



Semantic Representation of the Concept *Success/Failure* in English, German and Georgian Somatisms

Nunu Kapanadze^{1*} & George Kuparadze²

¹Department of German Philology, Institute of West European Languages and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Tbilisi State University

²Department of English Philology, Institute of West European Languages and Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Tbilisi State University

ABSTRACT

Humans often use the conceptualization of body parts to perceive reality, and so it is not uncommon that this also influences language. In order to find out whether the body is perceived and described in the same way in different languages, we focus on the contrastive analysis of somatisms, a subset of set phrases containing names of body parts from the semantic field success/failure in English, German and Georgian.

The terms of body parts belong to the oldest layers of the vocabulary of any language. Human body parts are also used for the symbolic expression of various facts and conceptualized as the location of emotional and mental activities. We have tried to describe the occurrence of body parts and their distribution in the semantic representation of *success/failure somatisms*. The results of the analysis of equivalence levels take into account not only the levels of full and partial correspondence, but also somatisms for which there are no somatic equivalences in all three languages. The problem of phrasal false friends is also highlighted.

Keywords: *Set phrases, conceptualization, quantitative, qualitative, equivalence.*

Citation: Nunu Kapanadze & George Kuparadze (2022). Semantic Representation of the Concept Success/Failure in English, German and Georgian Somatisms. *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Studies*, 4(2), 36-44

INTRODUCTION

Recent approaches in linguistics show a growing interest in the historical and cultural foundations of human cognition, taking into account cultural traditions and models commonly shared in societies, from which our conceptualizations of abstract concepts derive.

The paper draws on the findings of cognitive linguistics, which explores how languages conceptualize the world. In cognitive linguistics, a holistic approach postulates that “meaning is conceptualization and it is equated with meaning” [1]. The author specifies the conceptualization as the processing of the world by the person, as the formation of concepts depending on the function of the person and his interaction with the environment.

A central analytical tool of Cognitive Linguistics is the cultural model: [Cultural models] “are presupposed, taken-for-granted models of the world that are widely shared by members of a society (although not necessarily excluding other, alternative models). They play an enormous role in understanding that world and in behaving in it” [2].

In other words, cultural models are complex conceptual systems that function as building blocks of a cultural group's cultural cognition [3].

Our main objective, on a contrastive level, is to determine, the concepts of *success/failure* as a cultural model underlying the selected somatisms, the subset of set phrases with names of human body parts in English, German and Georgian.

Since the phraseological inventory reflects the mindset, culture and worldview of a people, the comparison reveals the most important universal tendencies. Sinclair [4] states: [...] a language user has available to him or her a large number of semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they might appear to be analyzable into segments. To some extent this may reflect the reoccurrence of similar situations in human affairs; it may illustrate a natural tendency to economy of effort; or it may be motivated in part by the exigencies of real-time conversation. However, it arises, it has been relegated to an inferior position in most current linguistics, because it does not fit the open-choice model. (p. 320)

Similar universal tendencies should be even more evident in somatisms, i.e. a subgroup of set phrases containing body part names. Somatisms usually serve as expressions of emotional, mental characteristics and various actions of human beings, reflecting their relation to the environment and expressing the traditional symbolism of a body language as well as local or common traditions and superstitions [5]. For this reason, the assumption that somatisms with their underlying metaphorical concepts can have a universal character is legitimate. As Enfield & Wierzbicka [6] state:

Biological events associated with emotion are more or less the same everywhere ... but it is well established that the interpretation and linguistic description of such responses, and the cognitive and cultural routines associated with these, are not universal or species-determined at all. (p. 5)

This suggests that while biological events may in some cases inspire the conceptualization of emotions (and other non-physical experiences), this conceptualization is in no way predetermined by the biological events. They can be interpreted and described differently depending on the cultural models that emerge from the main concerns of the people and communities involved. „It is very possible that the number of physiological patterns [of experiencing emotion] is limited and universal, but there is no universality in the corresponding subjective experience“ [7].

Wirtz [8] defines success and failure as the positive or negative outcome of an effort in terms of the occurrence or non-occurrence of an intended, desired effect. Of course, success and failure are quite abstract, „evaluative concepts that we use to understand and interpret everyday events and activities“ [9], and they are treated as the achievement/non-achievement of „self-definable goals“ [10].

Anyway, the achievement of the goal is a success that depends on what the evaluator considers positive on the basis of his value system. If it is not possible to achieve the goal identified as desirable, there is a failure. From the above mentioned: The achievement/non-achievement of desirable goals includes evaluation categories such as success, achievement, progress, failure, stagnation or regression. However, their evaluative focus is different and while success, failure and defeat evaluate the outcome or status of the respective activity, progress, backlog and stagnation additionally emphasize the development of the activity over time.

If the original goal of an activity is achieved, progress is recorded; if the goal is missed, it stagnates or experiences regression. Accordingly, the conclusion is obvious: If a developing activity leads to a positive outcome, progress is associated with success, whereas stagnation and regression imply failure. Although success/failure somatisms (SFS) can occur in different domains, the main ones that immediately come to mind are „life, competition, struggle, development, technology, which can be further subdivided, e.g. play, sport, physical exercise, etc.“ [9].

CORPUS AND METHOD

The analysis of the somatic set phrases corpus we created is based on various dictionaries in printed and digital form as well as glossaries from the Internet. However, it must always be taken into account that the procedure used here can only represent a compromise: Only written sources are the information basis of the study. The decisive factor for including a word in the list of body parts was that the lexeme of the core component (also) denotes a human body part.

As the *tertium comparationis* is used a somatonym, in our case a human body part and its conceptualization (quite generally as success/failure)/meaning. Contrasting is primarily concerned with establishing the equivalence level of set phrases in the source and target languages. Henschel [11] argues that by equivalence we mean the communicative correspondence between the source and target language of a unit. This is achieved by matching denotation, connotation and functionality, including formal structure and component inventory, as closely as possible. Due to the differences in semantic and grammatical features, only an approximately full equivalence is ever possible. In linguistics, it is generally accepted that both *quantitative and qualitative* aspects can be used to establish equivalence correlations. In our paper, however, we focus only on *qualitative* aspects of equivalence. Three main types of qualitative equivalence correlations are *full, partial and zero equivalences* [12, 13, 14 & 15] and they are derived from the literal and phraseological meaning or structure. In the later studies, two further forms of equivalence are added: *purely semantic equivalence and pseudo-equivalence*. They are actually embedded in the trinomial classification by many phraseologists under the level *zero equivalence* (lack of equivalence). Therefore, the comparison of set phrases mainly refers to the first three equivalence levels, but since our case is not simply about the comparison of somatisms but about the conceptualization of success/failure, *purely semantic equivalences* are also used for paraphrasing in case of missing equivalences. The identified cases of *false friends/pseudo-equivalence* are provided in our description as well, in order to avoid confusing associations and to make the results available for practical application.

Taking into account the lexical, structural-syntactic and structural-semantic aspects, the mutual equivalents of set phrases are (can be) classified into the following five equivalence levels [12]:

- 1) full equivalence (complete equivalence);
- 2) partial equivalence;
- 3) zero equivalence (lack of equivalence);
- 4) purely semantic equivalence;
- 5) pseudo equivalence ('false friends').

DISCUSSION

Until we deal with the equivalence levels mentioned in the examples, some brief explanations would be useful. Since our comparison was carried out on the material from three languages, an asymmetry of equivalence levels would also be expected. Thus, many cases occur where equivalence levels coincide, e.g. between the language pairs German/English, English/German. The assumption that the situation would be different in the case of Georgian is quite logical due to the historical development of German and English on the one hand, and Georgian on the other, but besides the different correlations of equivalence levels, we come across quite a large set of SFSs with complete qualitative equivalence between Georgian and the other two languages.

For reasons of space and better illustration, we use tables and each form of the qualitative equivalence is briefly described and illustrated by the examples. In our study, of course, according to the method of contrastive linguistics, the somatisms are compared on the base of all three languages as source languages (SL) and the SFSs are also classified on the basis of the somatonyms. The final data of the comparison are also classified according to the frequency of SFSs and the correlation results.

1. Full equivalence (complete equivalence): A set phrase is fully identical both structurally and semantically in the source and target languages and has the same denotative, connotative and functional meaning. No considerable deviations in the grammatical and lexical composition of a set phrase in the target language (TL) are acceptable within limits of full equivalence, as in certain cases they are completely different language systems, e.g. morpho-syntactic deviations in the number or case, the use of a synonym or the composition of the word order.

Table 1: Full equivalence of SF-Somatisms according to the source language (SL)

Somatonym	Meaning	SL	TL	TL
<i>Skin / Haut /tkavi</i>	to be successful	to save (sb.'s) own skin/ hide.	die eigene Haut retten.	sakut'ar t'kavs gadairč'ens.
<i>Hand / die Hand /xeli</i>	unsuccessfully	empty-handed; to come away empty-handed; to come back empty-handed.	mit leeren Händen; mit leeren Händen gehen; mit leeren Händen zurückkommen.	xelc'arieli; xelc'arieli cava; xelc'arieli dabrundeba.
<i>Kehle/Throat /qeli</i>	to destroy; to ruin; to ruin (financially, health-wise)	sich die (eigene) Kehle durchschneiden; jm die Kehle durchschneiden /abschneiden.	to cut sb.'s (own) throat; to slit sb.'s throat.	qels gamoičris; qels gamočris.
<i>Hals/ Neck / kiseri</i>	to ruin /to destroy sb., s.th.	jm den Hals brechen.	to break sb.'s neck; to snap sb.'s neck.	kisers mostexs/ moitexs; kisers mougrxs.
<i>t'avi / Kopf / Head</i>	to do something which will put you in danger or a difficult situation	t'avš qulp'ši gauqris/ gahqop's.	den Kopf in die Schlinge stecken.	to put/to stick your head in a noose.
<i>guli / Herz /Heart</i>	to gain the love, affection, or admiration of someone	vinmes guls moigebs.	j-s Herz (für) sich gewinnen.	to win sb.'s heart.

2. Partial equivalence: The meanings of the contrasted set phrases are almost the same in contrasted languages. There are deviations in the *morpho-syntactic* and *lexical-semantic* composition:

Table 2: Partial equivalence of SF-Somatisms according to the source language

Somatonym	Meaning	SL	TL	TL
-----------	---------	----	----	----

<i>Eye</i>	to be always ready to use a situation to their own advantage	to have an eye for/to the main chance.	ein Auge für gute Gelegenheit haben.	t'validan arap'eri gamoepareba.
<i>p'exi (leg)</i>	to cause damage/harm	p'exk'kveš micas/ niadags/ saqrdens gamoaclis.	einer Sache / jm den Boden/den Teppich unter den Füßen wegziehen.	to pull the rug out from under sb.'s feet.
<i>Mund(mouth)</i>	to be depressed	den Mund/die Ohren/den Kopf hängen lassen.	to hang sb.'s head.	qurebs č'amoqris (lit. Ger.: Ohren fallen lassen).

The last example shows the case that often occurs in contrasting when the equivalence levels are asymmetrical. If we compare the set phrases with the source language somatonym *mouth*, we are dealing with partial equivalence. However, since other source language somatonyms, *head* or *ears*, can also occur in this German sentence with the same meaning, there is a full equivalence between the German and English sentences in the case of the somatonym *head*, but only a partial equivalence in the case of the Georgian. But when the somatonym *ears* is used in the source language SFS, the equivalence level is reversed: there is partial equivalence between German and English SFSs and full equivalence between German and Georgian SFSs.

3. Zero equivalence (lack of equivalence): The structural composition of set phrases in two languages is quite different, and the meaning of a set phrase in the source language can only be paraphrased figuratively with other words in the target language; somatisms of this type may have largely semantic correspondence in both languages, but their grammatical, lexical and figurative composition is substantially different, and the pragmatic purpose is lost.

Table 3: Zero equivalence of SF-Somatisms according to source language (SL)

Somatonym	Meaning	SL	TL	TL
<i>Head</i>	to be very adept at doing something, with very little or no difficulty; to be able to complete or accomplish something in a relaxed, carefree, or effortless manner.	etwas mit der linken Hand / mit links machen/ schaffen/ erledigen.	to be able to (do something) standing on sb.'s head.	ert'i xelis mosmit' (somatonym: hand).
<i>Ohr (Ear)</i>	s.th. goes wrong or fails unexpectedly	jm um die Ohren fliegen.	to blow up in your face.	xeli moec'areba (somatonym: hand).
<i>Knuckles</i>	the <u>act of speaking</u> to someone <u>severely</u> or <u>angrily</u> because of something they have done or <u>failed</u> to do.	to get a rap on the knuckles [fig.]	eins auf die Finger bekommen/ kriegen.	quri aucies (somatonym: ear); t'it'i dauk'nies (somatonym: finger).

4. Purely semantic equivalence: Set phrases that do not match either in their constituents or in their conveyed images have a purely semantic equivalence with their equivalents in the target language (TL). A somatism in language L₁ has no somatic equivalent in L₂ or L₃ and can be translated with a set phrase close to the meaning.

Table 4: Purely semantic equivalence of SFSs according to source language (SL)

Somatonym	Meaning	SL	TL	TL
<i>Foot</i>	to work hard on s.th.; to make it a success	to put sb.'s best foot forward.	sein Bestes tun / geben; sich von der besten Seite zeigen.	zal-gones ar daišurebs.
<i>Kopf</i>	to prevail; to assert oneself	seinen Kopf durchsetzen.	to get one's way; to have one's way.	t'avisas gaitans/miağcevs.
<i>xeli (Hand)</i>	to achieve success	1. xeli moemart'eba.	1. Glück (auf seiner Seite) haben; das große Los ziehen; Schwein haben.	1. sb.'s luck is in; to be favoured by fortune; to strike oil; to have a stroke of luck.

2. xels moit'bobs	aus etw. Kapital schlagen; seinen Nutzen aus etw. ziehen.	to cash in on s.th.; to get mileage out of s.th.; to draw a profit from s.th.
----------------------	--	---

5. Pseudo equivalence /False Friends: In cases where a somatism occurs in the contrasted languages with the same or similar formal composition but has a completely different meaning, it is a pseudo-equivalence or a so-called *false friend*. This term refers to formally identical or almost identical units of two languages whose meanings, however, have nothing to do with each other. The matching inner image is interpreted differently, and the deceptive sameness is a significant source of error [11].

According to Dobrovolskij/Piirainen [16], there are three reasons for these differences in the meaning of phraseological false friends:

- 1) false friends based on different conceptual metaphors
- 2) false friends based on different images
- 3) false friends based on a constituent. (p.108)

Taking this point of view into account, Belin [17] refers to the third point that occurs frequently as a cause of the apparent equivalence of somatisms. Lexically identical lexemes have primary and secondary meanings and the secondary meanings have different functions in other languages. It is precisely these secondary meanings that lead to false friends. In any case, the question of what can be classified as the cause of the pseudo-equivalence needs to be addressed further in order to arrive at a more satisfactory, if not definitive, solution.

As far as pseudo-equivalence is concerned, we could not identify any cases where two of three languages would show pseudo-equivalence with respect to one and the same SFS. Asymmetric correlations also occur here. E. g. the meaning *to be clumsy* can be expressed by SFSs in Ger.: *eine unglückliche Hand haben* and in Eng.: *to be all fingers and thumbs/to be all thumbs* and there is a partial equivalence between them, while a positive formulation of the same German SFS *eine glückliche Hand* shows purely semantic equivalence with *to have the right touch (when doing/choosing s.th.)*. In Georgian, however, there is a structurally and lexically identical SFS to the German somatism *eine unglückliche Hand haben* - *ubeduri xeli ak 'vs* (lit. *to have an unlucky hand*), but the meaning is: *to bring someone bad luck*, while *to be clumsy* can be expressed by a purely semantic equivalence: *mouxerxebelia, ar umart 'lebs*.

The German somatism *jemanden aufs Kreuz legen* (*to put someone on his/her back*) comes from the technical language of wrestling. A wrestler has defeated his opponent when he forces him to the ground so that both shoulder blades touch the earth at the same time (<https://www.redensarten-index.de/suche.php>), but as SFS it means colloquially *to cheat / to deceive*. An English equivalent would be *to double-cross sb.* with purely semantic equivalence, while in Georgian SFS *bečebze dasc 'ems* shows pseudo-equivalence level and means colloquially *to defeat sb.*, whether in sport or any other branch. For the meaning *to cheat/to deceive* there is a purely semantic equivalence in Geor.: *gaac 'uro, gaac 'ucu 'rak 'o*.

The following set phrases correspond structurally and lexically to the Georgian SFS *kuriszirši moxvdeba/miğebs* in German and English: *eins hinter die Ohren/ [eine]/ein paar hinter die Ohren bekommen/kriegen; to get a smack on the ear* with the meaning *to be slapped*. In Georgian, the SFS *kuriszirši moxvdeba/miğebs* figuratively means *to suffer defeat, to be defeated*, but also *to be criticized*.

In addition to these forms of varying, the cases in which zero equivalence and false friends can vary in different languages are also significant. For comparison, see Table 3 for SFR with the SL Eng.: *able to (do something) standing on one's head* and their equivalents. This Eng. SFS in meaning *very adept at doing something, with very little or no difficulty; able to complete or accomplish something in a relaxed, carefree or effortless manner*, has zero equivalence level in Ger.: *etwas mit der linken Hand/mit links machen/schaffen/erledigen*, i.e. *to be successful*. There is a structurally and lexically similar unit for the English SFS in Geor.: *t'avdaqira dadgeba*, but the meaning is: *to do everything to achieve one's goal, the planned one*. The table below illustrates a condensed picture of symmetry/asymmetry of the equivalence levels between the SFSs.

Table 5: Symmetry/asymmetry in the equivalence levels between SFLs

Somatonym	Meaning	SL	TL	TL
		<i>partial equivalence</i>		<i>purely semantic equivalence</i>
<i>Auge (Eye)</i>	without much damage; to get off lightly	mit einem blauen Auge davon kommen.	to get away with a black eye.	iolad gadarč'a.

<i>Bein (Leg)</i>	to harm intentionally sb.	<i>purely semantic equivalence</i>		<i>full equivalence</i>
		jm ein Bein stellen.	to trip sb. up.	fexs daudebs.
<i>Tooth</i>	having a hard time saying s.th. or explaining smth. or even reading s.th.	<i>partial equivalence</i>		
		to break a tooth [on s.th.].	sich die Zähne an etw. ausbeißen.	kbils mokvet's/ močris.
<i>Auge (Eye)</i>	to fail /to misfortune /to damage; to have bad consequences; to end badly	<i>zero equivalence</i>		
		ins Auge gehen.	to blow up in sb.'s face.	xeli moec'areba.

Results: Quantitative-Qualitative Correlation of SPSs

The statistics of the somatic set phrases we identified are presented in tables, but a brief overview of the contrastive and descriptive procedures will make the results and our approach more manageable.

The somatonyms and SFSs were identified in all three source languages and their equivalents in the target languages are indicated. We tried to find out as many SFSs as possible, but it is highly probable that not all (up to the last SFS) could be recorded. In certain cases, their identification also depends on the range of interpretation, i.e. the extent to which some of them conceptualize success/failure. For this reason, we have not included doubtful cases, and even if some unidentified SFSs can be added to the group of SFSs, this will not change the picture established by the quantitative-qualitative correlation.

German has the largest set of somatonyms and SFSs: from 27 different somatonyms 175 SFSs are derived, while in English and Georgian the numbers are as follows: Eng. 22 somatonyms and 156 SFSs; Geo.: 22 somatonyms and 126 SFSs.

Table 6: Number of Success/Failure Somatisms (SFS) according to the source languages:

Source languages	Somatonym	SFS		
		Total	Success	Failure
Ger.	27	175	78	97
Geor.	22	156	63	93
Eng.	22	126	49	77

Table 7: The percentage correlation of Success/Failure Somatisms (SFS) equivalents according to the source/target languages

Source language	Target languages	
Ger. 175	Eng. 72 (41,1 %)	Geor. 73 (41,7 %)
Source language	Target languages	
Eng. 126	Ger. 73 (56,9 %)	Geor. 54 (42,8 %)
Source language	Target languages	
Geor. 156	Ger. 69 (44,2 %)	Eng. 66 (42,3 %)

As for the conceptualization of *Success/Failure* in somatisms, in all three languages the conceptualization of failure predominates:

Table 8: The percentage correlation of Success/Failure in somatisms

Concept	Language	Ger. (175)	Eng. (126)	Geor. (156)
	Success		44,6 %	38,8%
Failure		55,4%	61,1%	59,6

To offer an explanation for this data, we refer to description of the term *negativity bias* by Stangl [18]: *negativity bias*, also called *negativity effect* or *negativity dominance*, is the social psychological phenomenon, and negative

thoughts, feelings or experiences have a stronger psychological impact than neutral or positive ones, even if they are equally strong. Although evolution seems to have made people susceptible to the negative, since it governs a primitive region in the brain, it has also endowed the more sophisticated regions of the human brain with cognitive abilities that allow people to stand up to negativity or make constructive use of it.

A kind of summary of the research conducted on this could be the title of a paper by R. Baumaister et al. *Bad Is Stronger Than Good* [19]:

That is, events that are negatively valenced (e.g., losing money, being abandoned by friends, and receiving criticism) will have a greater impact on the individual than positively valenced events of the same type (e.g. winning money, gaining friends, and receiving praise) (p. 323).

And language is precisely a *repository* in which these stored emotions find their verbal expression: Language provides one index of relative power, although naturally language is subject to multiple determinants. To the extent that negative emotions are more powerful and important, they should be more fully represented in the language. Sure enough, there appear to be more words for negative than positive emotions [19].

The same view is summarized and acknowledged in the cited article by Baumaister et al. [19] who also draw on research findings by Averill (1980) and Anderson (1965): “Among the non-emotional traits, there was a small preponderance of positive traits (57%), but among the emotional traits, the negative ones were in a clear majority (74%). Clearly, then, there are more words for bad emotions than for good ones” (p.332).

The data collected by us are a further evidence of the views cited above. As far as the variety of somatonyms is concerned, the top 5 somatonyms are: *foot/leg, head, hand, neck, eye*. *Foot* as the lowest part of the *leg*, and the two as parts of the body ensure movement. From the *hand*, action and doing, but also intention and execution can be read. The *hand* has also always been regarded as a symbol of violence and power, of possession and protection. The *head* is seen as the center of rational thought, thinking, willpower, etc. Thus, for each somatonym we can functionally cite certain facts that can form the basis for conceptualization.

But one peculiarity shows up in Georgian language in contrast to other two Germanic languages: Of course, in Georgian, as in all languages, there are names for human limbs: *terp* ‘i/foot, *p* ‘exi/leg, *xeli*/hand, *t* ‘it ‘i/finger, but in no Georgian Success/Failure somatism does the somatonym *terp* ‘i/foot occur. Georgian prefers in SFSs the somatonym *p* ‘exi/leg (despite our best efforts, we could not find in Georgian at least a single idiomatic set phrase with *terp* ‘i/foot) not even where in German and English *Fuß* /foot stand, whereas equivalent SFSs with *Bein*/leg/*p* ‘exi occur in abundance. Almost similar is the case with *Finger*/finger/*t* ‘it ‘i: In Georgian SFSs *t* ‘it ‘i/finger occurs only once, with non-equivalent English and German somatisms. As an equivalent to *t* ‘it ‘i/finger, somatonym *xeli*/hand is used. On the other hand, there are many equivalents among three languages with *Hand*/hand/*xeli*. The actions described in Georgian SFSs are performed with the same part of the body (*foot or finger*) as in German or English SFSs.

Georgian also tends to use hyphenated compositional somatonyms, where some body parts (which could be interpreted as associative equivalents) are represented in pairs: *xel-p* ‘exi (lit. *hand-leg), *t* ‘av-p ‘iri (lit. *head-mouth), *c* ‘xvir-p ‘iri (lit. *nose-mouth). Some of them can occur in SFSs, e.g. *xel-p* ‘exi ak ‘vs šexkruli (lit. sb.'s hands and legs are tied in the meaning *be thwarted/be powerless to act* or its opposite *xel-p* ‘exiak ‘vs gaxsnili (lit. sb.'s hands and legs are untied) that means *be able to act freely because something (such as a rule or law) prevents it*, *c* ‘xvir-piri caimtvria (lit. to break your nose and mouth) in meaning *to suffer failure, but not a total one*. Furthermore, dialectal variant *c* ‘xvir-piri daimtvria with the phraseological meaning of falling and suffering a trauma - has prevailed in everyday speech, also with figurative meaning: result of a failure caused by active or unreasonable action.

CONCLUSIONS

According to the widespread opinion in the scientific literature, somatic set phrases primarily verbalize feelings and these are in the majority associated with internal organs. *Success/failure* somatisms (SFS) show a different picture, as in this particular case the external body parts clearly predominate. We could identify SFSs with only one internal body part: the heart.

Finally, it should be noted that the conceptualized meaning captures only part of the range of meanings of the intended expression, that the meaning is unique in each act of use, experientially individual and subjective, and that this individual-subjective meaning-making is emotion-driven. That is why “[...] to understand language it is sometimes necessary to study extreme examples” [20]. The Awareness of this fact and successful communication guidance can significantly increase the flow and efficiency of any communication process.

Although the contrastively analyzed languages have different idiosyncrasies in their phraseological systems, numerous full and partial equivalences at the lexical, syntactic and semantic levels have been found in the contrasted somatisms. The perspectives of these results can be considered with regard to foreign language didactics, lexicology, lexicography or phraseography as well as translation. A literal rendering of an idiom leads in the vast majority of cases to mistranslations or misunderstandings. Therefore, it is a great help for foreign language learners and translators when the spectrum of idiomatic set phrases is thoroughly contrasted. The analysis and synthesis of set phrases used in literature and everyday language explain and compare the conceptualizations/meanings in concrete speech situations and contexts of use. The formation of linguistic-cultural competence promotes the understanding of set phrases as forms of expression of the national culture, the national and cultural characteristics of the language.

REFERENCES

1. Baldauf, Ch. (1997). *Metapher und Kognition. Grundlagen einer neuen Theorie der Alltagsmetapher*. Peter Lang.
2. Quinn, N., & Holland, D. (1987). Introduction. In D. Holland, & N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*. 3-40. Cambridge University Press.
3. Sharifian, F. (2008). Distributed, emergent cultural cognition, conceptualization, and Language. In R. M. Frank, R. Dirven, T. Ziemke, & E. Bernárdez (Eds.), *Body, Language, and Mind. Vol. 2: Sociocultural Situatedness* (pp.109-13). 6th ed. Mouton de Gruyter.
4. Sinclair, J. (1987). Collocation: A progress report. In R. Steele, & T. Threadgold (Eds.), *Language topics: An international collection of papers by colleagues, students and admirers of Professor Michael Halliday to honour him on his retirement*, 2 (pp. 319–331). John Benjamins.
5. Földes, C. (1985). Über die somatischen Phraseologismen der deutschen, russischen und ungarischen Sprache. Versuch einer konfrontativen Analyse. *Germanistisches Jahrbuch DDR-UVR*: S. 18-40.
6. Enfield, N., & Wierzbicka, A. (2002). Introduction: The body in description of emotion. In N. Enfield, & A. Wierzbicka (Eds.), *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 10: 1/2, pp. 1–24. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.10.1-2>
7. Van Geert, P. (1995). Green, red and happiness: towards a framework for understanding emotion in universals. *Culture and Psychology* 1, 259–268.
8. Wirtz, M. A. (2016). *Dorsch – Lexikon der Psychologie* (18. überarbeitete Aufl.). Hogrefe.
9. Langlotz, A. (2006). *Idiomatic Creativity: A cognitive-linguistic model of idiom-representation and idiom-variation in English*. John Benjamins.
10. Timwo Monthe, C. H. (2017). *Success Value Management: Irrlehre verstehen und kluges Management umsetzen*. (1. Aufl.). Baar.
11. Henschel, H. (1993). *Die Phraseologie der tschechischen Sprache*. Peter Lang.
12. Korhonen, J. (2007). Probleme der kontrastiven Phraseologie. In H. Burger, D. Dobrovol'skij, P. Kühn, & N. R. Norric (Hrsg.), *Phraseologie. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung. Hbd. 1* (S. 574-589). De Gruyter.
13. Burger H., Buhofer, A., & Siam, A. (1982). *Handbuch der Phraseologie*. De Gruyter.
14. Földes, C. (1990). *Die Bibel als Quelle phraseologischer Wendungen: dargestellt am Deutschen, Russischen und Ungarischen*. *Proverbium* 7, 57 – 75.
15. Földes, C. (1996). *Deutsche Phraseologie kontrastiv. Intra- und interlinguale Zugänge. (= Deutsch im Kontrast; Bd. 15)*. Julius Groos.
16. Dobrovol'skij, D., & Piirainen, E. (2005). *Figurative language: cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives*. Brill.
17. Belin A. (2008). Idiomatiche falsche Freunde im deutsch-schwedischen Wortschatz. <http://su.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:199904/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
18. Stangl, W. (2021). Stichwort: 'Negativitätsbias – Online Lexikon für Psychologie und Pädagogik'. <https://lexikon.stangl.eu/23062/negativity-bias-negativitaetsbias/>
19. Baumaisteroy, R., Bratslavsky, E., & Finkenauer, C. (2001). Bad Is Stronger Than Good. *Review of General Psychology*. Vol. 5. No. 4, 323-370 <https://assets.csom.umn.edu/assets/71516.pdf>
20. Smith, N. (1999). *Chomsky: Ideas and ideals*. Cambridge University Press.

Dictionaries

- I. Collins, V. H. *A Book of English Idioms with Explanations*. (1985). Greenwood Publishing Group, Incorporated.
- II. Duden. *Redewendungen*. (2020). Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik (11. Aufl.). Hg. von der Dudenredaktion.
- III. Friederich, W. (1976). *Moderne deutsche Idiomatik. Alphabetisches Wörterbuch mit Definitionen und Beispielen* (2. Aufl.). Ismaning.
- IV. *Lexikon der Redensarten*. (2007). Bedeutung und Herkunft von A-Z. Erfstadt.
- V. Müller, K. (2005). *Lexikon der Redensarten. Herkunft und Bedeutung deutscher Redewendungen*. Bassermann.
- VI. Oniani, Al. *Qartuli idiomebi*. (1966). Nakaduli.

- VII. Schemann, H., Knight, P. (1997). English-German Dictionary of Idioms: Supplement to the German-English Dictionary of Idioms. Routlage.
- VIII. Schemann, H., Knight, P. (2013). Dictionary of German-English Idioms. Routlage.
- IX. Schemann, H. (1992). Synonymwörterbuch der deutschen Redensarten. Klett.
- X. The American Heritage Dictionary of Idioms by Christine Ammer. (2013). Mariner Books; 2nd revised.
- XI. The Farlex Idioms and Slang Dictionary. (2017). Farlex International.

Internet resources:

- <http://www.redensarten-index.de>
- <http://www.dwds.de>
- <http://www.duden.de>
- <https://www.phrasen.com>
- <https://www.phraseo.de>
- <https://www.openthesaurus.de>
- <https://context.reverso.net>
- <https://www.de.langenscheidt.com>
- <https://www.dict.cc/>
- <http://www.pons.de>
- <https://www.phrasen.com>
- <https://www.phraseo.de>
- <https://www.dictionary.cambridge.org>
- <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/us>
- <https://www.merriam-webster.com>
- <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary>
- <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com>
- <https://www.idiomconnection.com>