

ბიბლიიზმი, ინტერდისციპლინარული ენობრივი ერთეული

მდივანი თამუნა
საქართველოს უნივერსიტეტი

სტატიაში გაშუქებულია ბიბლიიზმი, როგორ ინტერდისციპლინარული ერთეული, ბიბლიური კოგნიტური მეტაფორის ენობრივი გამოვლინება, რომელიც დასტურდება ყველა ქრისტიანულ ენობრივ სისტემაში. ბიბლიიზმი სინტაგმატურ ჭრილში ეკუთვნის ენობრივი იერარქიის სხვადასხვა დონეს, კერძოდ, მორფოლოგიურს, ლექსიკურსა და სემანტიკურს. აქედან გამომდინარე, ერთეულების შესწავლა ხდება სხვადასხვა დისციპლინის-ლექსიკოლოგიის, ფრაზეოლოგიისა და პარემიოლოგიის ფარგლებში. შესაბამისად, დასტურდება ერთეულების რამდენიმე ჯგუფი: სიტყვა ბიბლიიზმები, ფრაზეოლოგიური ერთეული ბიბლიიზმები და პარემიოლოგიური ერთეული ბიბლიიზმები-ბიბლიური ანდაზები და აფორიზმები. თითოეულ ჯგუფს ახასიათებს იმ დისციპლინების სინტაქსური თუ სემანტიკური მახასიათებლები, რომლის ფარგლებშიც ხდება მათი შესწავლა, მაგრამ ამავე დროს, აერთიანებს ბიბლიური კოგნიტური მეტაფორა, ბიბლიური ტროპი, რომელიც დასტურდება ყველა მათგანის სემანტიკურ სტრუქტურაში და რომელიც ერთეულს ინტერდისციპლინარულს ხდის.

Biblicisms, Interdisciplinary Language Units

Mdivani Tamuna
The University of Georgia

Centuries have been dedicated to studying the Bible-the divine book that interested so many scholars and scientists. The Bible has influenced not only the religion but the language and in general, the philosophy of the (Western) civilization. Despite geographical, cultural and eth-

nological differences, all Christians are united with comparably similar perception of the world, similar thesaurus, as the world vision and perception to a certain extent are determined by the religion itself. This, in my view, is well proved by a cognitive biblical metaphor belonging to the level of cognition and embedded in a language reality in various forms, including the ones determined as biblicisms. The biblicisms as the units of Christian languages vary according to time and space, but in spite of these variations they all preserve biblical archetypes, entering Christians' cognition throughout centuries and determining the way of their thinking, values and world vision.

Biblicism attracted the linguists' attention from the very beginning of the discipline. Linguists were basically interested in studying the biblicism as a type of phraseological unit (Kunin, 1972; Naumova, 2001; Sakvarelidze, 2001, among others), while late last century the study of biblicisms, as of a specific group, came to the front. The scholars already proceeded from the study of an independently functioning language unit (Fedoulenkova, 1997; Dubrovina, 1998; Khachapuridze 2004), which offered a wide range of material to literature, speech, etc., although the interdisciplinary nature of the unit was never mentioned.

Based on the model of a *language sign*, proposed by Lebanidze (1998), a biblicism as an interdisciplinary unit can be studied within syntagmatic and paradigmatic frameworks of the language system. In syntagmatics, a hierarchical topology of the signs are present, conditioned by the contradiction and interrelation of complete and incomplete signs, reflected on different levels of the hierarchy. Based on this concept, biblicisms, according to the syntagmatic approach, are present on morphological, lexical and semantic levels of the language hierarchy. On the morphological and lexical levels, the biblicism is represented by a single member unit-lexeme/word of biblical etymology, with the interdisciplinary characteristics, i.e. biblical trope revealed in its semantic structure as in the words «Paradise», «Angel», «Golgotha» and others with the equivalents traced in other languages as well (in Georgian, «Samotkhe», «Angelozi», «Golgota»; in Italian: «Paradiso», «Angelo», «Golgota»; in Russian: «Rai», «Angel», «Golgota», respectively). In these and other lexemes, when functioning as biblicisms, connotative meaning dominates denotative. For example, in «Angel», the denotative meaning of the word is a *divine creature*, while when functioning as a biblicism it describes a kind, honest and in general, a very positive person. The meaning of the word to a Christian is motivated without any special religious background knowledge, proving the common perception and thesaurus the Christian people have. «Sei proprio un angelo» (Eng: *you are a real angel*), an Italian will tell an addressee who has done him a favor; «Namdvili angelozia» (Eng: *is a real angel*) a Georgian would caress the child; «Be an angel and give me a hand», (International Dictionary of English, 1996, p. 44) an Englishman would apply to someone to ask for a help.

On the lexical level, another type of biblicism is also revealed - the maximal unit of the level – a biblical phraseological unit. As mentioned above, initially biblicism was only viewed from the phraseological approach, as phraseology was the only discipline within the framework of which the unit was studied. This, in my view, is due to the numeric number and importance of biblical phraseological units among other types. *Biblical phraseological units are the units of biblical etymology characterized by completely or partially (on components level) transferred meaning, and are represented at least by a two-member unit and often by a sentence.* Structurally they differ from word-biblicisms, but semantically they too contain biblical metaphor in their semantic structure. A biblical phraseological unit may be of biblical etymology with a direct prototype in the text of the Bible as «Daily bread» with inter-lingual equivalents: Georgian: «Puri Arsobisa», Russian «Khleb nasushnii», Italian «Pane quotidiano», all deriving from the prayer «Our Father»: «Give us today our daily bread» (Matthew 6:11). Nowadays the biblicism means something of vital importance and is so natural for the Christian languages that is evidenced in a large variety and different types of discourses. The same is true about the biblicisms, such as «Crown of thorns», «The garden of Adam», «To wash one's hands», etc. All these units derive directly from the Bible with prototypical phrases which can be either a free phrase, transferred out of the Bible or already a metaphoric unit. In the second case, we would deal with the units not deriving as ready made from the Bible, but formed based on a biblical event, personage, etc. That Christian nations perceive the world through the same lenses across different spaces is well-proven by identical biblicisms created by different languages without prototypical direct phrase in the Bible. For example, the biblicisms «Good works», «Doubting Thomas» with respective units in Italian, Georgian, and Russian Languages: «ketili saqmeebi», «urtsmuno toma», «Affari Buoni», «Fare come San Tommaso», «Dobrie dzela», «Foma nevernii». In spite of the fact that the syntactic metrics differ from language to language, all the units are united by common biblical metaphor present in their semantic structure. For example, in the mentioned unit «Doubting Thomas», it is infidelity, proceeding from a biblical event when the apostle Thomas did not believe in the resurrection of Christ until he saw Christ's wounds himself. Apart from similar biblicisms, a language may borrow a word from the Bible and based on its specific needs form a phraseological unit on its basis. Such units rarely coincide in languages, as in many cases, despite similar interpretation of biblical cognitive metaphors by different languages as argued above, the language may fill its metaphoric stock based on its needs and lack and consequently interpret some happening in «its own way». In the semantic structure of such units biblical archetype is mostly preserved: Georgian biblicism «Iudas Kerdzi» (Eng: dish of Judas), Italian «Ai tempi di Noe'» (Eng: of the times of Noah), Russian: «Kak u

Khrista za pazukhoi» (meaning to live comfortably without any needs), English “Amen to that,” etc. Despite these differences within the group of biblical phraseological units, they all preserve interdisciplinary biblical characteristics - biblical metaphor.

As the statistical study of the inter-lingual biblicisms used as the research material revealed, 42% of biblicisms have direct prototype in the Bible, while 58% are based on the Bible and formed by the languages.

Biblical words and phraseological units represent minimal and maximal units of the same hierarchy of the language system, but are studied within different disciplines - lexicology and phraseology. The interrelation of word and phraseological unit is one of the ardent issues dealt by linguistics. Frequently, the two types of units have been regarded identical because of the degree of commonality they have in common (Reformatski, 1967, Cachiari, 1993). Identification of the two types of units was basically because of metaphoric nature they are characterized by. Metaphor, in my opinion, is rather a general category, not only a distinctive feature for a phraseological unit but for other types of units not belonging to phraseology as well (Rusieshvili, 1989). Although in semantic aspect the two units have something in common (Berger, 1997, Alekhina, 1989), their structure should not be disregarded, as the word - the smallest part of the speech - is one story and the unity of words is another. A word is firstly part of a connotation and only afterwards it is part of a sentence. Proceeding from the said, phraseology should study a phrase, a unity of at least two words, while the word even complex in semantic structure, idiomatic and non-translatable in another language does not belong to phraseology, but should be studied by lexicology and lexicography (Larin, 1956). Together with lexicology, for the study of a metaphoric word another discipline should also be involved, in particular, stylistics-to decode stylistic devices present in the lexemes, although lexicology remains as the central discipline to study the word (Stubbs, 2002).

Another type of biblicism is proved on the semantic level of language hierarchies, where it is represented by the unit of a sentence structure: biblical proverb/aphorism, studied within paremiology. As a famous paremiologist Mieder describes, «Proverbs (are) those old gems of generationally tested wisdom, help us in our everyday life and communication to cope with the complexities of the modern human condition» (1995, p. 28). From the 1990s, the study of paremiology becomes rather actual. The opinions of the scholars as to what is included in the discipline differ (Ageno, 1960; Takhaishvili, 1961; Cram, 1983; Mieder, 1995; Rusieshvili, 2005). That the proverb as a basic object of the study of the discipline reflects the in-depth conceptualization of the world and cognitive perception (Rusieshvili, 2005) is, in my view, in the first place true about biblical proverbs, as they reflect all the possible situations or

events a human may face, the answer to the problems or issues, that may exist in the mankind.

Much has been said and written about the proverb, but its status has not been unanimously determined. According to Rusieshvili (2005, p. 6), one may distinguish among three different approaches to the proverb. The first approach coincides with the initial stage of the development of phraseology and is based on the concept that proverbs represent a part of phraseology, although they differ from idioms proper (Smirnitsky, 1956, Ageno, 1960.). According to this concept, a proverb is characterized by several peculiarities including metaphoric nature, transferred meaning, and fixed form, but at the same time it has features making it different from a phraseological unit, one of them being a communicative function it is usually used with. Based on another approach, a proverb is not included in phraseology, as it is not a PU* (Lejava, 1959, Anderson, 1971.) and therefore, is not characterized by structural and semantic peculiarities of a PU. Lejava thinks that a proverb is not a language unit, but a literary text (1959) while Emisova and Avaliani (Rusieshvili, 1999) regard it to be a communicative unit. According to the third concept, a proverb is a separate language sign, the unit of one of the levels of the language hierarchies (Dandes, 1975, Kartoziya, 1995). In spite of the similarity of PU and proverb, the difference between the two types of units is still noticeable: a proverb is a unit of general reference, while a PU has always its definite reference. At the same time, a proverb is based on in-depth, metaphoric perception of language rules, while a PU is a sensory - physical, rather superficial - and usual nomination of something, not to mention their structural difference, namely that a proverb always takes the form of a sentence while a PU can be a two word unit as well (Rusieshvili, 2005). Proceeding from this concept, although biblical archetype is present both in biblical PU and proverb, in a deep hierarchical structure of a proverb semantic opposition is revealed, something that is missing in the case of a PU. The examples of biblical proverbs are as follows: «Not to let one's left hand know what the right hand does», «Let us not be weary in well doing», «He who lives by the sword shall die by the sword», «When the blind leads the blind, both shall fall into the ditch», «Better a dinner of herbs than a stalled ox where hate is»; Italian: «Il buon vino allieta i cuori degliuomini», «Non dare le perle ai porci», «Perche` seminarano vento e raccoglierano tempesto», Georgian: «nu scnobs marcxena sheni, rasa iqmodes marjvena sheni», «rasac dastes, imas moimki»; Russian: «Pust levaya ruka ne znaet chto tvorit pravaya» etc.. All these units differ in structure from the rest types of biblicisms, as they represent complete sentences with all the necessary elements of the sentence, while a word-biblicism is a single member unit, and a PU may be a phrase. Different from phraseological units, proverbs are provided to languages ready made (although in the course of time a ready made proverb may undergo

modification). Consequently, apart from lexicology, phraseology and stylistics, paremiology is also included in the study of biblicisms that once again points to the interdisciplinary nature of the biblicism.

The biblicism, characterized by a transferred meaning is metaphoric. The history of the study of metaphor is mostly the history of semantics. Although according to some viewpoints, the place of a metaphor is arguably within pragmatics. For example, Grice (1975) regards the metaphor to be the deviation from the norm together with irony and hyperbole. The norm in this case is a maxim. If the speaker violates the maxims, the listener tries to search similar proposition, implied by the speaker and tries to decode the said (Grice, 1975, pp. 115-120). Nebieridze regards pragmatics to have great influence on such semantic processes as they are metaphor, metonymy, and synecdoche (1991, p. 35). While according to a contrary viewpoint, metaphor is a semantic category and cannot not be studied within pragmatics. As distinct from both approaches, Rusieshvili thinks that a metaphor is a pragma-semantic category (Rusieshvili, 2003, p. 87). Supporting this concept, based on the first group of biblicisms, i.e. word-biblicisms, it can be argued that although in the units connotative meaning dominates denotative, metaphoric nature is only examined by the context- only in speech acts the unit as a biblicism is revealed. For example, independently taken units *Communion, Cross and Judas* out of the context may be regarded as the lexemes of religious meaning or as metaphoric units. The metaphoric nature is revealed in the context and the units may be correctly decoded by listener. As for other groups of biblicisms - PUs and proverbs, the units have the meaning independent from the context, while in the context they acquire additional load. As mentioned above, unlike a PU, a proverb is a unit of general reference and always has constative function (according to the classification of speech acts of Ostene, 1971). The semantic structure of a proverb is a unity of three hierarchical levels: 1. explicit meaning 2. implicit meaning 3. presupposition (Rusieshvili, 2005). To illustrate the said, in the proverb: «Not to let one's left hand know what one's right hand does» on explicit level an explicit opposite structure is registered: *Right-Left*, while on implicit level the unit is already decoded through semantic search, based on speaker's mentality, cultural schemata and the following meaning is registered: *do the good work hidden, the work done for others to see is not the good work*. On the propositional level, different associations may emerge, which would be basically intermingled with the context. The same is true about biblical phraseological units. In the discourse from Italian reality:

«*Ma adesso che posso fare io* »?

«*Chi cerca, trova*». (Eng: "Now what can I do? Who seeks, finds) the speaker of the speech act asks for the advice from the listener. Instead of giving a definite advice, the listener uses a biblical idiom which should be

decoded easily by the speaker proceeding from the background knowledge to learn about the pragmatic intention of the listener. On the explicit level, we face the opposite structure: *search-find* (as the unit derives from a biblical aphorism); on implicit level, the said is equipped with the illocutionary force of indirect directive and aims at encouraging the speaker, pushing to action, which can be regarded as the perlocutive force of the said, its presupposition. As it follows, among the biblicisms the first group -word biblicisms are always chained to the context, for example, speech acts they are used in to encode/decode their function as of biblicisms, while PU and proverb biblicisms acquire additional load, for example, perlocutive force in the speech acts, but their interdisciplinary characteristics is revealed even out of context.

Therefore, each group of biblicism is unique and is characterized by the peculiarities making the groups different from one another. In syntagmatics biblicisms are represented by the units of different levels of language hierarchies and are examined within the disciplines studying the units of these levels: *word-biblicism within lexicology, PU-biblicism within phraseology, proverb/aphorism i.e. sentence-biblicism within paremiology*. These disciplines differ from each other but at the same time are inter-chained. Three types of units are distinguished and united because of their interdisciplinary characteristics: *biblical etymology and metaphoric nature* present in all types of biblicisms.

References

- Khachapuridze, L. (2004). *Georgian Orthodox Parish Speech*. [k'art'veli mart'Imadidebeli mrevlis metkveleba]. Dissertation. Tbilisi.
- Lebanidze, G. (1998). *Antropocentrism and Communicative Linguistics*. [ant'ropoc'entrizmi da komunikac'iuri lingvistika]. Tbilisi: Language and Culture.
- Lejava, L. (1959). The Language of Georgian Proverbs. *The Structure of Georgian Languages*, ¹1, 139-167. [K'art'ul andazat'a ena. K'art'velur enat'a struk'turis sakit'xebi]
- Nebieridze, G. (1991). *Introduction to Linguistics*. [enat'mec'nierebis šesavali]. Tbilisi: Education.
- Ruseishvili, M. (1989). *Idioms in English, Georgian and Russian Languages*. [Idiomebi inglisur k'art'ul da rusul enebši]. Doctoral Thesis. Tbilisi
- Ruseishvili, M. (1995). *Proverb. Monography*. [Andaza. monograp'ia]. Tbilisi.
- Ruseishvili, M. (1999). *Proverb- Functional Issue, Semantic and Pragmatic Parameters*. [Andazebi-p'unck'c'iuri arsi, semantikuri da pragmatuli parametrebi]. Doctoral Thesis. Tbilisi. 89-101.

- Sakvarelidze, N. (2001) Theory of Translation. [T'argmnis t'eoriiis sakit'xebi]. Tbilisi University Press.
- Takiashvili, A. (1961). Georgian Phraseology. [k'art'uli p'razeologiis sakit'it'xebi]. Tbilisi. Press of Academy of Science.
- Alekhina, A.I. (1989). *Phraseological Unit*. [Frazeologièeskaja edinica]. Moscow: High School.
- Fedulenkova, T. (1997). *Phraseology of Bible*. [Biblejskaja frazeologija]. Omsk: Russia and the East.
- Kunin, A.V. (1972). *Modern English Phraseology*. [Sovremennaja Angliskaja Frazeologija]. Moscow: High School.
- Naumova, I.O. (2001). *Phraseological Commonalties of Biblical Origin in Russian and English in Language and Culture*. [Fraseologièeskaja sxodstva biblejskovo proisxaždenija v ruskom i angliskom jazike i literature]. *Journal Issues of Philology*. Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Foreign Languages. Moscow: R-T press.
- Smirnitsky, I. (1956). *English Lexicology*. [Leksikologija angliskovo jazika]. Moscow: University Press.
- Zagot, M. (2003). *Russian-English Dictionary of Biblicalism*. [Rusko-angliskji biblejskji slovar'] Moscow:Valent
- Agno, F. (1960). Premesa a un Repertorio di Frasi Proverbiali. *Romance Philolog*. XIII/3, 242-264.
- Anderson, S.R. (1971). *On the Linguistic Status of the Performative/Constative Distinction*. Indiana University: Linguistics Club.
- Austin, J. (1971). *Performative versus Constative*, in Searle: Philosophy of Language, London: CUP, .13-22.
- The Bible*, (1971). Glasgow: the British and Foreign Bible Society.
- Burger, H. (1998). Idiom and metaphor: their relation in theory and text. , in : *Phraseology and Paremiology (International Symposium, September 2-5, 1997, Liptovský Ján)*, Bratislava: Akadémia PZ, 30-36.
- Cambriadge, (1996). *International Dictionary of English*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Cacciari, C. (1993). *The Place of Idioms in a Literal and Metaphorical World*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cram, A. (1983). The linguistic status of the proverb. *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 2, 43-78.
- Dandes, A (1975). On the Structure of the Proverb. *Proverbium* #5. Texas, 179-199.
- Dubrovina, K. (2001). From the Bible to Russian biblical idioms, retrieved August 28, from www.rudn.ru/en/?pagec=411.

- Larin ,A. (1956). On Phraseology, *journal: Philology*. №198, Moscow, 45-49.
- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation in: Cole and Morgan Syntax and Semantics, Speech acts*. NY: New York Academic Press, 113-128.
- Mieder, W, (1995). The apple doesn't fall far from the tree; a historical and contextual proverb study based on books, archives and databases, de proverbso: *journal of international proverb studies*, N1, 200-289.
- Reformatskii', A.A. (1967). *Ocherki po yazikovedzeniu*. Moskva: Akadzemiya nauk.
- Stubbs, M. (2002). *Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- ASDA Baldini, M, (1999). *Milli Proverbi Italiani. tascabili feconomici newton*. Bologna: Zanboni.
- Casadei, F. (2001). *Breve Dizionario di Linguistica*, Roma (Carocci).

Footnote:

* PU-phraseological unit