

*Salome Omiadze
Tbilisi, Georgia*

On the Translation of Food-Related Somatic Phraseological Units

In every language there are units based on the link between two ancient cultural codes – food and somatic. Some of them pertain to metaphorical expressions, whereas others are non-metaphorical phraseological units. Therefore, the translator should either prove or exclude the metaphorical nature of a food-related somatic phraseological unit. Alongside with the preservation of the speech register and stylistic colouring, adequate translation requires the presence of somatic component in the translated expression. Based on concrete examples, the paper analyzes the ways of translation of food-related phraseological units.

Keywords: food code, somatic code, somatic lexeme, somatic phraseological unit, Georgian phraseology, phraseological translation

Phraseological units are not only linguistic objects, but, from the semiotic viewpoint, they should be classified as cultural peculiarities, because, alongside with the metaphorical description of reality, they maintain and spread those symbols, standards or stereotypes which bear the imprint of the national-linguistic conceptualization of the universe. Therefore, phraseological units are rightfully considered as set expressions which are difficult to translate. Sometimes they are called “untranslatable” units. However, the majority of phraseological units analyzed in the given paper do not belong to this group, because the difficulties are mostly caused by the transfer of the metaphoric image of the phraseological unit into another language. However, the units under analysis are not distinguished by high degree of metaphoric imagery.

Translation theories provide numerous approaches aimed at overcoming the potential difficulties of translation. In the given paper, I will present a different opinion regarding the translation of food-related somatic phraseological units.

It is well known that there are no strict boundaries between cultural codes [1, p. 6]. Cultural codes are closely linked with ancient archetypal beliefs. Moreover, cultural codes are markers of such archetypal beliefs. They are often coupled with somatic codes, as Man began perception and naming of the universe by perceiving his own body. Different parts of the body, apart from their primary function, have been attached certain symbolic meanings. Certain somatic units are polysemantic due to the diversity of functions performed by the organ itself as well as its multiple

metaphorical-associative transformation in a given culture. This can be proved by the fact that *hand* is related to more phraseological units than *nose*, and *tongue*, which is the main organ of taste, is rarely found in food-related units. Like many other languages, in Georgian, the dominant function of this word is that of speech. Therefore, there are numerous set expressions in which the somatic lexeme *tongue* refers to oral expression of thought, self-expression and communication.

Despite separate functions of body parts, the main difference lies in the meanings of corresponding lexemes in different languages. Such differences also become obvious if we compare the dialectal data of one and the same language. In the dialects of the Georgian language, the *stomach*, which is a digestive organ, is substituted by the *heart*, which is usually related to all kinds of emotions and feelings. For instance, in the Kiziki speech of the Kakhetian dialect, there is a caressing form of address **კუჭი ჯაჭი** “stomach” (cf. the literary language and other dialects of Georgian, where the caressing form of address is **გული გულო** “heart”/ ‘my heart’). Another colloquial caressing expression is **შენი კუჭისა! šeni kučisa!** (of your stomach) (cf. literary language and other dialects of Georgian **შენი გულისა! šeni gulisa** (of your heart)). Among the units of negative connotation, we should mention Gurian expressions **კუჭი მოუვა ჯაჭი mouva** (stomach will come), **კუჭს მოაყვანიებს ჯაჭს moaqvaninebs** “he/she will make someone’s stomach come” (cf. literary Georgian and other dialects of Georgia **გული მოუვა გული mouva** “heart will come”, **გულს მოაყვანიებს guls moaqvaninebs** “he/she will make someone’s heart come”), meaning ‘he/she will get angry’ or ‘he/she will make someone angry’. There is also a nominal verb **გაკუჭდება gaķučdeba** (literally: ‘he/she will turn into stomach’) (cf. **გაგულისდება gagulisdeba** (literally: ‘he/she will turn into heart’). In the above-mentioned expressions, the somatic units “stomach” and “heart” are synonymous. In some expressions of the same structure these somatic units are antonymous: **ცარიელი კუჭია carieli kučia** (he/she is all stomach) (‘very ill-tempered’) and **ცარიელი გულია carieli gulia** (he/she is all heart) (‘kind-hearted, generous’). *Stomach* and *Heart* substitute each other in other languages as well. This is due to the archaic belief, according to which the heart and the stomach performed one and the same function. In this regard, interesting examples of Russian colloquial speech are provided by O. Kravchenko and I. Subbotina [2, p. 76].

A Vietnamese expression denoting a clever and talented person is “*he/she has a clear stomach*”, whereas Georgians express the same meaning saying “*he/she has a clear mind*”. At first sight, this is the case of

a radically different perception of the somatic image of the universe. Indeed, stomach is not connected to talent in Georgian. However, it is related to sincerity. This can be illustrated by an example from Kiziki speech მაგის კუჭი არ გამოირეცხება **magis k̄uči ar gamoirecxeba** (his/her stomach will never be washed) meaning ‘he/she will never be sincere’. Neither complete coincidence nor difference between the components of phraseological units is sufficient for the research aimed at the comparison of linguistic images of the universe. For instance, the Georgian expression თავის საზომით ზომავს **tavis sazomit zomavs** (he/she measures with his/her own measure) has a Vietnamese correlate: “he/she thinks about someone else’s stomach based on his/her own stomach”. In Georgian, there is a proverb of the same meaning მაძლარს მშიერიც მაძლარი ეგონაო **mazyars mšieric mazyari egonao** (a well-fed man thought that the hungry man was also well-fed). Even though there is no somatic organ in this proverb, the Georgian language provides numerous examples of connection between *satiety* and *stomach*: მუცელი მოიღორა **muceli moiğora** (he/she turned his/her stomach into a pig), ღორმუცელა **ğormucela** (pig-stomached), მუცლის გაღებრება **muclis gaymerteba** (idolization of the stomach), მუცელღებრთა **mucelymerta** (idol-stomached), მუცელი ამოიყორა **muceli amoiğora** (fill one’s stomach), მუცელს გადაჰყვა **mucels gadahqva** (he/she sacrificed his/her life to stomach), მუცელი თავზე აქვს ჩამოცმული **muceli tavze akvs čamocmuli** (his/her stomach is placed above his/her head) and so on.

The linguistic units based on the interrelationship between the two ancient cultural codes – food and somatic – are found in every language. Some of these units represent metaphoric expressions, whereas their majority forms a group of non-metaphorical phraseological units. Therefore, in order to select an appropriate method of translation, the translator should either prove or exclude the metaphorical nature of the food-related somatic phraseological unit.

In the process of linguistic objectivization of the concept “food”, somatic lexemes are used mostly in their direct meaning. The set expressions formed by means of somatic lexemes describe nutrition processes and related feelings objectively and realistically. Later, these phraseological units are transferred into other thematic fields and, as a result of metaphorical-associative transformations, acquire new meanings. For instance, in the Georgian discourse, the collocation კუჭი ეწვის **k̄uči ec̄vis** (literally – his/her stomach is burning) means ‘he/she is starving’. Thus, this expression reflects a physiological process of being hungry. The disturbing nature of this feeling forms basis for the metaphorical meaning of the

expression **მაგას კუჭი რატომ ეწვის?** **magas kuçi ratom eçvis?** (literally – Why is his/her stomach burning?), meaning ‘why does he/she poke his/her nose into this matter?’.

In case the food-related somatic phraseological unit remains within the thematic field of food, due to the universality of the anthropocentric world vision, the phraseological unit is likely to have an absolute equivalent in another language. For instance, such pair is comprised of the Georgian expression **კბილების კაწკაწი** **kbilebis kaçkaçi** and Russian *щелкать зубами* (literally – “chattering of teeth”, both referring to the feeling of hunger). Another pair of this type is Georgian **ნერწყვ(ებ)ი (მო)სდის** **nerçqv(eb)i (mo)sdis** and Russian *слюнки текут* (literally – his/her mouth is watering); the meaning of both expressions is ‘he/she is very eager to eat something’. If the target language does not have an exact correlate, by means of onomasiological approach, the translator should find a collocation with a similar somatic component. For instance, Georgian **თითებს ჩაკენეტ** **titebs çaikvneṭ** (you will bite your fingers) and Russian *пальчики оближешь* (you will lick your fingers). In these expressions, the somatic lexemes are identical (**თითები** **titebi** = *пальчики* – fingers), whereas the verbs denote different actions. Both expressions denote “delicious food”. In certain cases, the translator may find a phraseological unit with a different somatic lexeme, without change in the meaning of the expression.

It is also important to preserve the register of speech: for instance, in Georgian there is a slang expression denoting a strong feeling of hunger **კუჭი ღელას აინებს** **kuçi dedas aginebs** (literally – his stomach is swearing at him). This expression should be translated into Russian by means of a set expression of the same stylistic colouring, for instance *кишка кишке кукиши кажет* (an intestine is giving the finger to another intestine); *кишка кишке бьет по башке* (an intestine is hitting another intestine). Thus, a disrespectful attitude will be preserved in the target language, for instance the Georgian expression denoting ugly and greedy eating **ყბობს ქნევა** **qbebis kneva** (to swing one’s jaws) should be translated into French using a phraseological unit “jouer des mâchoires” (the play of jaws) and so on.

Food as one of the key components of human life has acquired diverse meanings and functions, including the symbolic function, in different traditional cultures. Thus, a totally different strategy must be used when translating those food-related linguistic units which have penetrated into other thematic fields.

Naturally, it is impossible to translate virtually every phraseological unit by means of phraseological units in the target language. However, before free translation of the semantic content, the translator should do his/her best

to find a corresponding expression in order to preserve the original mechanism of nomination. In the above-mentioned examples, the original mechanism has been preserved by means of using set expressions with somatic lexemes embracing objects, actions and feelings related to food.

References

1. Krasnykh V.V. Cultural Codes and Standards (Invitation to Conversation). *Language, Mind and Communication: Collected Papers*, edited by V.V. Krasnykh, A.I. Izotov. Moscow: MAKS Press. 2001. Issue 19. 164 pages (In Russian).
2. Kravchenko O.N., Subbotina I.M. Somatic Lexeme «Heart» in Phraseological Units from the Anthropocentric Viewpoint (On the Material of English and Russian Languages). *Scientific Herald of Belarus State University. Series of Humanitarian Sciences*. 2014. № 20 (191). P. 74-78 (In Russian).

Юлія Плетенецька, Альона Лукащук
м. Київ, Україна

Неофразеологізми на позначення основних стратегій маніпуляції у ЗМІ

This paper considers neophraseological units used by mainstream English-language media in terms of their character and the level of manipulative effect as well as translations of these manipulative word-combinations into Ukrainian. The results of the linguistic analysis of manipulative strategies and tactics in our work allowed us to determine the manipulative potential of the neophraseological units. We have managed to select and classify the examples of neophraseologisms that authors use to realize the major manipulative strategies, such as overemphasis, labeling, accusation, hint or intrigue. The proficient use of manipulative strategies and tactics by publishers elicits the expected response to the material that they produce, and often distorts modern social and political life realities.

Keywords: neophraseological units, manipulative strategies, over-emphasis, labeling, accusation, hint or intrigue

Фразеологічний фонд будь-якої мови – це невичерпне джерело, що постійно живить її виражальні засоби, надає їй яскравих рис національного характеру, створює той неповторний колорит, який відрізняє одну мову від іншої. У фразеологічних одиницях відбивається досвід носіїв мови, їх уявлення про навколишній світ, виявляється своєрідність їх світобачення. Джерелом появи та контекстом використання фразеологічних одиниць завжди були розмовне мовлення, фольклор,