

Linguo-cultural approach to intertextual phraseology (through somatic code of culture)

O. M. Galynska*

National University of Food Technologies, Kyiv, Ukraine

*Corresponding author. E-mail: galynska@yahoo.com

Paper received 06.02.2016; Accepted for publication 22.02.2016.

Abstract. The paper considers intertextuality and intertext as linguo-cultural phenomena. Intertextuality makes it possible to find out in a new light how the national spirit is manifested and a national specific is expressed in intertextual phraseological units through somatic code of culture. The main sources of linguo-cultural information of English and Ukrainian phraseological units have been reconstructed; similarities and differences in beliefs and stereotypes of the British and Ukrainian nations have been determined.

Keywords: *intertextuality, intertext, linguo-cultural, intertextual phraseological unit, somatic code of culture*

Introduction. Phrasicon is predominantly the subject-matter of many linguo-cultural researches. The study of phraseology by V. Teliya resulted into separation of linguoculturology as a new perspective to study the language through the prism of culture. She was one of the first scientists to start the development of theoretical principles in the research of a phraseological sign from such a perspective: different layers of culture are present in the nature of the phraseological sign. "Culture is a specific sign system being a product of the centuries-long, multi-layer and constantly developing activity depending on the forms of the world perception by the individual" [10, p. 776]. Teliya defined the following layers of culture that had left imprints in the form of the corresponding cultural meaning or cultural information in figurative content of the phraseological units:

1. archetypical layer;
2. mythological layer (which includes ritual);
3. biblical layer;
4. folkloristic layer;
5. ethnographic sources and historical artifacts;
6. literary-publicistic;
7. symbolarium of culture [10, p. 781].

A brief review of publications on the subject. One of Teliya's ideas was the phenomenon of intertextuality. The term of intertextuality, introduced by M. Bakhtin [1] and developed by Y. Kristeva [7], is widely used in modern linguistics. Intertextuality is interpreted in different ways, thereby causing debates between the scientists and encouraging introduction of new approaches. Y. Kristeva pointed out that any text is a mosaic of citations and product of absorption and transformation of the other text. Under this term the researcher understood the interaction of different codes, discourses or voices that are intertwined in the text [7]. Some representatives of the western philological school (H. Plett, R. Bart, M. Riffaterre, G. Zhenett) focused their attention on such aspects of intertextuality as the problem of text understanding and text interpretation, functions and types of intertextual elements, the role of the author, correlation between the text and works of predecessors.

Intertextuality as linguo-cultural category creates vertical (with texts of the previous periods) and horizontal (with texts from other cultures) contexts. Thus, the text is considered as a dialogue between different cultural contexts, not only as a dialogue between the author and the reader [15].

The goal of the study is to describe the fragment of somatic code of culture in English and Ukrainian intertextual phraseology presented by phraseological units with somatic components with encoded cultural information; to define the main sources of linguo-cultural information in English and Ukrainian intertextual phraseological units.

Materials and methods. English and Ukrainian intertextual phraseological units with somatic component served the material for the research. With the help of comparative-historical method the main sources of linguo-cultural information of the analyzed units were reconstructed. Etymological analysis helped to find out primary meaning of the components of intertextual phraseological units in both languages.

Results and discussion. The simplest interpretation of intertextuality presents the idea that any text is a cloth with woven fragments from other texts, and these elements are loaded with cultural meaning. The most perfect examples of intertextuality could be citation, allusion, circumlocution, parody, etc. According to R. Bart: "Every text is a new cloth of the former citations, fragments of cultural codes, formula, social idioms, etc.; and everything is absorbed by the text and mixed, as before the text and around it there is the language" [2]. Thus, such an approach shows specific features of intertext as the result of interrelation of different linguo-cultural codes. And codes perform their functions in culture.

We understand intertexts as the key signs of culture which reflect national mentality. It is well-known that culture manifests itself through different culture-specific concepts (*realii*) personified in material form by *artefacts* (house, bench; *пiч, хата*), *natural culture-specific concepts* (sun, heaven, earth; *сонце, небо, земля, свiчка*), *mentofacts* (goodness, evil; *добро, зло*). And this study we consider phraseological units as microtexts with encoded information about culture, traditions, stereotypes, symbolics, etc.

The principle of anthropometry of the language phraseology and anthropomorphism of analogizing of the artificial world in the human consciousness determines specific meaning in naming processes of the signs of the human body's parts – somatisms. They are representatives of patronymic relations of the concept HUMAN BEING. One can suppose that natural phenomena and human body were one of the first culture-specific concepts perceived by people.

In opinion of R. Weintraub, somatic code of culture is one of the biggest taxonomic families of words of interlin-

guistic phraseology, because phraseological units with somatic components make 30% of a language's phrasicon [14, p. 157–162]. And this is naturally because human body unites two powerful forces: nature and culture.

Phraseological units with somatisms are presented by V. Uzhchenko and D. Uzhchenko in a tabulated form for "Dictionary of phraseologisms of Ukrainian language" (2003) (*Slovník frazeologizmiv ukrajinskoj movy*). The biggest part of phraseological units with somatisms present the units with component "Eye", "Heart", "Head" and "Hand". The least part present the units with components "Hair", "Knee", "Stomach". In general, somatisms were the subject-matter of the profound researches done by I. Hosudarska, V. Sheveliuk, D. Gudkov, M. Kovshova [4; 12; 5]. Accordingly, we are not aimed at describing intertextual phraseologisms with all the somatisms. We choose those having "encoded" information about folkways, folk beliefs, traditions and way of life. Every somatism, every organ of the body relates with the corresponding pieces of the Universe, i.e. they symbolize something, for instance: bones – earth, heart – mind, hand – power, head – heaven, blood – water etc.

In the result of analysis we can find out the main sources of linguo-cultural information of intertextual phraseological units with somatisms. Thus, these sources are the following:

1) **the Bible** (in English: *to turn the other cheek; by the skin of one's teeth; feet of clay; by the skin of one's teeth; finger on the wall; to see a mote in one's eye* [DIO, p. 72; 271; 119; АУФС, p. 185; 334; 842]; in Ukrainian: *адамове реберце; око за око, зуб за зуб* (expression from the Old Testament; in the New Testament Jesus Christ in one of his sermons says: "Forgive your enemies"); *живий трун; у поті чола; відкривати / відкрити очі; і волосина не спаде з голови* (чмї, у кого); *посипати голову попелом; кістки та шкіра; не мати де голову (голови) прихилити; язик приріс до піднебіння* (у кого, чий); *умивати руки* [6, p. 20; 73; 271; 24; СФУМ, p. 103; 123; 547; 297; 379; 786; 6, p. 283]; *He was a dream come true for most women: a faithful, loving, hard-working man. Suzi Godson laments an idol with feet of clay* [DIO, p. 120].

2) **folk beliefs, folkways, superstitious beliefs and traditions** (in English: *to get / set off on the right foot; one's ears are burning; to offer one's hand and heart; to win one's hand; to have one's heart in one's mouth* [DIO, p. 128; 111; АУФС, p. 712; 1012; 474]; *from the bottom of one's heart; to pour out one's heart* [LDI, p. 157; 158]; in Ukrainian: *дух у п'яти ховається; душа в п'яти тікає* (чмя, у кого); *зав'язати косу; покривати голову; просити руки* (в кого, кого, чмї); *світити волоссям; винести ногами вперед; встати на ліву ногу* [СФУМ, p. 224; 226; 240; 536; 579; 634; 78; 132] (*And indeed, under the surface there is, apparently, a simmering undercurrent of rivalry. As one would expect, it is Victoria Beckham, wife of the English captain, whose ears are burning the most*) [DIO, p. 111]; (*To win her hand and all the rest of her he had to be a proper man*) [Shar, p. 141]; (*– А Боже! – жахалась моя бідна душечка, намалювавши собі Бога страшином дядьком із ножем, і скрутившись їжачком, ховалася в п'яти*) [Тар, p. 64].

3) **social and historical life and human activity** (in English: *to rack one's brains; to turn a blind eye; living*

(*from*) *hand to mouth; to let one's hair down; hand over fist; to win hands down; to pull someone's leg* [DIO, p. 243; 43; 148; 146; 147; 184]; in Ukrainian: *знімати полуду з очей; хоч обіддя гни; клепати язиком; милити шию (голови) (кому); без клепки в голові; губи як вареники; язик як лопатень (лопата, помело, млин)* [СФУМ, p. 270; 150; 301; 387; 301; 786].

4) **sources of Greek, Roman and modern literature** (in English: *to go in one ear and out the other* (compare with Ukrainian: *пропускає новз вуха*); *to have / take the bit between one's teeth; to put one's best foot forward; the face that launched a thousand ships; to wear one's heart on one's sleeve; a King Charles's head* [DIO, p. 110; 36; 128; 116; 273; АУФС, p. 383]; in Ukrainian: *Синя Борода; синій птах* [11].

5) **myths, legends** (in English: *Achilles' heel / the heel of Achilles* [АУФС, p. 15]; in Ukrainian: *ахіллесова п'ята; всевидюче око* [СФУМ, p. 589; 463]; *лежати в богів на колінах* [11].

As we can see from analysis of the somatic code of culture, in both languages the main sources of linguo-cultural information are the Bible and Christianity, folk beliefs, superstitious beliefs, folkways and traditions, historical and social life, partly literature and mythology.

For example, a biblical expression *feet of clay* "a weakness perceived in someone held in high regards" comes from a story in the Book of Daniel. After spending the night in prayer, Daniel was the only person in Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom able to interpret the king's troublesome dream. Nebuchadnezzar had seen a huge statue of a man, dazzling in appearance, made of several different metals, starting with gold at the head down to iron on the legs. The statue's feet were part iron and part clay. In the interpretation, Daniel says that, by God's will, he is the golden head but other inferior kingdoms will succeed him, ending with a divided kingdom represented by feet of iron and clay. The mighty statue was not as strong as it appeared, its greatest weakness being its feet of clay. Even the greatest and perfect may have hidden flaws [DIO, p. 119–120].

The origin of Ukrainian intertextual phraseological unit *кістки та шкіра* (English: *skin and bones*) is concerned with the Old Testament, where too exhausted and thin people were mentioned, so the hyperbole "their skin stuck to the bones" was used. Job the Just Man (Pravednyi Iov) who suffered a lot physically and morally, said: "My bones stuck to my body" [Bible, Job, 19: 20] (*У Надьчиної Вірусі – шкіра та кості і то не першої свіжості, тоді ж як моя Ольга – пишечка здобна*) [Чм, p. 40]. In this example we can see the phraseologism as Biblical allusion that in its semantic-syntactic structure has the words-components of Biblical origin, but not a Biblical citation formed as a phraseologism in the Bible's texts.

The body of the human being is considered by the ethnics as a form of the individual existence, as the soul's container. In opinion of the Russian scientist A. Shmeliiov, correlations between the soul and the body are complex enough. The soul, from one hand, stands against the body as material to non-material. From another hand, the soul is like the body's part. The soul is perceived as certain "container" of inner state of the person. Thus, the human exists in the unity between the body and the soul

(in English: *body and soul*; in Ukrainian: *душею і тілом*) [АУФС, p. 150; СФУМ, p. 230]. And accordingly, the person's death means the breakage of this unity (in Ukrainian: *душа вилітає (відлітає, тікає) / вилетіла з тіла, душа прощається з тілом, погубити душу [з тілом]*) [СФУМ, p. 226; 227; 528] (*І справа не в тому, що голова похнюплена, руки звішені. Справа в тому, що душа відлітає*) [Кост, p. 176]. Negative symbolic of black colour determines the meaning of Ukrainian phraseological unit *тримати в чорному тілі* [СФУМ, p. 192]: *Ні, цю банду нахлібників треба розігнати! А Боса послати к чорту і самій, самій крутити... А то роз'ївся, а мене в чорнім тілі тримає, як Ізауру яку* [Мт, p. 138].

In British beliefs heart is emotional center of human body, the container of various emotions. The person can be *in good heart, light at heart, heavy at heart, to have one's heart in the right*. Compare with Ukrainian: *з важким серцем, серце як не вискочить, гаряче серце (у кого)* [СФУМ, p. 643; 642; 639] and others. The Bible mentions the human heart about 800 times. In essence, this is what it says: the heart is that spiritual part of us where our emotions and desires dwell. Drawing on the texts of the Bible, I. Ohijenko suggests his own view on the meaning of the word "heart", i.e. heart is the center of human's mind, human mental activity. And the first meaning of the Hebrew *lev* or *levar* was "mind" [ЕССУМ, p. 247–249]. As the linguist believes, the Bible is full of the places, where the word "heart" should be understood and translated as "mind". For example, "man of heart" (Job 34:10, 34) means "wise man" (English intertextual phraseologism *a man after his own heart*) [DIO, p. 271]. I. Ohijenko adds: "Such an interpretation of the heart moved from the Bible to life, as well as it was used in the science up to XIX century. Among the people this understanding exists nowadays: heart is the center of the will, wish and mind [ЕССУМ, p. 249]

Analysis of the intertextual phraseologisms with the somatism *heart* illustrates that semantics of destructive physical act is connected to the component *heart* denoting:

a) semantics of "grief" as negative emotions: *to eat / tear one's heart, to lose one's heart* [LDEI, p. 157; 158]; *серце болить, щемить серце* [СФУМ, p. 640; 642]; *Every heart has its own bitterness; Every heart has a pain* [АУФС, p. 308]. Compare with Ukrainian: *У кожного серця свій біль;*

b) negative scurvy actions with core verbal semantical component of destruction (semantics of "wound, cutting": *різати серце, роздирати серце [на шматки], рвати серце* [СФУМ, p. 312; 608]; *one's heart is breaking or one's heart bleeds* [АУФС, p. 483].

Some characteristics attributed to the heart in British lingoculture, determine its parameters, i.e. *content* – the heart can be golden, stony (metaphorical meaning); *size* – it can be big, light; *temperature feeling* – (mainly the warmth); *quality characteristics* (full – unfilled). Compare in Ukrainian: the heart can be big, golden, stony, soft; the feeling of the warmth and cold; full – unfilled; it can be squeezed. Metaphorical oxymoron image of the cold hands and warm heart is presented in English *cold hand, warm heart* [АУФС, p. 223]. In Ukrainian we have the similar image and coding: *Холодні руки – гаряче серце.*

Common for both linguocultures is the expression *my ears are burning* – "вуха горять" (*або цюки*) "a remark made by those who think they are being talked about". The origin of this belief goes back to Roman times. Pliny, the Roman historian and writer, for instance, wrote: *It is acknowledged that the absent feel a presentiment of remarks about themselves by the ringing of their ears (Naturalis Historia, AD 77)* [DIO, p. 111]. The ancient belief that the left signified 'evil' and the right 'good' applies here also. Both Plautus, the ancient Roman writer, and Pliny hold that if a person's right ear burns then he is being praised but a burning left ear indicates that he is the subject of evil intent. Accordingly to ancient belief, other unexpected bodily twitches and sensations also serve as warnings, among them those in eye and the thumb. A flickering right eye indicates that a friend will visit or that something longed for will soon be seen, and a pricking in one's left thumb warns of an evil event [DIO, p. 111]. Let us compare with Ukrainian proverb: *Праве око свербить – радити, ліве – на сльозу.*

The British phrase *to get / set off on the right foot* "to begin something well / badly" originated in some sort of superstitious belief. And according to Ukrainian belief, if you want to be lucky, get up in the morning on the right foot. Thus it follows a superstitious belief *встати на ліву ногу* [СФУМ, p. 133]. Besides, we bless ourselves with the right hand and disown the devil with right. So, in mentality of Ukrainians the right and the left sides are similarly connected with good and bad.

To keep a stiff upper lip "to remain calm and self-reliant in the face of problems or danger; to be in control of one's emotions" is a particularly British characteristic. Strange, then, that the earliest references are found in American works such as John Neal's *The Down-Easters* (1833), William Thompson's *Chronicles of Pineville* (1845), Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) and Canadian author Thomas Chandler Haliburton's *The Clockmaker* (1837–8) [DIO, p. 281] (***Keeping a stiff upper lip and martyrishly not wanting to make a fuss about yourself is an extremely British and peculiar way of dealing with things.***)

The expression *to rack one's brains* (in Ukrainian *крутити мізками*) dates from the second half of the seventeenth century. The *rack* was an instrument of torture. It consisted of a frame with a roller at each end. The victim was strapped to these and would endure agony as they were turned little by little, stretching the joints of his arms and legs. From the sixteenth century onwards the *rack* was a favourite figure for expressing something that caused intense suffering [DIO, p. 243].

The phrase *to live from hand to mouth* dates from the sixteenth century when the problem of vagabondage and poverty became urgent. The poor were described as living *from hand to mouth* as their hunger was such that they were forced to consume the alms put into their hands immediately, with no thought for the next day [DIO, p. 148]. In contrast, in Ukrainian culture poverty is associated with bread and salt as the poorest food – *перебиватися з хліба на воду.*

Besides, trades and the old Ukrainian way of life were the basis for the birth of new phraseological units: *tinplating* (*людити очі; полуда на очі впала; знімати з очей полуду*), cooper's craft (*без клепки в голові; не вистачає*

однієї (третьої, десятої) клепки в голові), blacksmith's craft (клепати язиком, клепаний на язик, fisher's (клявати носом), hairdresser's (милити шию (голову)).

Conclusions. In the "body" of phraseological sign penetrate the codes of culture which serve as the means of reconstruction of the folk memory of native speakers about reflected national mentality. Comparative analysis of the somatic code of culture in both languages allowed

reconstructing the main sources of linguo-cultural information in English and Ukrainian intertextual phraseological units, i.e. the Bible, folk beliefs, superstitious beliefs, folkways and traditions, historical and social life, partially literature and mythology. The study of intertextual phraseological units of English and Ukrainian has revealed some similarities and differences in perception of two remote cognates.

REFERENCES

1. Bachtin, M. (1986). *Esthetics of Written Word*, Isskustvo, Moscow.
2. Bart, R. (1989). *The Selection of Works: Semiotics. Poetics*, Progress, Moscow.
3. Bible, (1992). *The Bible or the Books of Holy Scripture of Old and New Testament*. Ukrainian Biblical Assosiation.
4. Hosudarska, O. (2011). Somatisms as means of expression of naïve and scientific world view (a case study of the languages of Romanic and Slavonic groups, PhD thesis, Kyiv.
5. Hudkov, D., Kovshova, M. (2007). *Somatic code of culture: material for the dictionary*, Gnosis, Moscow.
6. Koval, V. (1975). *Colourful Expressions in Ukrainian Literary Language*, Vyshcha shkola, Kyiv.
7. Kristeva, Y. (1995). Word, dialogue and novel, *Moscow university reporter*, no. 1, Is "Philology", pp. 97-124.
8. Ohijenko, I. (2001). *History of Ukrainian literary language*, Nasha kultura i nauka. – URL: <http://litopys.org.ua/ohukr/ohu.19htm>
9. Teliya, V. (1996). *Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*, Yazyki russkoy kultury, Moscow.
10. Teliya, V. (2006). *Introduction / Big Phraseological Russian Dictionary. Meaning. Usage. Cultural comments*. Yazyki russkoy kultury, Moscow, P. 6–14.
11. Phraseologisms. – URL: http://supermif.com/frazeologizm/ukr1/ukr_s_fraz.html
12. Sheveliuk, V. (2009). Contrastive semantics of phraseological units with somatic component: linguo-cultural approach (case study of Spanish and Ukrainian), PhD thesis, Kyiv.
13. Shmelev, A. (2002). *Russian language pattern of the world: material for the dictionary*, Yazyki slavianskoi kultury, Moscow.
14. Weintraub, R. (1975). Experience of Comparison of Somatic Phraseology in Slavonic Languages. *Writings of Samarkand University*. Is. 288, no. 9, pp. 157-162.
15. Zverkova, S. (2004). Intertextual connections and their specificity in works by Angela Carter, PhD thesis, Novosibirsk.
16. АУФС (EUPD) – English-Ukrainian Phraseological Dictionary. (2005). Znamnia, Kyiv.
17. ECCYM (ESUD) – Etymological Semantical Ukrainian Dictionary. (1995). V. 4, Winnipeg, Canada.
18. СФУМ (DPU) – Dictionary of Phraseologisms in Ukrainian. (2008), (ed. By Bilonozhko), Naukova dumka, Kyiv.
19. DIO – Dictionary of Idioms and Their Origins (2006), (ed. by Linda & Roger Flavell), Kyle Cathie Limited, London.
20. LDEI – Longman Dictionary of Idioms. (1979), Longman Group Limited.
21. Кос – Kostenko, L. (2011). *Zapysky ukrainskogo samashedshego, A-BA-BA-GA-LA-MA-GA*, Kyiv.
22. Мт – Matios, M. (2002) *Furshet*, Kalvaria, Lviv.
23. Тар – Tarasiuk, G. (2006). *Yanhol z Ukrainy*, Lybid, Kyiv.
24. ЧМ – Chemerys, V. (2007). *Tajemnych pryhoda na Orili, Ukrfitosotsiotsentr*, Kyiv.
25. Шар – Sharpe, T. (1996). *Grantchester Grind. A Porterhouse Chronicle*, Pan Books, London.

Лингвокультурологический подход к интертекстуальной фразеологии (на примере соматического кода культуры)

Е. Н. Галинская

Аннотация. В предлагаемой статье интертекстуальность и интертекст рассматриваются как лингвокультурологические явления. Интертекстуальность дает возможность по-новому увидеть, как проявляется дух народа и выражается специфика во фразеологических единицах на примере соматического кода культуры. Реконструированы основные источники лингвокультурологической информации английских и украинских фразеологических единиц; установлены общие черты и различия в верованиях и стереотипах британского и украинского этносов.

Keywords: интертекстуальность, интертекст, лингвокультурологический, интертекстуальная фразеологическая единица, соматический код культуры