

SAL 30/2017

The Functional and Pragmatic Peculiarities of the Anthropocentric Phraseological Units in Different Languages and Cultural Environments

Received 03/2017

Accepted 05/2017

The Functional and Pragmatic Peculiarities of the Anthropocentric Phraseological Units in Different Languages and Cultural Environments (on the Descriptive Material of Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, English)

Antropocentrinių frazeologinių vienetų funkciniai ir pragmatiniai ypatumai skirtingose kalbose ir kultūrinėje aplinkoje (aprašomoji ukrainiečių, rusų, lenkų ir anglų kalbų medžiaga)

LINGUISTICS / KALBOTYRA

Lubomira Hnatiuk

Dr., professor, Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine.

 <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.30.17724>

Abstract



Research Journal
Studies about Languages
No. 30/2017
ISSN 1648-2824 (print)
ISSN 2029-7203 (online)
pp. 18-28
DOI 10.5755/j01.sal.0.30.17724 9
© Kaunas University of Technology

The article attempts to outline some characteristics of the selected Ukrainian-Russian-Polish-English anthropocentric phraseological units. The author strives to show a significant role of anthropocentric phraseological units in the representation of a cultural mentality, as well as in reflecting the national and cultural identity. The investigated examples are grouped into several paradigms, each reflecting a special human trait. It is the first attempt to draw parallels as well contrasts between phraseologisms in a given semantic paradigm both in related Ukrainian, Russian, Polish and non-related English languages. The attempt has been done to learn and understand the national spirit of the certain ethnic group through anthropocentric phraseological units. This is one of the first attempts when these four languages – Polish, English, Russian and Ukrainian, have been compared in the certain paradigms of anthropocentric phraseologisms reflecting the national and cultural identity in order to capture the spirit of the target language. It is essential for effective cross-cultural communication because the

national and cultural factors of a single speech environment significantly affect not only the elements of the communicative code, but they are also important in the communication process with all its components, i.e. principles, maxims, rules of communication, communication strategies and tactics.

KEYWORDS: linguo-cultural concepts, anthropocentric phraseological units, animalistic component, pragmatic function, national and cultural identity.

One of the most important problems of modern linguistics is the presentation of language as a reflection of the surrounding world, the reflection of the world view by different language tools.

Phraseological idioms reflect the objective reality in the imagination of the particular cultural community. Due to this they are important as a source of the cultural concepts, i.e. the information about specific national characteristics of the certain language and cultural environment, therefore "the cultural information incorporated in phraseological phrases need to be taken into account" (Cowie, 2001, p.34).

Because of the complex nature of a phraseological unit with a number of specific features there exist a lot of different classification systems provided by different scholars and based on different principles. Within traditional approach the major tasks are connected with the systematization of the phraseological fund of a language in accordance with semantic criteria. The semantic approach is focused on the importance of idiomatic, functional and contextual aspects. In the classical works of the majority of leading researchers much attention has been paid to the study of inner structure of phraseological unit. Within the inner-connected semantic constituents or components there have been distinguished three main constituents: signification, denotation, and connotation (Kunin, 1996) or six interrelated macro-components: descriptive, evaluative, motivational, emotive, stylistic, grammatical (Teliya, 1988).

However, many relevant issues within traditional approaches remained outside the range of interests: "these approaches have no way of accounting for how phraseological meaning is formed, how cultural or sociocultural information is encoded and stored during its creation and then is retrieved by speakers while using phraseologisms in actual communication, as well as how the mechanisms of the phraseological processing work. Neither has the special nature of the phraseological imagery nor its genesis been subject to an exhaustive description" (Zykova, 2016, p. 256). As prominent scholars claim, in classical researches on phraseology the study of phraseological semantics was confined, to a great extent, to rather general observations (Baranov, Dobrovolskij, 2013).

At the end of the 20th century with the development of cognitive linguistics the traditional view of phraseological meaning began to alter as the researchers have shifted their interest to learn and understand the national spirit of the certain ethnic group through anthropocentric phraseological units. A significant role of anthropocentric phraseological units in the representation of a cultural mentality, as well as in reflecting the national and cultural identity have been taken into account. All that gave a rise to the development of the new direction, i.e. the anthropocentric phraseology as the research of interaction between linguistic and extra-linguistic meanings of phraseologism (Aliefirenko, 2008), because it verbalizes the national spirit of the nation, that allows to identify the peculiarities of the mental world of the certain ethnic group, its culture and to learn about different stages of its cultural development.

Such prominent scholars as A. Cowie (2001), S. Koziara (2002), R. Palmatier (1995), S. Ter-Mynasova (2000), I. Vidović-Bolt (2008), W. Wysoczański (2006), also focus on the connection of language and thought, consciousness, culture and society. The linguistic and cultural approach to understanding the concept implies that it consists of two parts, i.e. the conceptual one and

the cultural background. The conceptual part of the concept is the basis of lexical meaning of the word, but the cultural layer includes the axiological evaluation, associations, abstraction, etc. The cultural concept reflects the ethnic representation of linguistic knowledge.

Since these problems have not been the subject of much attention of linguists, studying cultural, functional and pragmatic peculiarities of anthropocentric phraseologisms in related Ukrainian, Russian, Polish and non-related English languages is the valid subject in the modern linguistic research. It is also essential for effective communication, so that the national cultural factors of a single speech environment are important in the communication process. All that motivates **the validity of** the proposed research and its **practical application** is defined by the possibility to use the results in the translation practice and in some university courses, in the areas of intercultural communication in particular. **The practical aspect** of the research is connected with the attempt to show peculiarities of anthropocentric phraseologisms in order to capture the spirit of the target language. **The novelty** and **the relevance** of the topic lie in the linguistic analysis of the anthropocentric phraseological units of four languages – Polish, English, Russian and Ukrainian. **The novelty** of the research lies in the characteristic of different manifestations of the national and cultural concepts in related and non-related languages to identify similarities and differences and the correct interpretation of the pragmatic value in order to increase efficiency of cross-cultural interpersonal interaction

In the proposed research the phraseological level of anthropocentric concepts with its figurative meaning will be investigated

The aim of the research is to consider the functional and pragmatic meaning of the anthropocentric idioms on the descriptive material of different languages, i. e. Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, English. That aim determines the realization of such specific **tasks**: to distinguish some subgroups of the anthropocentric idioms; to analyze the similarities and differences of the equivalents of the certain idioms, also the idiomatic variations on the material of related and non-related languages; to identify the national and cultural peculiarities in phraseology of the studied groups. The analysis of the concepts proper and sub-concepts will be done at the phraseological level.

The conceptual image of the world is reflected in human activities, cognitive processes to present the world, knowledge and understanding of the world by the members of the certain society. These images and knowledge are widely represented in phraseology of the certain society, because each lexical unit which is involved into the verbalization of concepts, stores some knowledge during ages. The phraseological layer of language preserving national and cultural characteristics of the specific language and cultural environment reveals the nature of the ethnic community, nation, nations. More than that, due to the phraseological units the unique national cultural treasure is passed down from generation to generation. Wilhelm von Humboldt was the first one to make the connection between language and culture. For the philosopher, the interlocutors of the particular cultural community are capable to contribute to the formation of a collective cultural identity through specific ethnic concepts, which the famous scholar called the spirit of nation (Humboldt, 1984). Also E. Sapir was one of the first as well to postulate explicitly that language represents and conceptualizes reality in a culturally specific manner (Wierzbicka, 1978, p. 28).

Cultural concepts have anthropological nature because they as the mental formations are focused on spirituality, subjectivity and the inner world of the native speaker of the particular language. That is why the most complete national concepts are revealed in the anthropocentric phraseological units. As for modern linguists "phraseology is the only domain of the linguistic study which illustrates the correlation between language and culture" (Cowie, 2001, p.38).

The phraseological idioms are determined by social and political aspects, traditions, customs, cultural values which create similar thematic domains in all investigated languages. The cultural concepts in the research will be described within a broader anthropocentric paradigm since it includes the cultural dimension; and its central assumption is that every language, especially its figurative meanings is connected with the reflection of the world-view shared by the linguistic knowledge about the reality.

Cultural concepts in anthropocentric phraseology of the proposed research are abstract notions such as, for instance, intellectual ability, emotional and expressive aspects, empathy and other positive traits of human nature as well as bad sides of human nature which construct the world-picture in a culturally specific way. Both concepts proper and sub-concepts are involved.

It is noteworthy indeed that “their specificity is implemented mostly at the cognitive, not the semantic level because cultural background refers to information that is most difficult to formalize, as it is connected with semantics in a very indirect and still unexplored way” (Hnatiuk, 2013, p.231) as, for instance, in **the paradigm the traits of character** with the positive meaning **in the sub-concept smart, capable**: Ukr.: *голова на плечах* (1) someone is very smart, capable; 2) to do something after proper consideration: *У мене є голова на плечах, і не каліка я!* (Кропуньский, 1975); Rus.: *голова на плечах*; compare: *с головой*: – *У тебя есть погоны и голова на плечах – иди и зарабатывай*, – сказал в интервью сотрудникам института один московский милиционер (The National Corpus of Russian Language, 2003); Pol.: *mieć głowę do czegoś*; Eng.: *a bright chap (girl); a person with a head on his shoulders; to use one's head (loaf) when doing something: Matthew, the eldest, is quite a bright chap and Emma, the next one age-wise, is all right but learning the recorder* (Time Corpus, 2015). In the first meaning there are synonyms like *зуби з істу (проісти) на чому* to have a great experience, great knowledge of something; in the second meaning there is the synonym *не ликом шитий; не в тім 'я битий* about the person who has much knowledge, specific skills, know how to behave properly: *Я не в тім'я битий та й знаю, як що куда йде* (Martovych, 1970).

The mentioned before subgroup also involves such **feature of character** as **capability**: Ukr.: *золоті руки*: – *Присядько перейшов до нашої лабораторії. Хлопець – золоті руки. Працювати з ним легко* (Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes, 2016); compare: *майстер на всі руки* (1) someone is very skilled, does any job with the great passion; 2) someone has great skill in any kind of handwork: *Далі намет Лахмана – він майстер на всі руки* (Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes, 2016); Rus.: *золотые руки*: *У него золотые руки! Хотите/ он и вам такую машину сделает? Молодец! Золотые руки. Любо-дорого глядеть/ кода он за что-нибудь берётся.*(The National Corpus of Russian Language, 2015); compare: *мастер на все руки: Он и хормейстер, и концертмейстер, и режиссёр драмкружка; играл на всех инструментах и в изобразительном искусстве разбирался, – словом, одарённая личность, мастер на все руки, энтузиаст своего дела, сумел увлечь и других* (Rybakov, 1977); Pol.: *złota rączka*, por: *Jej podopieczny Marinduzi, złota rączka, który wszystko potrafił w misji naprawić, skonstruował nawet specjalne ramię podtrzymujące mikrofon, aby nie musiała go trzymać w ręce* (Nurowska, 2012); compare: *człowiek orkiestra* (about the comprehensive intellectual abilities): *Topor to prawdziwy człowiek orkiestra – pisarz, rysownik, reżyser teatralny i filmowy, a także aktor, scenarzysta i scenograf* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); Eng.: *somebody is good hand at any job; somebody can do anything with his hands*. The phraseological units of that subgroup are common to all investigated languages because of the same factors of logical and psychological nature. They were borrowed from the common sources, for example, more often they describe the

positive qualities of men in connection with the manual physical work; mentioning of certain physical activities are typical for the contexts in which they are used. But there are also a lot of idioms specific to the certain language, for instance, the Polish phraseologism *człowiek orkiestra* is connected with the intellectual rather than physical qualities of human nature. The mentioned before phraseological unit also should not be confused with the English idiom *Jack of all trades* with the pragmatic meaning *someone tries to do everything but nothing does properly*: *In the early days, Stevenson described himself as having been a **Jack of all trades**. The most fascinating part of any business is the early days, because that's when every experience is a new experience* (Time Corpus, 2015).

The sub-concept experience becomes an inspiring source for many of the idioms in all investigated languages **because** the idioms expressing the main professional categories of the daily life are common in the anthropocentric phraseology. For instance, Ukr: *старий (стріляний горобець); стріляний птах; стріляна птиця* (1) a person who is very experienced, who is hard to deceive; 2) the experienced person who has seen a lot in his life: *Сухарко, трохи зніяковілий, промовив: – Та маніриться, знаєш, задається ... Не псуй паперу, кажє. Але це завжди так спочатку буває. Я в цих справах **стріляний птах**. Знаєш, неохота морочитися – довго припадати та притоптувати* (Ostrovskij, 1975); Rus.: *воробей стреляный (старый) воробей: Впрочем, Дмитрий Самойлов – «воробей» стреляный, отвечает односложно, как говорится – по делу* (The National Corpus of Russian Language, 2015); *видал види, тертый калач, пройти огонь и воду; пройти сквозь огонь и воду и медные трубы: Это человек опытный, себе на уме, не злой и не добрый, а более расчётливый; это тёртый калач, который знает людей и умеет ими пользоваться* (The National Corpus of Russian Language, 2015); польське: *stary wyjadacz: Sam też rozłożył się wygodnie, nóżkę na nóżkę złożył, od razu widać – **stary wyjadacz**, czuje się w obcej klasie jak u siebie w domu* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); англ.: *a wise old bird/ an old hand: Stephen studied the fields, where the drab clothing of the workers blended into the deep rich brown of the arable land, but where each pair of greys was clearly visible, its progress across the field assessed instantly. He smiled in admiration at his father-in-law. He was **a wise old bird** and no mistake* (Sunley, 1991). In the second meaning there is also the equivalent *пройти (крізь) вогонь і воду (Крим і Рим, крізь сито і решето) і мідні труби* (it means to have been in many and various difficult situations; have complicated and not innocent past); compare Rus.: *пройти (сквозь) огонь и воду и медные трубы*; Pol.: *przejsć przez młyn*; Eng.: *to go (have been, pass) through the mill*. In the first meaning there is also a synonym *око набите* (about the experienced person with a great life experience; about the person who immediately assesses any situation correctly). **The sub-concept hardworking** includes phraseological units with the concept of “work”. In a given paradigm a number of basic components should be highlighted, so that the members of the ethnic community frequently find inspiring sources in them in order to characterize different situations, individuals or community aspects. They can be illustrated by such idioms as Ukr.: *до сьомого поту; сім потів зійшло; умиватися потом; в поті чола; не покладаючи рук, і. е.* (1) to work long hours and diligently; 2) to work or to make sb work until exhaustion; exerting oneself to the utmost; to work spending a lot of strength and energy: *Ніхто її не побачить нігде і ні з ким, усе за роботою та по господарству, цілий день, рук не покладаючи* (Vovchok, 1976); Rus.: *до седьмого пота; не покладая рук; умываться потом*; Pol.: *do siódmego potu: Po wielkim zmęczeniu, po trudzie drożnym aż **do siódmego potu**, po wykonaniu pracy ostatniej, która daje możliwość poznania forsy i trudu jucznego konia, jego znojów i niemal uczuć – było mu teraz na kamieniach odwiecznej posadzki zimno i obmierzłe* (Żeromski, 2010); Eng.: *to sweat blood: There was no way I could care about anything now till this kiln was fired. It would be done this time. If I had **to sweat blood** it would be done* (Lindsay, 1989); *to sweat one's guts out; to work day and night (from morning till night): But*

the reality of my new career was harsh. The medical faculty at Buenos Ayres would not accept me, and I had to work day and night for a year to learn enough science to be enrolled (Fowles, 1988). The descriptive material confirms that the semantic meaning of mentioned before idiomatic nominations with the **component sweat** in the pragmatic sense of **diligence** is the same in all analyzed languages. Moreover, the component *blood* appears in order to strengthen the meaning of *exhaustion*. Another phraseologism in the paradigm of sub-concept “hard work” *рання пташка* (*ранній птах*) reflects the pragmatic meaning *a person who gets up early, early starts to work*: *Аби на світ благословилося, уже вона й прокинулася, як рання пташка, і клопочеться, й бігає* (Vovchok, 1976). The pragmatic value is clear in the phraseological opposition which combines *hard work* with *laziness*, such as: *рання пташка носик чистить, а пізня очі продирає; рання пташка пшеничку клює, а пізня очки дере*.

Cultural connotation plays a significant role in the appropriate interpretation of phraseological idioms. It arises from an associative relation between the image contained in the inner form of a language sign and the content of a cultural pattern. For instance, on the one hand, in the English linguo-cultural environment phraseologism *pigeon-livered* in the positive meaning *little as a dove, sensitive as a dove* is associated with a tiny pigeon chest. But there also exist a few phraseological nominations, for instance, *to pluck as a pigeon; to fleece a pigeon* with the negative pragmatic meaning *to deceive a naive person* (Bartel, 1983, p.266). They are correlated with negative traits of human nature. On the other hand, there exist a lot of idioms with the component *a dove*. The lexical unit *dove* always has a positive value. It began from the biblical events. That lies in the fact that lexical unit *dove* was used in the biblical story about the Flood. The dove brought good news to the Noah’s family that the water went down. Since then the lexical unit *dove* in English and in other languages has been used as a symbol of goodness, peace, sensitivity, love and it is also reflected in some other anthropocentric phraseologisms, for instance, *a pair of turtle-doves* (Palmatier, 1995, p.322), as well as: Ukr.: *голубка сива; голуб миру; маленький як голубенятко; наївний як голуб; покірний як голуб: І на вернулась йому на думку Олена, що хороша була, як зоря ясна, а покірна, а тиха, як голубка сива!* (Vovchok, 1976); Rus.: *голубь мира; голубиная кротость; наивен как голубь: Вечное молчание и голубиная кротость ее глаз говорили за ее беззащитность* (The National Corpus of Russian Language, 2015); Pol.: *gołąbek pokoju: Przez pierwszych kilka lat Rada Miejska była skłócona, a ja przyszedłem wtedy jako taki gołąbek pokoju – mówi Andrzej Pol. – Potrafię godzić różne interesy, jestem człowiekiem kompromisu* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *czuła gołąbica; malutki jak gołąbek*; Eng.: *the dove of peace; as harmless as a dove; as innocent as a dove; pigeon-livered; to pluck as a pigeon; to fleece a pigeon*. Thus, the metaphorical component *голуб* which in English is used in two forms *dove* and *pigeon* should be considered as a significant component of linguo-cultural connotation. Although the above phraseological units exhibit more similar values common to the analyzed languages, such as: **soft-hearted, kind, delicate, sensitive, peaceful**, at the same time some significant differences are noticed in the other metaphor nominations within a given paradigm of phraseological idioms. They do not always suppose a perfect equivalence of phraseological units from one language to another, as the individuals from each community select different elements from their own culture in order to create idioms with a significant degree of expressivity. There are animals, instruments, objects which have a specific reference in the immediate universe for the certain community, as there are components particularly important for the life of that ethnic group. Compare: Ukr.: *покірна овечка; невинна овечка; лагідна як котеня; мухи не скривдять*; Rus.: *ласковый как теленок, ласковая как кошка; мухи не обидит – Ислам мягкий, застенчивый, что называется, мухи не обидит* (The National Corpus of Russian Language, 2015); Pol.:

potulny jak baranek: Dopiero kiedy się uśmiechał, odstaniając równiutkie zęby, nikt nie miał wątpliwości, że ten pozornie groźny facet jest potulny jak baranek. – Nigdy nie było z nim kłopotów. Miał wielu kolegów i przyjaciół (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *niewinny jak baranek; czuła kotka; przytulny jak pluszowy miś; nawet muchy nie skrzywdzi; Eng.: pigeon-livered; cuddy as a bear; pussy cat; gentle as a lamb; he cannot say boo to a goose; sb would not hurt (harm) a fly.*

Cultural connotation also arises from the interpretation of concepts or sub-concepts. For instance, in Ukrainian, Polish and English within the meaning of *submissive, gentle* the word *lamb* is the key component of idioms, in Russian, the component *теленок* appears in such anthropocentric idioms, because a cow, not a sheep in Russia was a symbol of prosperity. The same is not true about, for instance, Britain, where feeding of sheep was high on the list, because it brought big profits. In all analyzed cultures there is an interesting comparison of the gentle person with a cat. As for the English expression *pussy cat* it is assumed that “*puss* is the equivalent to Rus. *кис-кис* and Ukr.: *кіс-кіс*, the expression which is used to draw the cats’ attention” (Ter-Mynasova, 2000, p.122).

Phraseology of the investigated cultural and language environments is also rich in **idioms that emphasize the negative traits of human nature**. In this paradigm there have been found a lot of statements with the animalistic components. Let us follow the declared idioms in order to identify common and different features in metaphor, motivation, meaning, etc. Compare: Ukr.: *вовк в овечій шкурі; скільки (як) вовка не годуй, а він (все) у ліс дивиться; вовча натура в ліс тягне; свиня в золотому нашійнику – все ж свиня*. Порівн: *А я тобі другу приказку скажу: як вовка не годуй, а він все в ліс дивиться* (Мурнуй, 1972); Rus.: *как волка не корми, он все в лес глядит; черного кобеля не отмоешь до бела; свинья в золотом ошейнике – все ж свинья*; Pol.: *wilk w owczej skórze: Lęk mnie ogarnął, żem w pierwszej chwili tak lekkomyślnie skłonny był zaufać pięknym pozorom biorąc się na lep roześmianych ust i uprzejmych słów. Czyżby wilk w owczej skórze? – pomyślałem – a jeśli wilk, to jawnie wyzłaziła mu natura z oczu, kiepsko ukrywana* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *natura ciągnie wilka do lasu: W Stanach, jako właściciel kilku domów czynszowych, dobił do middle class, ale natura ciągnie wilka do lasu – w gąszcz bud bazaru Różyckiego, w mateczniki starych zaułków i mrocznych podwórek z mnogimi sklepikami i warsztatami; w ten nurt podskórny życia gospodarczego* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *czarnej kobyły nie domyjesz do białego; świnia w złotym naszyjniku zawsze pozostanie świnia; a silk purse out of a sow’s ear*.

The descriptive material of **the paradigm bad traits of human nature** confirms the semantic similarity of analyzed nominations, such as: Ukr.: *як вовка не годуй, його все одно тягне до лісу* in the meaning *the bad traits of human nature does not change regardless of the circumstances; вовк в овечій шкурі* *about the person who under the guise hides his true intentions; вовком дивитися* (compare: Rus.: *волком смотреть; польське: patrzeć się wilkiem*) *have a dark, hostile look*. The above phraseological units with the animalistic components are distinguished, first of all, by common to all languages the invariant connotation. The peculiarity of human nature lies in the fact that bad habits, no matter how people try to change, sooner or later reveal themselves.

We also focus our attention on the units which are specific to the particular language, and are structured on traditions and cultural values, unique for the national identity of the certain culture. For instance, anthropocentric phraseology of Slavic languages differs substantially from the Western Germanic group of languages, to which English belongs, for example, in syntactic forms. On the one hand, the passive structure in Slavic phraseology, such as *вовча натура в ліс тягне; скільки (як) вовка не годуй, а він (все) у ліс дивиться* (пор.: *как волка не корми, он все*

в лес глядит; черного кобеля не отмоешь до бела; *natura ciągnie wilka do lasu; czarnej kobyły nie domyjesz do białego*), points out that the external circumstances are more responsible for the creation of human nature, and therefore people are not mostly responsible for their bad nature.

On the other hand, the syntactic forms of English phraseological units are characterized by active voice, for instance, *the dog returns to its vomit; leopard never changes its spots; you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's*, that means that people themselves are the performers of the actions, people's own actions aim to the creating of their character, therefore they are responsible for their bad traits of nature.

In semantic aspect, however, the investigated languages exhibit many similarities. Compare: Ukr.: як звір в клітці; як згряя вовків; як загнанний звір; як злий (скажений) пес; як собака на прив'язі; зірвався як з прив'язі; Rus.: как зверь в клетке; как загнанный зверь; злой как собака; как собака на цепи; как с цепи сорвался; серая волков; Pol.: jak zwierze w klatce; zły (wściekły) jak pies: *Taki talent – raz leniwy jak świnia w błocie, a za drugim razem wściekły jak pies – to nic przyjemnego Tylko że gmina nie kościół, Pietruszka!* – warknął **zły jak pies** (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *dzika bestia Był więc prawie u celu swej misji, na progu świata snów, gdzie rosły sosny przetarte strzępami mgły, gdy spostrzegła go nienasycona śpiewaczka Nefertiti, i natychmiast zawładnęła jej ciałem i mózgiem dzika bestia płci* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *jak pies na łańcuchu: Zatrzymawszy auto przed bramą parku, postać Mihalya, żeby doręczyć bukiet i list; nie było czokidara, który jak pies na łańcuchu zawsze się kręcił, strzegąc wejścia* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *zgraja wilków*; Eng.: *like an animal; behave like animals; cross as a bear with a sore head; pack of wolves*

The idioms of analyzed subgroups involve the components with the pragmatic meaning of *an aggressive animal (dog, wolf, bear)*. The general nomination is also noteworthy: *beast in a cage or imprisoned animal* in the pragmatic meaning *the aggressive behavior is caused by the loss of freedom and independence*

Animalistic components also characterize **the subgroups** of anthropocentric phraseologisms describing **negative interpersonal relationship**. Compare: Ukr.: як пес з котом to be with someone in constant struggle, in frequent quarrels; *на ножках; метати бісер (перла) перед свиньми* say something to people who can not understand what you say; *лізти як свиня до корита* about the impudent person; *надодідливий як муха; причепитися як реп'ях до штанив; прожжжужати всі вуха* to tire sb by speaking continually about one and the same thing or person; Rus.: *как кошка с собакой* (compare: *на ножках, не в ладах*); *прожжжужать все уши; надоедливы как муха*; Pol.: *jak pies z kotem: Rosła wzajemna nieufność i ci, co jeszcze niedawno śpiewali "obok Orła znak Pogoni", zamilkli, zapiekli się, bo jedni i drudzy byli uparci, jak to zwykle Litwini. Tak żyli ze sobą jak pies z kotem, mimo woli przywykając do siebie* (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012); *drzeć z kimś koty; rzucać perły przed wieprze; pchać się jak świnia do koryta; natrętny jak mucha; przyczepić się jak rzep do psiego ogona*; Eng.: *to fight like cat and dog; to be at daggers drawn with sb; to make a song about sb/ smth; to have a love-hate relationship; dog-eat-dog*

It is worth paying special attention to the English idioms *to have a love-hate relationship*. In English the idiom *to have a love-hate relationship* characterizes the negative interpersonal relationship in marriage. The same is also true about the semantic borrowing *wyścig szczurów* of the English idiom *rat race* that has the similar meaning with Am.E *dog-eat-dog*, which do not have any equivalents in the Eastern Slavic Ukrainian and Russian languages. The above idioms express one side of the American lifestyle, connected with a kind of severe rivalry: *Dziś podstawowa forma egzystencji jest wyścig szczurów. Drugi człowiek jest albo rywalem, którego należy pokonać,*

albo jest traktowany instrumentalnie, jako ktoś użyteczny do osiągnięcia sukcesu (The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2012).

To conclude, the culture-oriented approach in my research in line with particular achievements of cognitive linguistics in the area of concepts sheds more light on the specifics of the anthropocentric phraseology in order to clarify some aspects of how linguo-cultural information is encoded into phraseological idioms. The cross-cultural study of Ukrainian-Russian-Polish and English idioms has revealed that the unusual character of concepts and sub-concepts in the paradigms of anthropocentric idioms both in related and non-related languages manifests itself in the comparison with the equivalents in the investigated languages.

On the one hand, a perfect phraseological equivalence should be taken into account, for instance, Ukr.: *вовк в овечій шкірі; скільки (як) вовка не годуй, а він (все) у ліс дивиться; вовча натура в ліс тягне; свиня в золотому нашійнику – все ж свиня*; Pol.: *natura ciągnie wilka do lasu; czarnej kobyły nie domyjesz do białego*); Rus.: *как волка не корми, он все в лес глядит; черного кобеля не отмоешь до бела; свинья в золотом ошейнике – все ж свинья*. In English, however, there exists the semantic loan-translation like the expressions *the dog returns to its vomit; leopard never changes its spots; you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's*. The above idioms are generally identical for the studied linguo-cultures in meaning, but they are expressed by different cultural components. For instance, if phraseologisms of Slavic languages involve such animalistic components as *a wolf, a dog, a pig*, we can notice the component *leopard* in English.

On the other hand, some phraseological units have only a partial correspondence in different languages, compare: Ukr.: *покірна овечка*; Rus.: *ласковий как теленок*; Pol.: *potulny jak baranek*; Eng.: *gentle as a lamb*. If, for the Ukrainian, Polish and English languages within the meaning of submissive, gentle the word *lamb* is the component of idioms, in the Russian case, the component *теленек* sometimes serves this function. From time immemorial it is a cow, not a sheep in the Russian linguo-cultural environment that was considered to be a symbol of prosperity, for instance, in the ancient Rus the cow was gently called *матушкой-кормилицей*.

On the whole, concepts proper largely coincide in all investigated languages but for aspects of meaning. At the same time, corresponding phraseologisms show a high degree of cultural specificity in the subconcepts. The difference in the anthropocentric phraseology in the Ukrainian-Russian-Polish and English languages is rooted in the choice of different realia or different aspects of the same realia by representatives of investigated linguo-cultural societies

To conclude, we admit that, in many cases, we deal with similar logical and semantic patterns in all investigated languages because of the existence of the same human universal spirit, of a resembling ontological experience, of a common European identity. We could also assert, on the basis of the previously analyzed descriptive material, that there are unique phraseological units in the culture and mentality of each community, determined by different economic, social, historical and psychological aspects.

Since phraseology in comparative linguo-cultural studies is still relatively young field of research, much more corpora are necessary to learn and understand the national spirit of the certain ethnic group through cultural concepts. This is one of the first attempts when these four languages – Polish, English, Russian and Ukrainian, have been compared. Therefore, the prospects of further investigation are connected with the comparison of phraseological units in the anthropocentric paradigm expanding the study by the large group of phraseological idioms. The comparison will be continued and the conclusions of the proposed research have a premature character.

1. Алефиренко [Aliefirenko], Н., 2008. Фразеология в свете современных лингвистических парадигм [Phraseology in the light of modern linguistic paradigms], М.: ООО «Элпис», р.271.
2. Баранов [Baranov], А., Добровольский [Dobrovolskij], Д., 2013. Основы фразеологии (краткий курс) [Fundamentals of Phraseology (the short course)]. М: Флинта; Наука, р.312.
3. Гнатюк [Hnatiuk], Л., 2013. Технології міжперсонального спілкування у міжкультурній взаємодії [Technology of Interpersonal Communication in Intercultural Interaction] Донецьк: Вид-во Ноулідж, р.336.
4. Гумбольдт [Humboldt], В., 1984. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влияния на духовное развитие человечества [On the Difference between the Structure of Human Language and its Influence on the Spiritual Development of Mankind], pp.37–296. in: Избранные труды по языкознанию, М.: Прогресс, р.400.
5. Кунин [Kunin], А., 1996. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка [Phraseology of Contemporary English], М.: Высш. шк./ Дубна: Изд. центр Феникс, р.381.
6. Телия [Teliya], В., 1988. Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира [Metaphorization and its Role in Creating a Linguistic Picture of the World] in Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира, (отв. ред., Серебренников, Б., М.): Наука, pp.173–203.
7. Cowie, A., 2001. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Koziara, S., 2002. Frazeologizmy pochodzenia biblijnego z nazwami zwierząt w języku polskim. W: *Annales Academiae Paedagogicae Cracoviensis, Studia Linguistica*, nr 1, pp.155–164.
9. Vidović-Bolt, I., 2008. Frazeologizmy zoonimiczne odnoszące się do człowieka w języku chorwackim i polskim, W: *Wyraz i zdanie w językach słowiańskich: opis, konfrontacja, przekład*, Sarnowski, M., Wysoczański, W. Wrocław: Wydawn. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Volume 6, pp.483–492.
10. Wierzbicka, A., 1978. Sapir a współczesne językoznawstwo, W: *Sapir, Edward (1933/1978): Kultura, Język Osobowość*, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, pp.5–31.
11. Wysoczański, W., 2006. *Językowy obraz świata w porównaniach zleksykalizowanych. Na materiale wybranych języków*, Wrocław: Wydawn. Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, p.402.
12. Zykova, I., 2016. The Phraseological Meaning Construal in the Traditional vs Cognitive Culture-oriented Perspectives. In: *Language Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, vol. I (2), pp.253–286. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lart-2016-0015>

Sources

1. Вовчок [Vovchok], М., 1976. Горпина // Словник української мови в 11 томах. [The Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes], vol. 7. Available at <http://sum.in.ua> [Accessed 1 February 2016].
2. Кропивницький [Kropivnytskyj], М., 1975. Дві сім'ї // Словник української мови в 11 томах [The Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes], vol. 6. Available at <http://sum.in.ua> [Accessed 11 December 2015].
3. Мартович [Martovych], Л., 1970. Стрибожий дарунок // Словник української мови в 11 томах [The Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes], vol.1. Available at <http://sum.in.ua> [Accessed 01 August 2015].
4. Мирний [Myrnyj], П., 1972. Лимерівна // Словник української мови: в 11 томах [The Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes], vol 3. Available at: <http://sum.in.ua> [Accessed 25 July 2015].
5. Национальный корпус русского языка [The National Corpus of Russian Language]. Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН. Available at www.ruscorpora.ru/ [Accessed 29 August 2015].
6. Островський [Ostrovskij], М., 1975. Як гартувалася сталь // Словник української мови в 11 томах [The Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes], vol 6. Available at <http://sum.in.ua> [Accessed 11 December 2015].
7. Рыбаков [Rybakov], А., 1977. Тяжелый песок // Национальный корпус русского языка [The National Corpus of Russian Language]: Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН., Available at www.ruscorpora.ru/ [Accessed 29 August 2015].

References

8. Словник української мови в 11 т. [Ukrainian Dictionary in 11 Volumes], АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства, Білодіда, І. М. (ed.), К.: Наукова думка, 1970—1980. [online]. Available at <http://sum.in.ua> [Accessed 01 February 2016].
9. Тер-Минасова, С. 2000. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация [Language and Intercultural Communication] М.: Слово, р.624.
10. Bartel, R., 1983. *Metaphors and Symbols*. New York: Council of Teachers.
11. Fowles, J., 1988. *The Magus* // Time Corpus: 100 Million Words, 1923–2016 [online]. Brigham Young University. Available at <http://corpus.byu.edu/time/>. [Accessed 25 August 2015].
12. Lindsay, K., 1989. *The Chymical Wedding* // Time Corpus: 100 Million Words, 1923–2016 [online]. Brigham Young University. Available at <http://corpus.byu.edu/time/>. [Accessed 26 August 2015].
13. Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego [The National Corpus of Polish Language]: 430 mln Segmentów, 2008–2012 [online]. IPI PAN, PWN i PELCRA. Available at <http://nkjp.pl/poligarp/> [Accessed 28 January 2012].
14. Nurowska, M., 2009. *Niemiecki taniec* // Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego: 430 mln Segmentów [The National Corpus of Polish Language, 2008–2012 [online]. IPI PAN, PWN i PELCRA. Available at <http://nkjp.pl/poligarp/> [Accessed 28 January 2012].
15. Palmatier, R., 1995. *Speaking of Animals: A Dictionary of Animal Metaphors*. London: Greenwood Press.
16. Sunlay, M., 1991. *Fields in the sun* // Time Corpus: 100 Million Words, 1923–2016 [online]. Brigham Young University. Available at <http://corpus.byu.edu/time/>. [Accessed 23 August 2015].
17. *Time Corpus: 100 Million Words, 1923–2016* [online]. Brigham Young University. Available at <http://corpus.byu.edu/time/> [Accessed 20 August 2015].
18. Żeromski, S., 2010. *Popioły* // Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego: 430 mln Segmentów [The National Corpus of Polish Language], 2008–2012 [online]. IPI PAN, PWN i PELCRA. Available at <http://nkjp.pl/poligarp/> [Accessed 20 January 2012].

Santrauka

Lubomira Hnatiuk. Antropocentrinų frazeologinių vienetų funkciniai ir pragmatiniai ypatumai skirtingose kalbose ir kultūrinėje aplinkoje (aprašomoji ukrainiečių, rusų, lenkų ir anglų kalbų medžiaga)

Straipsnyje tyrinėjami antropocentriniai frazeologiniai vienetai, kuriais į kalbą (giminingose ukrainiečių, rusų, lenkų kalbose ir negiminingoje anglų kalboje) yra įterpiama etninė ir kultūrinė informacija. Straipsnis mėgina išskirti tam tikras subgrupes su atrinktais ukrainiečių-rusų-lenkų-anglų antropocentriniais frazeologiniais vienetais. Išnagrinėti pavyzdžiai grupuojami į keletą sričių, atspindinčių nacionalinį ir kultūrinį identitetą kalbos kultūrinėse sąvokose, parodant frazeologinių vienetų vaidmenį vaizduojant kultūrinį mentalitetą ir brėžiant paraleles, taip pat ir kontrastus tarp antropocentrinų frazeologinių vienetų skirtingose kalbose ir skirtingoje kultūrinėje aplinkoje siekiant atspindėti tikslinės kalbos dvasią. Tai labai svarbu siekiant efektyvios tarpkultūrinės komunikacijos, nes vienos kalbos aplinkos nacionaliniai kultūros veiksniai daro didelę įtaką ne tik komunikacinio kodo elementams, bet yra svarbūs komunikacijos procese su visais savo komponentais, t. y. principais, maksimumais, komunikavimo taisyklėmis, strategijomis ir taktika.

About the Author

Lubomira Hnatiuk

Doctor of Science in General Linguistics, professor, English Translation Studies Department, Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, Vinnytsia, Ukraine.

Academic interests

Functional linguistics, pragmatics, comparative linguistics, intercultural studies and text linguistics.

Address

127/42 Grunwaldzka Street, Przemysł, 37-700, Poland.

E-mail:

lhniuk@wp.pl