was the concept “emotion” and its verbalization by means of somatic phraseological units. Accordingly, it’s pointed out, that mainly negative emotions are verbalized with the help of somatic phraseological units. Among them: irritation (*one’s hair stands on end – das Haarstehtzu Berge – волосыдыбомвстают – մազերըբիզ-բիզկանգնել – մազերըբիզ-բիզվրճննրկենալ*) ; contempt (*to thumb one’s nose at somebody – die Nasehochtragen – задиратьнос – քիթըվերցցել - քեթըերգինքինսնել*); anxiety (*one’s heart bleeds for somebody – jemandemblutet das Herz – сердцекровьюобливается – սիրտըարյունովլցվել – սրտավըարունքինալ*); suffering (*break somebody’s heart – jemanden ins Herztreffen – разбитьсердце – սիրտըկոտրել – սրճտըկոտրել*); offence (*step on somebody’s toes – jemandem auf dem Fuss treten – наступитьнаногу – ոտքըկիսել – վրճննրկոխաալ*). There are few positive emotions verbalized with the help of this group of phraseologisms, e. g. love (*to win one’s heart – jemandesHerzgewinnen – покоритьчье-либосердце – մեկիսիրտըշահել*).

In traditional linguistics the concept of many body parts carry some symbolic character and become a part of an idiom through the use of various stylistic devices and expressive means. Below are discussed connotational shades of some body parts.

Head/ Kopf/ голова/ գլուխ/ կըլծխ controls mind and reason. Hence, it follows the main connotational meaning of the somatism, designates reasonableness and wit or the lack of them, e. g. *to have a good head on one’s shoulders – seinen Kopf fürsichhaben – иметьсвоегоголовунаплечах – ուսերինգլուխունենալ – ջընըդնէրէնյիրակըլծխսինի*. The meaning of will and ability to concentrate is reflected in such phraseological line as: *to lose one’s head – den Kopf verlieren – потерятьголову – գլուխըկորցնել – կըլծխըկորցընել*.

Hair/ Haar/ волосы/ մազ/ մազ can be considered both independently and as a possible attribute of head. Usually this word acquires a meaning of some emotion in the structure of a phraseological unit, e. g. fear: *one’s hair stand on end – die Haarestehenzu Berge – волосыдыбомстоят – մազերըբիզ-բիզ-բիզկանգնել – մազերըբիզ-բիզվրճննրկենալ*; vexation: *to tear one’s hair – sich die Haareausraufen – рватьнасебеволосы –*

մազերը րզկետել – *մազերը քանդիլ*. “A hair” has the meaning of something small, unimportant: by a hair – um ein Haar – наволосок – մազիչափ – մազոււնը չանք.

Eyes/ Augen/ глаза/ աչքեր/ աչկեր symbolize the main and natural function of this organ that is: observing, looking, watching, seeing, on the bases of which phraseological units are formed. Eyes are important exponents of surprise: *to open one's eyes wide* – *die Augenaufreissen* – *вытаращить глаза-աչքերը չորսանել* – *աչկերը չորսանել*; envy and ill-will: *the envy eye* – *ein böses Auge* – *дурной глаз* – *չարաչք* – *միմիմ աչկը միկյալ*.

Nose/ Nase/ нос/ քիթ/ քր՛թ has a meaning of proximity often attended by the receipt of information, e. g. *not to see beyond one's nose* – *nicht über die eigene Nase hinaussehen* – *невидеть дальше собственного носа* – *քիթցայն կողմ չտեսնել* – *քր՛թանիտ ռուտը՛ սնուն չի, to steal something under one's nose* – *jemandem etwas vor der Nase wegschnappen* – *стациить что-либо у кого-либо из под носа* – *քիտակից փախցնել* – *քր՛թն տական կողմանալ*; morbid curiosity: *to stick one's nose into something* – *die Nase in etwas stecken* – *совать свой нос что-либо* – *քիթը խոթել* – *քր՛թը կոխել*.

Teeth/ Zähne/ зубы/ ատամներ/ կր՛նէքնէ are the ancient symbol of an aggressive and defending force, e. g. *to show one's teeth* – *einen Zahn gegen jemanden haben* – *иметь зуб против кого-либо* – *մեկի դեմ ատամ ունենալ/ատամ սրել* – *կր՛նէքնէի միմի ըրրա*.

Hand/ Hand/ рука/ ձեռք/ ձր՛ք is used in various meanings, the most frequent of which are intercourse, activity, skill, exchange, i. e. the practical application of thought. Hand is the symbol of strength, leadership, power and capacity: *to take something in hand* - *die Hand auf etwas legen* – *взять в свои руки* – *ձեռք բանել* – *ձր՛քը յորոնել*; to be under one's thumb – *an der Hand sein* – *быть под рукой* – *ձեռքի տակ լինել* – *ձր՛քն տակ է միմի*.

The comparison of the somatic phraseological systems of these languages should provide answers to the following questions: what do the similarities and differences between the phraseological systems of the English, German, Armenian and Russian languages consist in; how do they manifest in the main aspects of the language: functional, semantic, structural; what degree of interlingual equivalence do the somatic phraseological units have?

The first and the main criterion that determines the presence of

equivalents among the phraseological units of these languages, is their semantic correlation. It implies a complete or partial coincidence of the main general meaning and the connotational meaning of the phraseological unit, e. g. *to scream at the top of one's lungs* – *mitvollem Backenausposaunen* – *кричать вовсегорло* – *Կոկորդոկվճեկզոռալ* – *սլաւարկըլօխըբցել*. These phraseological units have identical lexical meanings but different components: to scream with full *throat* (in Russian and Armenian) – to scream with full lungs (in English) – to scream with full *cheeks* (in German) – to scream with *head* (the Karabakh dialect). The little differences that are noticed among the equivalent phraseological units of these languages maintain the common linguistic mentality of these nations. [1, 53]

The semantic criterion implies the generality of connotational meanings on the basis of which takes place the change of the meaning of a lexical combination into a phraseological unit in the English, German, Russian and Armenian languages and the Karabakh dialect. Such semantic relations are observed in the contrasted languages on the material of the phraseologisms with the most frequent components, such as : head/ Kopf/ голова/ գլուխ/ կըլօխ, eye/ Auge/ глаз/ աչք/ աչկ, hand/ Hand/ рука/ ձեռք/ ծրէրք, heart/ Herz/ сердце/ սիրտ/ սը՛րտ, mouth/ Mund/ рот/ բերան/ պէրան, tongue/ Zunge/ язык/ լեզու/ լուզու. Phraseological series of this type constitute semantic group where the group seme, e. g. “the process of thinking” is associated with the somatic component, e. g. *head (brains)/ Kopf/ голова/ գլուխ/ կըլօխ* such as in *to cudgel one's brains over something* – *sich den Kopf überetwaszerbrechen* – *լօմաթղօլուսըմաթըցնել* – *կըլօխտըրըբըցնել*.

However, the differences of connotational associations should be noted. In the phraseological line *to bare one's heart* – *jemandem das Herzausschütten* – *излить душу* – *սիրտը/ հոգիսըբացել* – *սը՛րտըպէ՛նալ*. In Russian and Armenian the words *душа, հոգի* and *сердце, սիրտ* are identified.

The next criterion according to its significance is the structure of the phraseological unit. The structural (lexical and syntactical) organization unlike the first criterion defines the presence of complete structural semantic equivalents.

A. D. Rachstein pointed out that the semantic affiliation of constituent parts to this or that thematic group is faintly reflected on the degree of

interlingual phraseological equivalence. He affirms that only a few groups of phraseological units are an exception to the general rule. [11, 120]

For example, set phrases with component names of realities and proper names neither of English nor of Russian and Armenian origin possess a high structural - semantic equivalence; these are phraseologisms – internationalisms, i.e. loan – translations dating back to antiquity, biblical gospels. E. g. *Achille's heel* – *die Ferse des Achilles* - *ахиллесовапята* – *ափիլիսյանգարշապար*; *voice crying out in the wilderness* – *die StimmeeinesRufenden in der Wüste* - *гласвоиющего в пустыне* – *ծայրաբարբառահանապարհ*.

The Karabakh dialect has no equivalents to the given series of phraseological units. It can be explained by the fact that these phraseologisms belong to the literary layer of vocabulary.

The low structural semantic phraseological equivalence is characteristic to the units including component parts, the equivalents of which either fail to appear in the lexico-semantic system of the contrasted languages or they have an outlying status. Anyway, A. D. Rachstein states that the phraseological units, the constituent lexemes of which occur frequently both in their independent use and according to their phrase-forming activity, possess a high structural semantic equivalence. [11, 127]

E.g. *to hold/ carry one's head high* – *den Kopf hochhalten* - *высокодержатъголову* – *գլուխըբարձրապահել* – *ըլծխըպէտցուրապահել*; *to throw dust in somebody's eyes* – *jemandem Sand in die Augenstreuen* - *пускатьпыль в глаза* – *աչքերիհընդհել* – *ըշկերդըթօզըըշի*. So, thenumber of equivalents among the phraseological units with a “body part” component is rather high, as somatisms possess a high phrase-forming activity.

The syntactical structure of phraseological units is important for the comparison of the languages where words are connected through identical rules. Thus, comparing the Armenian and the Russian languages (where case endings, prepositions, conjunctions and word forms are the indices of the syntactical relations of words) one can take into consideration the syntactico-structural patterns which possess or lack an unequivocal correspondence in the contrasted language and are characterized by low or high phraseological equivalence . E. g. the model “an adverbial participle of the perfective aspect + a noun” (сломяголову) is characteristic to the Russian language. The Armenian language has the equivalent

phraseological unit (գլուխկոտրելով), where the construction “a noun + an infinitive in the instrumental case” is used. As there are no adverbial participles in the English and German languages, consequently the given phraseological unit has no complete equivalents in these languages. Accordingly, to the phraseological units “*сломляголову – գլուխկոտրելով*” correspond the following constructions: *to break one’s neck – mit dem Kopf nachunten*, which differ in structures. Thus, as the contrasted languages have serious differences in the verb system (a complicated tense system, a special system of participles, the presence of such a form as gerund, which undergoes no declension), and there are no categories of case and personal forms of verbs in English and as German, Russian and Armenian have different case systems, no strict structural semantic correspondences are possible among the phraseological units of these contrasted languages.

The grammatical peculiarities inherent to any language lie on the basis of its phraseological system. E. g. neither English nor German and Russian display the decisive role of the article for the semantics of phraseological units. The definite article changes the meaning of the phraseological unit in Armenian and the Karabakh dialect. [1, 52]

This phenomenon is most vividly observed on the material of the somatic phraseological units: աչքիընկնել (to be famous)-աչքինընկնել (to notice); գլուխսպահել (to be passive)-գլուխըսպահել (to make one’s living); սիրտսալ (to encourage)-սիրտըսալ (to devote oneself to somebody); ծըրքսալ (to play into one’s hands)– ծըրքըսալ (to help).

The presence of a somatic component in the structure of a phraseological unit predetermines in some way its colloquial style, except for the single phraseological units of biblical and antique origin. Anyway, among the sharply lowered colloquial structures very few stylistic structural semantic equivalents are found. As a rule, the low colloquial phraseology of each language has its own original construction, which has no direct analogues in the contrasted languages, e. g. *by the skin of one’s teeth; einegrosseLipperiskieren; ниуха, нирыла; հոգինկոպտեկանցշինել*.

The Karabakh dialect also has phraseological units of a colloquial style. Such ones are: ղուղուղնեմբակած (obedient), կըլծխըփալավատանել (to decieve), փօրըսափերըքսել (to beg) are sharply lowered colloquial structures.

The structural semantic equivalence of phraseological units is lowered

together with the drop of productivity of the standard images, according to which phraseological units are formulated. According to V. V. Vinogradov and N. M. Shanskey the minimum of such an equivalence is attained by the phraseological units, on the basis of which unique images are laid, especially if the figurative motivation is obscure or completely lost for the modern state of the language. This means that the phraseological fusions have the least degree of equivalence.

Nevertheless, if the interlingual equivalence is defined by the metonymical change of the meanings of psycho-physiological processes common to all mankind or by the historically formed standard of cultural communities the phraseological structural semantic equivalence can be rather high. [11, 126]

E. g. to keep an eye/ one's eye on somebody – sein Auge auf jemanden lenken – не спускать глаз с кого-либо – աչքը վրան պահել – աչկը վրան պահել. Consequently, if in the contrasted languages act the same productive “figurative ideas”, according to which a considerable number of phraseological units with the same or close meanings are formulated, the probability that these phraseological units have structural semantic equivalents is rather high in the contrasted languages. [11, 127]

Thus, summing up we can state that the main criteria of defining the presence of equivalents among English, German, Russian and Armenian somatic phraseological units are the general meaning, the structure and the lexical construction of the phraseological unit. The phraseological units of the lexico-semantic field of “body parts” present a large group of phraseologies and possess specific peculiarities. The majority of body parts have several connotational and symbolic meanings arising from the basic means of the “body part.” component. The somatic phraseological units of the English, German, Russian and Armenian languages and the Karabakh dialect possess a high interlingual equivalence that is explained by the fact that “body part” components are in the high-frequency vocabulary of these contrasted languages and their high phrase-forming activity raises the degree of the interlingual equivalence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Բաղիկյան Խ. Գ., Ժամանակակից հայերենի դարձվածային միավորները, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀԳԱ հրատարակչություն, 1986:
2. Բեդիրյան Պ. Ս., Ժամանակակից հայերենի դարձվածաբանություն, Երևան, «Լույս» հրատարակչություն, 1973:
3. Խամոյան Մ. Հ., Քրդերեն լեզվի դարձվածաբանության հիմունքները, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀԳԱ հրատարակչություն, 1988:
4. Մինասյան Շ. Մ., Ղարաբաղի բարբառի դարձվածքները, Ստեփանակերտ, Դիզակ «Պլյուս» հրատարակչություն, 2007:
5. Սարգսյան Ա. Յու, Արցախի բանահյուսությունը, Երևան, «Էդիտ Պրինտ» հրատարակչություն, 2015:
6. Սուքիասյան Ա. Մ., Գալստյան Ս. Ա., Հայոց լեզվի դարձվածաբանական բառարան, Երևան, 1975:
7. Блюм А., Семантические особенности соматической фразеологии, Москва, АСТ-пресс, 2000.
8. Виноградов В. В., Лексикология и лексикография: Избранные труды, Москва: Наука, 1977.
9. Кунин А. В., Фразеология современного английского языка, Москва: Издательство “Международные отношения”, 1972.
10. Пеклер М. А., Русско-немецкая идиотичность, Тбилиси: АҚД, 1967.
11. Рахштейн А. Д., Сопоставительный анализ немецкой и русской фразеологии, Москва: Высшая школа, 1980.
12. Чернышева И. И., Фразеология современного немецкого языка, Москва: Высшая школа, 1970.
13. Шанский Н. М., Фразеология современного русского языка, Москва: Высшая школа, 1985.
14. Fernando Ch., Idioms And Idiomaticity, Oxford University Press Publication, 1996.
15. Gibbs. R., Literal Meaning and Figurative Language, Discourse Process 16, 1993.
16. Iskov A., Lenkova A., Deutsche Lexikologie, Moscow, 1970.
17. Katz J. J. and Postal P.M., An Integrated Theory Of Linguistic Description, Cambridge, 2003.
18. Katz J. J. and Postal P.M., Semantic Interpretation Of Idioms And Sentences Containing Them, Quarterly Progress Report of the Research Lab of Electronics, 1963.
19. Kunin A. V., English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary, Moscow 1984.
20. Lakoff G., Women, Fire And Dangerous Things, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
21. Makkai A., Idiom Structure in English, The Hague: Mouton, 1972.
22. Weinreich U., Problems in the Analysis of Idioms: Substance and Structure of Language, University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1996.

ԱՆՂԵՐԵՆԻ, զԵՐՄԱՆԵՐԵՆԻ, ՈՌԻՄԵՐԵՆԻ,
ՀԱՅԵՐԵՆԻ ԵՎ ՂԱՐԱՔԱՂԻ ԲԱՐՔԱՌԻ՝ ՄԱՐՄՆԻ ՄԱՍԵՐՈՎ
ՂԱՐՉՎԱԾՔՆԵՐԻ ՀԱՍԵՄԱՏԱԿԱՆ ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ

Անի Հարությունյան

ԱրՊՀ, Անգլերեն լեզու և գրականություն, 3-րդ կուրս

ԱՄՓՈՓԱԳԻՐ

Հանգուցային բառեր՝ լեզու, բարբառ, դարձվածք, կառուցվածք, հավասարարժեքություն

Հոդվածում ներկայացվում է անգլերենի, գերմաներենի, ռուսերենի, հայերենի և Ղարաբաղի բարբառի մարմնի մասեր պարունակող դարձվածքները: Բացահայտվում են միջլեզվական դարձվածային հավասարարժեքությունը և դրա վրա ազդող գործոնները: Պետք է նշել, որ լինելով բարբառ՝ Ղարաբաղի բարբառը, իր հարուստ լեզվական պաշարներով, արժանվույնս կարողանում է համեմատվել վերը նշված լեզուների հետ:

**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ СОМАТИЧЕСКИХ
ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ АНГЛИЙСКОГО, НЕМЕЦКОГО,
РУССКОГО, АРМЯНСКОГО И КАРАБАХСКОГО ДИАЛЕКТОВ**

Ани Арутюнян

АрГУ, Английский язык и литература, 3-ий курс

РЕЗЮМЕ

Ключевые слова: язык, диалект, фразеологическая единица, структура, эквивалентность

В работе анализируются соматические фразеологические единицы одновременно нескольких синтаксических (немецкий, русский) и аналитических (английский, армянский) языков вместе с карабахским диалектом. Основываясь на трудах выдающихся лингвистов, этот сравнительный анализ выявляет степень межъязыковой фразеологической эквивалентности и определяет факторы, влияющие на нее. Примечателен тот факт, что, будучи диалектом, карабахский, с его богатым лингвистическим запасом, стоит вместе с противопоставленными языками.