

Дж.Галецки-Кубич

Агата Пассент еңбектерінде юмордың берілу жолдары

Мақалада Агата Пассент еңбектерінде юмордың берілу жолдары қарастырылған. А.Пассенттың юморы төмендегілерге негізделеді: сөздік қор (перифраздың қолданылуы, сөз мағынасының екіұштылығы, авторлық неологизмдердің жасалуы); фразеологиялық тіркестер (фразеологиялық тіркестерді модификациялау арқылы); стильдеу (А.Пассент еңбектерінде бірнеше стиль мен жанрдың араласуын байқауға болады: спорттық комментарийлер, тілші репортажы, телевизиялық жаңалықтар, ауа райы болжамы, пікірлер); сондай-ақ синтаксис деңгейінде (синтаксистік құрлысы, сөздердің түсіріліп қолданылуы, субъектісіз фразеологиялық тіркестер мен сөйлемдердің қолданылуы).

Дж.Галецки-Кубич

Способы выражения юмора в статьях Агаты Пассент

В статье представлены способы языкового выражения юмора в работах Агаты Пассент. Юмористическое в её работах базируется на: словарный запас (использование перифраз, двусмысленность слов, создание авторских неологизмов), кроме того, фразеологические выражения (главным образом за счет модификации фразеологических выражений), стилизацию (в работах А.Пассент наблюдается смешение различных жанров и стилей: спортивное комментирование, журналистский репортаж, телевизионные новости, прогноз погоды, мнение), а также на уровне синтаксиса (в частности, в синтаксическом построении, словесных пробелах, использовании бессубъектных фразеологических выражений и предложений).

UDK 81'373.72:39

U.I.Kopzhasarova, A.T.Kikimova

*Y.A.Buketov Karaganda State University***Reflection of culture by means of phraseological units**

The article deals with the problem of language and culture correlation. It is proved that language is the reflection of culture and mentality of the people. The most valuable source of cultural information is the phraseological fund of the language. The article defines the essence of cultural connotation concept. The sources of culturally significant interpretation of phraseological units are allocated. Authors defined the mechanism of reflection of culture in language, in particular in phraseological units. The analysis of the Russian and English phraseological units with a national and cultural component is carried out. On the basis of this analysis authors have come to a conclusion that phraseological units reflect culture of the people through correlation to stereotypes, myths, legends, standards, rituals, etc.

Key words: phraseological fund of the language, the internal form of phraseological units, cultural and national connotation, the resources of culturally significant interpretation of phraseological units, myth, symbol, rituals.

Language is a means of culture reflection. E.F.Tarasov notes that language is included in culture since a sign «body» (meaning) is a cultural subject in the form of which language and communicative ability of the person are subjected. The meaning of the language is also a cultural form which arises only in human activity. The culture is also included in language as it is modeled in the text.

According to V.A.Maslova, there are three main approaches to the problem of language and culture correlation. The first approach was developed mostly by Russian philosophers — S.A.Atanovskii, G.A.Brutyayn, E.I.Kukushkin, E.S.Markaryan. The essence of this approach is the following: the interrelation of language and culture is the movement in one direction. Since language reflects reality, and culture is the integral com-

ponent of the reality, language is a simple reflection of culture. As the reality changes cultural and national stereotypes and language are also changed.

The second approach is connected with V.Humboldt and A.A.Potebnya. They understood language as a spiritual force. Language is such an environment without which we can't live. As V.Humboldt wrote, language is «the world lying between the world of the external phenomena and interior world of a human». Therefore, being the environment of our dwelling, language doesn't exist as an objective reality. It exists in our consciousness and our memory. It changes its outlines with each movement of thought, with each new social and cultural role.

Within the second approach this problem was developed by the linguistic school of E.Sapir and B.Whorf. The basis of this hypothesis is the belief that people see the world differently — through a prism of the native language. For the supporters of this approach the real world exists so far as it is reflected in language. But if each language reflects reality in its own way, therefore, languages are different from each other by «the lingual pictures of the world».

In Sapir — Whorf's hypothesis the following basic statements are allocated: 1. Language influences the way of thinking of people speaking it. 2. The way of the real world acquisition depends on what languages people think.

The basis of the third approach is a statement that language is the culture fact, because: 1) it is a component of culture which we inherit from our ancestors; 2) language is the main tool by means of which we acquire culture; 3) language is the most important of all cultural phenomena. Since if one wants to understand the essence of culture — science, religion, literature, one should consider these phenomena as the codes formed like language as the natural language has the most developed model. Therefore, the conceptual acquisition of culture can occur only by means of a natural language.

Thus, language is a component of culture and its tool. It is the reality of our spirit and the reflection of culture. It expresses peculiar features of national mentality. Language is the mechanism which has opened the area of consciousness before a human.

As K.Lévi-Strauss noticed, language is simultaneously both a culture product, and its important component, and a condition of culture existence. Moreover, language is a peculiar way of culture existence and a factor of cultural codes formation [1; 49].

Language reflects not only the world surrounding a person, but also the public consciousness of people, national character, traditions, system of values, mentality [2]. Language stores culture concepts and transfers them from generation to generation. For this reason language plays a significant role in formation of the personality, national character, an ethnic community [3; 100].

The mentality is a category which deals with the internal organization and differentiation of the nation's character, its way of thinking. The mentality is understood as a profound structure of consciousness which depends on the social and cultural, lingual, geographical and other factors. The features of national mentalities are seen only at the lingual, naive, but not conceptual picture of the world (Yu.D.Apresyan, E.S.Yakovlev, O.A.Kornilov). The lingual picture of the world is the unique subjective representation of the reality which includes the objects of both direct and mediated reality. It contains such components of culture as myths, legends, religious views etc. [1; 49].

Phraseological fund of the language is the most valuable source of information on culture and mentality of the nation because it preserves the ideas of the people on myths, customs, ceremonies, rituals, habits, morals, behavior etc. B.A.Larin noted that phraseological units always indirectly reflect people's views, social order and ideology of the epoch [1; 43]. Phraseological units, reflecting a long development of the nation's culture in its semantics, store and transfer cultural attitudes and stereotypes, standards and archetypes from generation to generation. According to F.I.Buslaev, phraseological units are peculiar microcosms. They comprise «both the moral law, and the common sense, expressed in a short saying, which were entrusted to the descendants by their ancestors». It is a soul of any national language in which the spirit of the nation and its originality are expressed in a unique way.

V.N.Teliya claims that the phraseological fund of the language is «a mirror in which the lingual and cultural community identifies its national consciousness». Phraseological units impose a special vision of the world, situation to native speakers [1; 82]. It is expressed mostly in the phraseological units connected with the traditions and customs of the people: for example, in Russian *перемывать косточки* (to gossip — the origin of this phraseological unit is connected with the existence of a Slav ceremony of the so-called secondary burial in the ancient time. It was carried out a few years after the funeral to sanctify a dead person and to remove a paternoster from him. Before the ceremony of the secondary burial the dug-out remains were

washed up. That was accompanied by sharing the memories about the dead man, an assessment of his character and acts etc.), *из полы в полу* (from hand to hand — this was a custom at a horse sale) [4], *вывести на чистую воду* (to expose — the water always had an exclusive value in Russian national beliefs and ceremonies. It is still possible to hear many stories and legends about wonderful healings by means of water in the villages of Russia. In order to heal a person water surely should be clean, fresh and transparent) [5]; in English *a baker's dozen* (according to the ancient custom, bread tradesmen received thirteen loaves instead of twelve from bakers, and the thirteenth loaf was taken into an income of tradesmen); *good wine needs no bush* (according to the ancient custom, innkeepers hung out ivy branches meaning that there was wine on sale) [6].

The internal form of phraseological units being the carrier of motivation often contains elements of the national and cultural plan as phraseological units evolve «from figurative idea of the reality, reflecting mainly the everyday empirical, historical and spiritual experience of the lingual community connected with its cultural traditions».

How is the culture embodied in language, particularly in phraseological units? V.N.Teliya put forward a hypothesis the essence of which is «if the units of the language possess cultural and national peculiarities, the latter should have the ways of its display and means of correlation with it, i.e. to serve as some kind of «link» connecting «a sign body» (and for the signs of the secondary nomination it is a «literal meaning» of the signifier) — on the one hand, and on the other hand — concepts, stereotypes, standards, symbols, mythologemes, etc. the signs of national and universal culture mastered by the people — the native speakers».

As for the phraseological units, their means of an embodiment of cultural and national peculiarities is the figurative basis, an internal form of the phraseological unit, a figurative gestalt structure (often including culturally marked components designating «cultural» realities). The way of emphasizing the cultural and national peculiarities is «an interpretation of the figurative basis in a marked cultural and national space of the language community» [7].

N.Yu. Shvedova outlined twenty general semantic categories in Russian: animacy, action, condition, subject, measure, place, time, etc. These categories form a semantic framework of the language. It is the most abstract level of the lingual picture of the world. But there are also some figurative and associative mechanisms of initial meaning reconsideration that are more specific to a certain nation. For example, the *dog* in Russian is associated (along with the negative phenomena) with fidelity, devotion, unpretentiousness that finds a reflection in such phraseological units as *собачья верность* (dog's fidelity), *собачья преданность* (dog's devotion), *собачья жизнь* (dog's life), etc. In English the *dog* has mainly negative values (*a dog's breakfast/dinner* — a poor job, a mess; *as sick as a dog* — very ill, *lead a dog's life* — to lead a drab or boring life, *dirty dog* — a person who is deemed to be despicable or contemptible) [8]. For the Russian the *pig* is a symbol of dirt and ingratitude; for Englishmen the *pig* means the glutton. From these examples one can see that the characteristic of each language and each culture is the emergence of the specific co-meanings called connotations.

So, the content of a cultural connotation of phraseological units is the interpretation of the figurative basis (an internal form of the phraseological unit) in a marked cultural «space» of the language community. According to this it is possible to deduce two methodologically important implications: 1) the cultural knowledge can be «caught» from an internal form of the phraseological unit: there are «traces» of the cultures which are customs and traditions, historical events and life elements and 2) culture can be understood as a way of orientation of the person in an empirical, cultural, spiritual life according to the norms, standards, stereotypes, symbols, mythologemes, etc. — signs of the national culture which have been traditionally established in a certain national (lingual) society. If we understand culture in that way, it is possible to reformulate the definition of a cultural connotation: the correlation to a standard or model is also a cultural connotation.

According to V.N.Teliya, it is possible to outline some main areas being the sources of the culturally significant interpretation of phraseological units: 1) words with no direct equivalents in other languages, culturally specific vocabulary and lacunes; 2) mythologized language units: ceremonial and ritual forms of culture, legends, customs, beliefs fixed in a language; 3) paremiological fund of the language; 4) models, stereotypes, symbols, rituals; 5) images; 6) the stylistic structure of languages; 7) speech behavior; 8) religion and language interaction; 9) the area of speech etiquette [7].

Words with no direct equivalents in other languages, culturally specific words are designations of the phenomena specific to the culture (*гармошка* — an accordion, *бить челом* — to ask humbly, etc.) which are a product of a cumulative function of the language. They may be considered the storage of the background knowledge, i.e. the knowledge which is available in the consciousness of the native speakers [3; 37].

Quite a few components of phraseological units may contain the indication of ethnographic realities (in Russian *лапоть* — a bast shoe — in the idiom *лаптем щи хлебать* — to be ignorant, *аршин* — in the idiom *мерить на свой аршин* — to judge by one's own yardstick; in English *inch* — in the idiom *within an inch of one's life* — very close to one's death, *brownie* — in the idiom *earn/get brownie points* — to get praise or approval for something you have done), of archaic elements (*зеница* — a pupil of the eye — in the idiom *хранить как зеницу ока* — to be very careful with something), of historical elements (*ижича* — in the idiom *прописать ижицу* — to teach a good lesson, punish: *izhitsa* is the name of the last, the 43rd letter of the Church Slavonic alphabet, reminding the Roman figure «five» in form).

The **myth** is an ancient form of knowledge that is expressed in national legends about gods and legendary heroes, about the origin of life on the Earth. The most important part of the myth is the mythologeme which is the major character or situation, «the protagonist of the myth» which is passed on from myth to myth. Archetypes are the core of mythological consciousness. The archetype is the stable image which arises in consciousness of the individual of a certain lingual society and which is kept in culture. For example, the basis of phraseological units with component *bread* is the archetype of bread as a symbol of life, wellbeing and material prosperity. For example, in Russian — *есть чужой хлеб* (to live off somebody), *жить на хлебах у кого-либо* (to receive housing and food in another family as payment, to live in dependence on somebody), *зарабатывать на хлеб* (to make for a living), *хлебом не корми* (about strong enthusiasm for something); and in English *someone's bread and butter* — livelihood, *bread is the staff of life* — there's no life without bread.

Some phraseological units reflect the remains of the last generations' world view. They are ancient *popular beliefs and legends*. In Russian *чертова дюжина* (a baker's dozen) means number thirteen — according to popular beliefs the number thirteen is considered unlucky, bringing misfortune; *благую часть избирать / избрать* (to choose a good part) — it stems from the evangelical legend about two sisters — Marfa and Maria who were visited by Jesus. Marfa was preparing food, and Maria, who had chosen a good part, was listening to Jesus' sermon. In English *a black sheep* is a person who is regarded as a disgrace or failure by his family or peer group (according to an ancient belief the black sheep is marked by the devil); *lick into shape* is to bring into satisfactory condition or appearance; *an unlicked cub* is a rude uncouth young fellow (both idioms are connected with a medieval belief according to which bear cubs are born shapeless, and a she-bear, licking them, gives them a due look), *halcyon days* — quiet, peace days (according to the ancient legend, the halcyon hatches baby birds in a nest, floating by sea, in a winter solstice and during this period, for about two weeks, the sea is absolutely quiet).

It is important to describe **symbols, stereotypes, standards and rituals** to reveal the cultural content of idioms.

The **symbol** in linguistics is a thing, object or phenomena endowed with a sense. In the structure of idioms separate components develop a symbolical meaning: for example, in Russian *отбиться от рук* (the same in English *to get out of hand*) — when it is impossible to control something or someone. In these phraseological units a component *hand* develops a symbolical meaning «power». *Быть чьей-либо правой рукой* (the same in English *to be somebody's right-hand man/woman*) — someone who helps you with your work and who you depend upon, *протянуть руку помощи* (the same in English *give somebody a hand*) — to help someone. In these phraseological units a component *hand* develops a symbolical meaning «help», etc.

Unlike the proper symbol the role of the language symbol is concluded in the change of meaning of a language essence to a symbolical function. According to V.N.Teliya, «the word meaning in this case is endowed with a sense which doesn't indicate the proper referent of the word, but associatively «replaces» some idea». It is important to note that a material exhibitor of this replacement is not the reality itself, but the name. For example, in the Russian idiom *сердце кровью обливается* (the same in English *a bleeding heart*) it is not the reality *heart* that is a symbolical carrier, but the name the proper meaning of which is replaced with a symbolical interpretation: heart is an organ of feelings. Therefore, the cultural symbols embodied in a language body, are always the word meanings which carry out the function of symbols: lexical units are endowed with the meanings that are steadily associated with them. They point out the concepts which are not their proper lingual meanings. For example, in a Russian phraseological unit with semantics of fear *душа в пятки ушла* (to be scared) the meaning of the word *душа* (soul) maintains its symbolical interpretation as the organ of vital activity.

The important sources of cultural interpretation are the images of Christianity, theosophy and moral attitudes corresponding to them. Some phraseological units are connected with the biblical myths about the creation of the world, a deluge and the life of saints. The phraseological units that stem from religious dis-

courses can be different types of citation: a direct citation or an allusion to religious texts. For example, in Russian there is a phraseological unit *быть на седьмом небе от радости* (to be on cloud nine, to be very happy) the origin of which is in the Bible where various spheres of heaven are allocated. On the seventh sphere there is heaven. That's why this image is connected with the meaning of joy. *Нести крест* (the same in English *to bear/carry one's cross*) — to handle or cope with one's burden; to endure one's difficulties; where cross is the symbol of suffering. This image stems from the evangelical story about Jesus carrying a cross to the place of his crucifixion.

The **standard** is a stable comparison of qualities of the person or a subject with properties of the reality. Standards usually exist in the language in the form of figurative comparisons: in Russian *злой, как собака* (literally: as angry as a dog; very angry); *глуп, как пробка* (literally: as silly as a cork; very silly); *здоров, как бык* (literally: as strong as a bull; very strong); *тонкий, как былинка* (literally: as thin as a blade of grass; very thin); *толстый, как бочка* (literally: as fat as a barrel; very fat); *работать, как негр* (literally: to work like a Negro; to work very hard); *пьяный, как сапожник* (literally: as drunk as a shoemaker; someone who has drunk very much); in English *as hungry as a bear/a wolf*; *as big as an elephant*; *as white as snow*; *as tall as a giraffe*; *as strong as an ox*, etc. The standard comparisons, which are reproduced from generation to generation, are connected with the world outlook because they are «the result of the comparison of the proper human qualities with the «inhuman» qualities the carriers of which are perceived as standards of person's qualities». The basis of a standard may be a person or natural object, a thing which from the point of view of everyday cultural experience are the signs of quality dominating in them. For example, for the Russian the ram is silly (*глупый, как баран*), the bear is clumsy (*неуклюжий, как медведь*), the hare is cowardly (*трусливый, как заяц*), the fox is cunning (*хитрый, как лиса*), etc.; for the English the beaver is hardworking (*as busy as a beaver*), the lamb is gentle (*as gentle as a lamb*), the rabbit is timid (*as timid as a rabbit*) [9]. The bases of such steady comparisons make up one of the most important cultural codes in a certain cultural society and traditionally are reproduced in each generation.

The **stereotype**, unlike a standard, is the type existing in the world. It measures activity, behavior, etc. Behavior stereotypes being the most important among all the stereotypes can turn into rituals. The difference between them is that when there is a realization of stereotypes people may not realize the purposes of the actions. The ritual, however, always assumes an introspection concerning the meaning of its realization. The ritual is conditional and conventional. The sociological understanding of the ritual has more generalized character. According to V. Fuchs ritual is «a socially adjustable, collectively carried out sequence of actions which do not generate new concreteness and do not measure a situation in a physical sense, but process symbols and lead to a symbolical change of situations». By means of rituals the general cultural norms and values of the people are maintained. For example, some rituals are fixed in phraseological units: in Russian *преподнести хлеб-соль кому-либо* (literally, to give bread and salt to someone) — «to honour guests». In this phraseological unit the ritual ceremony is fixed: when meeting the guests of honour the Russians give them «bread and salt» — a loaf of bread and a saltcellar with salt. Another example is *класть в гроб (могилу)* (to bury a dead person). The meaning of the phraseological unit is accounted for a ceremony of the burial of the dead men. The **ceremony** thus is understood as the certain actions established by a custom or a ritual and embodying religious beliefs, household traditions, etc: for example, a phraseological unit *пойти под венец* (literally, to go under a wreath; to get married). The meaning of the phraseological unit is explained by the existence of the church ceremony of laying a wreath on the head of the groom and the bride [7].

One of the most important sources of cultural interpretation is the images from fiction, philosophy and history, i.e. from those forms of activity which embody an intellectual heritage of the nation and mankind as a whole. These sources belonging to different epochs and genres let us understand the meaning of phraseological units better [10]. For example, in Russian *положить, класть под сукно* (literally, to put under the cloth) — to postpone the solution of the case, not to pay attention to the request (it goes back to the system of jurisprudence of old Russia when the cases were tried with big delays. The papers were usually stored under the red cloth); *Потемкинские деревни* (literally, Potyomkin's villages) — eyewash (Potyomkin who made a trip to the Crimea with Catherine II ordered to build ostentatious settlements with painted log huts on the way of the empress, expose festively dressed people in order to show the prosperity of the new territory to the empress); in English *as well be hanged (or hung) for a sheep as a lamb* is something that you say when you are going to be punished for something so you decide to do something worse because your punishment will not be any more severe (in the past, people who stole lambs were killed, so it was worth stealing something more because there was no worse punishment); *the curse of Scotland* (cards) is the nine of diamonds (the card is called so because of the similarity to the coat of arms of the earl Dalrymple Stair who caused ha-

ted in Scotland because of his pro-English policy); *Admirable Crichton* is the scientist, the educated person, the man of science (James Crichton is the well-known Scottish scientist of the XVI century); *a Sally Lunn* is a sweet roll (by the name of the female confectioner of the XVIII century); *a Florence Nightingale* is a nurse (the English nurse, the organizer and the head of the group of nurses during the Crimean war of 1853–1856).

So, the source of the analysis of the cultural content of phraseological units is the interpretation of myths, mythologemes, archetypes, symbols, stereotypes, standards, rituals, and the nation's views, the lifestyle of the common people of the lingual society and the interpretation of the key universals [7].

Thus, we have come to the conclusion that phraseological units directly (in denotation) or indirectly (through the correlation of the associative and figurative basis to standards, symbols, stereotypes of national culture) bear cultural information about society and the world. Therefore phraseological units are fairly considered to be some kind of «the fount of wisdom» of the people, storing and reproducing mentality and culture from generation to generation.

References

- 1 Maslova V.A. Linguocultural studies: the course book for university students. — Moscow: Academy, 2010. — 208 p.
- 2 lomonosov-msu.ru/archive/Lomonosov_2007/10/Simonova.pdf.
- 3 Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and intercultural communication. — Moscow: Moscow State University, 2008. — 352 p.
- 4 dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/michelson_old/3167/from
- 5 ru.wiktionary.org/wiki.
- 6 Kunin A.V. The course of modern English phraseology: the course book for the students of foreign languages department. — Moscow: Phoenix, 1996. — 381 p.
- 7 Potapushkin N.A. Russian phraseological units in a linguocultural aspect. — Moscow: RUDN, 2000. <http://www.web-local.rudn.ru/web-local/uem/gumsoc/1/Html/.../potapushkin.doc>.
- 8 idioms.thefreedictionary.com.
- 9 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simile
- 10 Belaya E.N. Theory and practice of intercultural communication. — Moscow: FORUM, 2011. — P. 71,72.

Ү.И.Көпжасарова, А.Т.Қиқымова

Тілдің фразеологиялық қоры халықтың мәдениетін көрсететін құрал ретінде

Мақалада тіл мен мәдениеттің ара-қатынасы мәселелері қарастырылып, тіл халықтың ділі мен мәдениетінің көрінісі екендігі дәлелденді. Тілдің фразеологиялық қоры ақпараттық мәдениеттің өте құнды дерегі болып табылады. Мәдениет коннотациясының негізгі түсінігі белгіленіп, фразеологизмдердің мәдени интерпретациясы берілген. Авторлар тіл мәдениетінің фразеологизмдерден көрінетінін анықтаған. Орыс және ағылшын фразеологизмдерінің ұлттық-мәдени компоненттеріне талдаулар жасалған. Фразеологизмдер ұлттың мәдениетін қалыптастыратын аңыздар, әпсаналар, дәстүрлер мен әдет-ғұрыптарға байланысты пайда болады деген қорытындыға келді.

У.И.Копжасарова, А.Т.Кикимова

Фразеологический фонд языка как средство отражения культуры народа

В статье рассмотрена проблема взаимосвязи языка и культуры, отмечено, что язык — отражение культуры и менталитета народа. Особенно ценным источником культурной информации является фразеологический фонд языка. В статье определена сущность понятия культурной коннотации и выделены источники культурно-значимой интерпретации фразеологизмов. Авторами определен механизм отражения культуры в языке, в частности во фразеологизмах. Проведен анализ русских и английских фразеологизмов с национально-культурным компонентом. На основе данного анализа авторы пришли к мнению, что фразеологизмы отражают культуру народа через соотнесенность со стереотипами, мифами, легендами, преданиями, эталонами, ритуалами и т.д.