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SUMMARY

In this dissertation, I examine metaphorical expressions of biblical and sacral origin (bibleisms) that occur in Russian narrative literary texts. The interpretation of bibleisms is carried out within the framework of interaction theories of metaphor, making it possible to account for the use of bibleisms in Modern Russian, and for the role of their original meanings in the development of their new metaphorical associations. This is viewed as a set of intertextual relationships between the biblical and sacral texts, the Modern Russian language and the literary texts in which the expressions occur. Different types of metaphor are distinguished in terms of interaction theory. This has implications for the translation of bibleisms. It is demonstrated that in different interactive situations, the same bibleism can be referred to different types of metaphor, and hence the translation procedure may only be determined by taking into account the metaphorical language in each individual case.
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interaction of the associations
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The present study of Russian metaphorical expressions of biblical and sacral origin in relation to their English equivalents has been inspired by the following two factors: 1) Russia's increasing interaction with the rest of the world, which raises the issue of successful communication between the representatives of different cultures (i.e. cross-cultural communication); and 2) the revival of interest in religion and the Bible in Russia.

In this dissertation, the study of metaphorical expressions of biblical and sacral origin is viewed as a specialised field within a study of metaphorical language in general. Metaphorical expressions are almost always specific to a particular culture and language, and may often cause translation problems. Studying the metaphorical expressions of a certain language enables us to gain a deeper insight into some very important aspects of the particular language and culture, providing the background knowledge which is essential for successful cross-cultural communication (Tomakhin, 1982). Studying the relation of Russian metaphorical expressions to their English equivalents may prove to be useful for translation purposes, because there is much interaction between Russia and the English-speaking countries, and a great deal of literature is being translated from Russian into English and vice versa.

To a large extent, both the Russian and English-speaking peoples are rooted in the Judaeo-Christian heritage. The influence of this heritage and the Bible upon cultural life, spirituality and the languages of these peoples has been pervasive. This influence is particularly evident from a general fact (to be demonstrated in the rest of this study which focuses on the Russian language) that among the metaphorical expressions
frequently used by Russian and English speakers, a considerable number would appear to be of biblical and sacral origin.

In the former Soviet Union, religion was persecuted. Many churches were destroyed and the Bible was virtually banned from 1926 until 1956 (Bychkov, 1990). If it were known that one adhered to a particular faith and observed religious days, it would be a stumbling-block in one's career in any field. An overview of the available literature on expressions of biblical and sacral origin used in Modern Russian (Babkin, 1964; 1970; Shanskiy, 1985; Mokienko, 1986; Fomina, 1990; Kotova, 1993; Dann, 1994) has revealed that a study of this group of expressions has not been given enough attention. Some lexicographers, evidently fearing accusations of being "too religious", often marked the expressions containing the word Божьес (God), and other expressions of biblical and sacral origin, as "obsolete" (Mokienko, 1986:132). Nevertheless, it is quite obvious that such expressions are still widely used in the Russian language, in common speech as well as in literary texts. It is therefore unwise to avoid a study of them. It has been recognised (Dann, 1994) that such expressions are now used more frequently in all sorts of contexts than was the case during the Soviet Union era. For someone who is not familiar with the history of the Russian language, it may be difficult to understand the language of the contemporary Russian mass media and, consequently, it may be difficult to understand what is happening in contemporary Russia.

Religious persecution and prohibition of the Bible have done much harm to the cultural and spiritual life of the Russian people, because real appreciation of the references to the Bible that occur in the Russian language, as well as in world literature and art, requires background knowledge which many modern ordinary Russian speakers may have lost as a result of their lack of familiarity with the Bible itself. I use my fellow students at the Irkutsk State Teachers' Training Institute of Foreign
Languages and myself as examples of the ordinary educated Russian speakers who were born between 1965 and 1972. All assumptions about the 'ordinary educated speaker/reader of Russian' in the present dissertation refer to this group of speakers. These are based on my personal experience and impressions, and not on empirical study.

Since the situation is presently changing, and religion is no longer persecuted in Russia, we observe a revival of Christianity in that country. Evidently, Russians are greatly interested in the Bible and other sacral texts; also in literature containing a wealth of information about them: historical, religious, literary and linguistic.

In the English-speaking countries, the Bible has been available to ordinary readers for a long time. However, it has been admitted that elementary knowledge of the Bible has declined among young English-speakers in recent years, since public schools do not teach religion any more (Alter & Kermode, 1987; Hirsch, et al 1988).

My interest in the Bible is not that of a biblical scholar but of a literary one. I view the Bible as an influential literary intertext that has enriched both the Russian and the English languages with numerous figurative expressions. Therefore knowledge of the influence of the Bible on Russian and English is essential for our cultural literacy. This is knowledge that enables a writer or reader to know what other writers or readers know within the literate culture (Hirsch, 1987). There are cultural and denominational differences pertaining to the two languages (e.g. the order of the books comprising the New Testament in the Russian and in the English Bible is slightly different); I shall not, however, discuss such differences in detail. These could raise interesting issues for interdisciplinary research, but are beyond the scope of this study, which attempts to provide a possible model for studying some frequently used
Russian expressions of biblical and sacral origin by students of Russian
and English.

The subject of this study is the group of expressions of biblical and sacral
origin that belong to metaphorical language use, and that are registered
in the dictionaries of Russian usage. Calling the expressions concerned
metaphorical expressions of biblical and sacral origin (образные
выражения библейского и церковно-кинжного происхождения), I use
the terminology of such scholars as Ashukin & Ashukina (1960), Babkin
among others, who investigated the etymology and origins of Russian
phraseology, and acknowledged the conventional origin (условное
происхождение) (more detail in section 2.1.) of these expressions. As a
matter of principle, my definition entails a more general religious origin
than a strictly biblical one. However, the examples that have been chosen
for the detailed analysis in this dissertation are mainly of biblical origin. I
therefore generally refer to them as metaphorical expressions of biblical
origin or bibleisms, the term used by some scholars (e.g. Kunin, 1986;
Mateshich & Birikh, 1994) as an umbrella term for naming all expressions
of apparent biblical and sacral origin. The associations that such an
expression has in the Bible are referred to in this study as its original
associations or original meaning.

The objectives of this study are: 1) to investigate the use of bibleisms that
have entered Russian usage, i.e. to investigate what new associations they
have acquired in Modern Russian, and how these new associations relate
to their original meaning in order to enhance our understanding of these
expressions; and 2) to establish whether equivalents of the same origin
have entered English usage, and if not – to investigate the possible ways
of translating such Russian expressions into English.
I investigate the use of Russian bibleisms on the basis of selected Russian narrative literary texts ranging from the sixties to the nineties, namely novels and short stories by native Russian—speaking authors such as Aksyonov (1965; 1969; 1985; 1987), Voinovich (1976; 1987; 1990), Grossman (1970), Druzhnikov (1989) and Dombrovskiy (1989). Most of the works by these authors have been translated into and published in English. For those Russian texts where English translations were not available, the English translations of the quotations from these works are mine. Besides the selected texts, some literary extracts have been borrowed from Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka, Akademiya Nauk SSSR (Dictionary of the Modern Russian Language, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1948—1969), further referred to as Slovar'. 1948—1969. English literary extracts containing English bibleisms are quoted from various English dictionaries. For practical reasons, this study is limited only to British English. (American spelling of some sources quoted, however, is left unchanged.)

The analysis and interpretation of metaphorical expressions of biblical origin are carried out in this dissertation within the framework of interaction theories of metaphor that in the past few decades have been widely accepted as legitimate explanations of metaphor (Waggoner, 1990). They provide a framework that makes it possible to account for the functioning of metaphor in different interactive situations. I therefore propose to apply insights derived from these theories to the interpretation of bibleisms functioning in different literary contexts.

Bibleisms analysed in the present dissertation have been chosen from 143 instances of bibleisms found in the selected secular literary texts (the total number of pages is approximately 4 500, whereas the total number of different bibleisms encountered in these pages is 41).
Russian biblical quotations in the present dissertation are from the Russian Synodal Bible (Библия: Книги священного писания Ветхого и Нового Завета), sometimes with reference to the Church Slavonic Elizabeth Bible (Новый Завет Господа Нашего Иисуса Христа). The Church Slavonic Elizabeth Bible (1751) and the Russian Synodal Bible (1876) are most often reprinted by various publishers in Russia and abroad, and are thus most easily accessible to the Russian people. That these translations have influenced Russian vocabulary is evident from the occurrence of numerous figurative expressions, such as зла́ба дни́ (lit. 'the evil of the day', i.e. the topics of the day), притча во язы́цах (lit. 'a proverb (an a byword) among all nations', i.e. the talk of the town), блудный сы́н (prodigal son), заблу́дшая о́вца (lost sheep), Фома неве́рующий (doubting Thomas) (Словар' 1948–1969).

English equivalents of the biblical quotations in this dissertation are from the King James Version, the most famous translation of the English Bible ordered by King James I in 1611. It has been acknowledged that the English language owes a lot to the King James Bible. The Bible has provided many quotations and allusions that have become proverbial and owe their general use to this translation in particular. For instance, the golden calf, vanity of vanities, the voice of one crying in the wilderness, the burning bush, prodigal son, good Samaritan (McArthur, 1992:121).

The objectives and the scope of this study as outlined above are reflected in the following organisation of the dissertation:

A basic theoretical background for the investigation of Russian bibleisms is provided in Chapter 2 by surveying the existing works on these expressions in Russian and English (2.1), and by discussing relevant aspects of metaphorical language (2.2). On the basis of the theoretical views discussed, the key components are selected in a proposed method
for the interpretation and translation of bibleisms that occur in Russian narrative literary texts (2.3).

Chapter 3 comprises the analysis and interpretation of the data. The examples have been especially selected to demonstrate the functioning of bibleisms as different interpretative types of metaphor. Conclusions about the findings of this study are provided in Chapter 4.

The list of Russian expressions of apparent biblical and sacral origin, with specific references to their sources and with their English translations, is presented in Appendix 1. This list contains the expressions registered in the Russian dictionaries that have been consulted in the course of this study. It may be used for reference purposes and gives an idea of the approximate quantity of bibleisms used in Modern Russian speech and writing. Appendix 2 presents possible interactive situations of the nine bibleisms discussed in this dissertation summarised in nine tables.
CHAPTER 2:
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF
METAPHORICAL EXPRESSIONS OF BIBLICAL AND SACRAL ORIGIN

2.1 SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON BIBLEISMS

An overview of the available literature on metaphorical expressions of biblical and sacral origin reveals that, in the former Soviet Union, the question of the relation of these expressions to their sources has often been neglected. So far, the precise structure, function and significance of Russian bibleisms have not been investigated in detail (Mokienko, 1986; Kotova, 1993; Dann, 1994). Nevertheless, the biblical origin of many such expressions has been acknowledged by a number of Russian scholars (e.g. Babkin, 1964; 1970; Shanskiy, 1985; Mokienko, 1986; Fomina, 1990; Kotova, 1993) and stated in dictionaries (e.g. Slovar’ 1948—1969; Molotkov, 1978; Ashukin & Ashukina, 1960; Walshe & Berkov, 1984).

It is possible to identify bibleisms with the help of the dictionaries of so-called winged words by Maksimov (1955), Ashukin & Ashukina (1960), Walshe & Berkov (1984). These dictionaries contain a large number of bibleisms used in Russian speech and writing with specific reference to their sources. The work of Walshe & Berkov (1984) is especially valuable to this study. Being the first attempt to compile a Russian—English dictionary of winged words, where the meanings of the Russian winged words are explained in English, it also provides English equivalents for the Russian entries where possible. Among the nearly 1900 entries contained in this dictionary, I found that approximately 180 are marked as expressions of biblical origin. In the Ashukins’ work, which was taken as a basis for the dictionary of Walshe & Berkov, I discovered 164 bibleisms among almost 1400 popular Russian expressions. This dictionary demonstrates how expressions of biblical origin function in Modern Russian. All the entries are
supported by examples taken from 19th and 20th century Russian literary texts, the mass media, speeches by famous politicians, etc.

The term **winged words** (крылатые слова) is not commonly used in English lexicology. This term (used in Russian) is a loan translation of the German "geflügelte Worte", which in turn, is a loan translation of the Greek "epea pteroenta" used by Homer in The Iliad. The first dictionary of winged words was compiled by the German linguist Georg Büchmann (1864). Büchmann included in this category expressions of biblical origin (names, idioms and quotations), i.e. expressions that he could track down to the Bible, since he gave the name "geflügelte Worte" to words, phrases and sentences which are derived directly or indirectly from a literary or historical source, and which are commonly used in speech and writing as lexical units (Büchmann, 1864:XII).

Ashukin & Ashukina (1960:4) emphasise that the origins of some winged words cannot be traced with absolute accuracy. The situation is especially difficult in the case of the landmarks of antiquity that are known to us in their translations rather than in their original languages, and that is why they (e.g. the Bible), are considered as conventional sources (условные источники) of many expressions that appear in them and have later entered common usage (Ashukin & Ashukina, 1960:5). This is the case with the Bible and bibleisms. There are many expressions that do not appear in the Bible, but were created later on the basis of the stories described in the Bible (e.g. в костюме Адама (lit. 'in Adam’s suit')). The biblical origin of the expressions dealt with in this study is therefore to be understood as a conventional origin (условное происхождение).

Some scholars argue that the notion of winged words is 'not scientific enough', for these expressions form a very vague non-linguistic category
which is not homogeneous. Shmeleva (1964), for instance, attempts to
categorise this group of lexical units on a more scientific basis. She tries to
provide a framework which will make it possible to distinguish, within a
group of winged words, those expressions that belong to metaphorical
language use, and, within the latter, to distinguish those that belong to
idiomatic language use. This will make it possible to account for the new
associations that bibleisms have acquired and are acquiring in modern
usage. Shmeleva (1964:185) refers to an expression as metaphorical if its
meaning is not derived from the individual meanings of its components.
Among various winged words she considers to be metaphorical expressions,
Shmeleva names several Russian bibleisms (e.g. бросить камень в кого—либо (to cast a stone at somebody), в поте лица (by the sweat of one's brow), ни на йоту (not a jot (or title)). According to Shmeleva (1964:198), a
metaphorical expression enters idiomatic language use only when the
process of its metaphorisation has been completed, i.e. when its
motivatedness is no longer obvious and it becomes a dead metaphor (the
issue of the 'death' of metaphors with reference to more recent research is
discussed in section 2.2.1.3). Shmeleva explains the completion of
metaphorisation of winged words in the following way: the author or the
source and the primary context of the expression are forgotten. In other
words, the process of metaphorisation has been completed when a winged
word loses the connection with its original associations. Such an expression
may be considered an idiom. Shmeleva excludes from the category of
idioms those expressions that do not comply with the formal features of an
idiom (e.g. single words or full sentences). Thus, not all bibleisms that are
registered in the dictionaries of winged words, and that can be considered
metaphorical expressions, belong to idiomatic language use.

The term idiom is used in grammar and lexicology to refer to a sequence of
words which is semantically and syntactically restricted, so that they function
as a single unit (Crystal, 1991). This term and the question of the criteria for determining idiomatic status have attracted considerable discussion among modern theoreticians (Makkai, 1972). Various definitions and categorisations of idioms in terms of forms of expressions, grammatical constructions and degree of idiomaticity have been suggested by many scholars. In the present study, I deal with bibleisms that, according to some theoreticians, may be considered idioms, but according to others, may not. The classification of bibleisms as different types of idioms lies outside the interest of the present study. I will therefore not use the terms *idiom* or *idiomatic language use* in relation to bibleisms in this dissertation.

The new metaphorical associations that certain bibleisms have developed in Modern Russian are viewed by some scholars (e.g. Babkin, 1970; Shanskiy, 1985; Fomina, 1990) as becoming so distant from their sources, that the new associations they have acquired and are acquiring, no longer depend on the original associations. New metaphorical associations of these expressions are generally viewed as being very remote from the associations of their prototypes. However, a contradiction encountered in Babkin’s (1970) analysis of associations of some bibleisms was one of the factors that stimulated the investigation of the role of metaphorical origins of bibleisms in the development of their new associations in the present study.

Babkin’s work on the history of Russian phraseology includes a detailed analysis of several expressions of biblical origin (Babkin, 1970:151–180). Babkin maintains that the expressions of biblical origin retained by tradition continue to function in the Russian language of the post-revolutionary era, acquiring new qualities and meanings. He also claims that modern Russian speakers who use such expressions, do not associate them with their former meanings, and that this is the reason why they hold such a firm position in modern Russian phraseology (1970:151). Explaining several expressions of
biblical origin, Babkin begins the analysis of each bibleism (e.g. святая святых (the Holy of Holies)) by describing the original meaning of the bibleism. However, his discussion of the original specifications appears to be incomplete, since he does not support these considerations with a quotation from the Bible. Secondly, he provides numerous examples from various literary sources and mass media to exemplify the different associations (or in his terms, shades of metaphorical meaning) the bibleism has acquired in Modern Russian. Babkin also emphasises that some expressions of biblical origin have acquired new metaphorical meanings in Modern Russian which are not even implied in the Bible ("на которые в Библии нет и намека") (1970:173), i.e. the new associations have nothing in common with the originals. (I find these conclusions insufficiently convincing without an analysis of a quotation from the Bible to illustrate the original specification of the expression in question). Furthermore, a certain contradiction between this statement and the analyses of some biblical expressions can be found in Babkin's own work. For instance, in his analysis of the expression не от мира сего (not of this world), Babkin maintains that the new associations, such as of an unpractical person, that the expression не от мира сего (not of this world) has acquired in Modern Russian, have nothing in common with its original biblical characteristics. But if we analyse the associations that are determined and implied by its occurrence in the Bible [John 18:36], and interpret the literary extracts provided by Babkin (but not analysed and interpreted by him), we may see that such associations as of an unpractical person are in fact based on the original ones (as emerges from my brief interpretation of this expression in section 2.3). This contradiction in Babkin's analysis was one of the factors that prompted me to investigate the metaphorical origins of other bibleisms.

Among recent studies on bibleisms, the works of Kotova (1993) and Mateshich & Birikh (1994) are relevant to this study.
Mateshich & Birikh (1994) maintain that Russian bibleisms are not static expressions—they are constantly influenced by the lexical and phraseological systems of the Russian language. In some of them, for instance, obsolete components have been replaced (e.g. несть пророка в своем отечестве → нет пророка в своем отечестве (lit. no prophet is accepted in his own country), where the Church Slavonic form несть (no) has been replaced by the modern form of this word — нет). In some bibleisms, one or more components have become archaic (e.g. метать бисер перед свиньями (lit. to cast glass beads before swine), where бисер (glass beads) is жемчуг (pearls). In some bibleisms the meaning of the whole expression has changed (e.g. злачное место (lit. 'green pastures' = a place of revelry). Sometimes bibleisms are misinterpreted in terms of so-called folk etymology or due to accidental associations. For instance, in Modern Russian the expression благую часть избрать (choose the good part) means 'to choose what is more profitable', whereas in the Bible [Luke 10:38–42], it implies 'to take care of saving one's soul'. Mateshich & Birikh (1994) conclude that an investigation of the metaphorical origins of bibleisms and the way in which the system of the Russian language affects bibleisms, is one of the most interesting tasks of Russian historical phraseology. The aim of this study is to enrich our understanding of bibleisms.

Kotova's (1993) article is based on the study of Sirot, who, at the end of the previous century, investigated those Russian proverbs that had parallels in the Bible, i.e. were created in the Russian language on the basis of certain biblical stories. Человек предполагает, а Бог располагает (Man proposes but God disposes), for instance, is thought to have its roots in the following extract from the Bible: Много замыслов в сердце человека, но состоит только определенное Богом (There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand) [Proverbs 19,21].
Kotova (1993) compares the functioning of such sentence—metaphors she categorises as proverbs of biblical origin in several Slav languages. Following Kotova's comparison, a comparison can be drawn of bibleisms functioning in Russian and English. Some Russian bibleisms have English analogies used in the same sense (e.g. козел отпущения and a scapegoat), whereas others have English analogues which coincide literally and derive from the same biblical source, but are used in a different figurative sense from that of their Russian counterparts (мертвая буква (lit. 'dead letter') in Russian, for instance, refers to the formal, external side of something as opposed to its content, meaning, spirit, while its English literal counterpart dead letter refers to a law or rule not enforced (Walshe & Berkov, 1984)).

Also, an existing English analogue may be understandable lexiemically to English speakers (e.g. зелёное место (lit. 'green pastures') which means "a place of revelry"), but may not affect them with the same force and additional meaning as it affects the speakers of the Russian language.

General stocks of Russian and English expressions of biblical origin can be compared with the help of the list of English bibleisms with their Russian translations made by Ignatov (Smith, 1958) in his translation of Smith's (1928) book on English idioms. Smith mentions the immense influence of the Bible on the English language and provides a list of expressions of "which biblical origin is most obvious" (Smith, 1928:223–227). Ignatov's Russian translation of this list allows readers to compare the stocks of the bibleisms used both in English and Russian. The dictionaries of Walshe & Berkov (1984), and Kunin (1984) can also be used for this purpose. Kunin's (1984) dictionary contains etymological information on every idiom, as well as examples from English literature of the 19th and 20th centuries. A few literary examples have been borrowed from this dictionary to illustrate the functioning of the English equivalents of some Russian bibleisms in the present dissertation.

The above discussion reveals that it is possible to identify bibleisms in both Russian and English with the help of the available literature. It also reveals that in order to account for the new associations that bibleisms have acquired and are acquiring in modern usage, it is necessary to view them in terms of metaphorical language use.

Following Shmeleva (1964), I consider the expression to be metaphorical when I understand, by virtue of my knowledge of the world, that the literal purport of such an expression postulates what is illogical. It is also understood that other words surrounding the metaphorical expression force this expression to undergo a change and/or extension of associations, and it acquires a figurative (metaphorical) meaning. For instance, when a human being is called козел отпущения (scapegoat), the expression козел отпущения (scapegoat) is perceived to be metaphorical. The issue of the completion of metaphorisation that leads to the death of a metaphor, as raised by Shmeleva (1964), holds a particular relevance to the interpretation of bibleisms that occur in literary texts. In the analysis and interpretation of bibleisms, Babkin's (1970) model may be taken into consideration. In addition to the interpretative steps used by Babkin, I will investigate in more detail how an expression of biblical origin is qualified in the original text. I will argue in this dissertation that the original associations of a bibleism
form the basis for the development of its new associations. Insufficient
knowledge of their metaphorical origins may eventually lead to the
disappearance of bibleisms from current usage or to their being
misunderstood. This might impoverish our speech and understanding of
literary art. However, the analysis and interpretation of the original
associations of bibleisms and their new associations in terms of metaphorical
language use may enhance our understanding of these expressions and more
of their associative potential may become active in usage.

2.2 RELEVANT ASPECTS OF METAPHORICAL LANGUAGE

2.2.1 Metaphor as interactive

In this dissertation the study of metaphorical expressions of biblical origin is
viewed as a specialised field within metaphorical language in general. A
review of recent theoretical research on metaphor is therefore presented
below in order to select the key components that the interpretation of
bibleisms as metaphors in literary texts entails.

Essential concepts for the interpretation of metaphorical expressions that
occur in literary texts are those of foregrounding and intertextuality.

Foregrounding involves a comparison between the two instances of language
use, ordinary and poetic (or literary). It consists in employing the two sets of
devices as complementary forces: devices of deviation from a norm and
devices of parallelism (Mukařovský, 1964; Leech, 1969; Van Peer, 1986,
among others). As each of these devices may occur on each of the different
linguistic levels (phonology, grammar, and semantics), on the semantic level,
we observe metaphorical language as one of the areas of foregrounding.
Metaphorical expressions constitute a violation of selectional restrictions in
terms of semantics (Leech, 1969). Because readers or speakers adhere to a
norm of lexical compatibility, they recognise a statement which does not follow this norm as a deviation. Metaphorical language attracts attention and is perceived as uncommon, as 'deautomatised' or foregrounded (Mukařovský, 1964).

As a foregrounded element of the text, a metaphorical expression always constitutes lexical deviation. Foregrounding also occurs through parallelism. An important principle implied by parallelism is that it suggests semantic relationships between the elements that are placed in parallel. This account of parallelism is based on Jakobson's (1960:358) view of the poetic function of language, that it "projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination".

Van Peer (1986) connects the notion of parallelism with intertextual (i.e. literary extratextual) relations (defined in Lotman, 1977), by pointing to the association between intertextuality and the principle of repetition. A metaphorical expression has the potential to indicate and establish interaction between a text in which it occurs, and extratextual reality. In terms of Jakobson's equivalence principle, a metaphorical expression establishes equivalence or parallelism for which a corresponding equivalence or parallelism is sought on another level of poetic organisation. According to Lotman's (1977) definition, extratextual relations may be either non—literary or literary. The latter have been equated with intertextual relations (e.g. Gräbe, 1984; Lipatov, 1991; Biermann, 1993): "Intertextual relationships of the literary text include the interaction between the text and other, mainly literary, texts" (Biermann, 1993:197). I adopt this use of the term intertextual in the present dissertation.

Van Peer (1986) points out that intertextual relationships are sometimes manifested in literary texts by citations or quotes. These may be considered
as the most explicit manifestations of intertextuality. From this, we may infer that intertextuality is also manifested in metaphors. A metaphorical expression of biblical origin in a literary text may be viewed as a repetition (or varied repetition) of a premise which previously occurred in another kind of text, i.e. in the Bible. In other words, it indicates an intertextual relationship through parallelism between the literary text in which it occurs and its original biblical context. In terms of Riffaterre (1990), in a literary text, such an expression can be viewed as a specialised sign for the intertext which the reader must know in order to understand a work of literature in terms of its meaning as a whole. Speaking of knowing an intertext, however, it has to be distinguished between the actual knowledge of the form and content of that intertext, and mere awareness that such an intertext exists and can eventually be found somewhere (Riffaterre, 1990:56–58). Cultural changes may make the possibility of recovery of some intertexts in the minds of ordinary readers less likely. (Ordinary readers are understood here as what Riffaterre (1990:58) calls "normal readers (that is, readers armed only with their linguistic competence and trying to make do without the philological crutches of footnotes and scholarly gloss)".) This may be the case with a biblical intertext for an ordinary Russian reader: persecution of religion and the Bible in Russia during the Soviet period made ordinary Russian readers unfamiliar with the Bible and other sacral literature.

Intertextuality, however, does not cease to operate, even if the reader is unfamiliar with the original intertexts involved. Elements (such as metaphorical expressions, for instance) originating in no longer accessible or forgotten intertexts, continuously enter other intertexts and even become part of the established semantic stock of the language, which may also be viewed as a sort of intertext. Consequently, from other texts and from the established semantic stock, such elements enter new literary texts and establish intertextual relations which may cross the boundaries not only of
specific texts, but also of text types, or genres. This constitutes a universal
structure of intertextuality as a many-faceted phenomenon (Riffaterre,
1990:74). Therefore, I maintain that the recovery, in one way or another, of
the intertext in the mind of a reader is an inevitable process. Metaphorical
expressions of biblical origin may be viewed as points of interaction between
the biblical texts, the Modern Russian language and the literary texts in
which these expressions occur. These sets of intertextual relationships should
be considered when interpreting metaphorical expressions of biblical origin
that occur in literary texts.

2.2.1.1 Constituents of metaphor

No unifying theory for the purpose of the analysis and interpretation of
metaphorical expressions has been developed so far. Nevertheless, in the
past few decades interaction theories have been widely accepted as
legitimate explanations of metaphor (Waggoner, 1990). Advocates of
interaction theories do not agree on every aspect of metaphor, but certain
assumptions about metaphor are shared by all or most interactionists. They
provide a framework that makes it possible to account for the functioning of
metaphor in different interactive situations. Some of these assumptions and
terminology of interaction theories are discussed below with a view to their
application in the interpretation of metaphorical expressions of biblical
origin in Chapter 3.

The current terminology relating to the constituents of metaphor used in
interaction theories may be illustrated with reference to Reinhart's (1976) and
Grâbe's (1985) clarification of the terms tenor and vehicle (Richards, 1936)
and focus and frame (Black, 1962). The following local units offered in Black
(1962) exemplify the basic aspects of metaphorical language (discussed in
Grâbe, 1985:3).
(1) The chairman plowed through the discussion.
   **Argument Focus**

(2) An argumentative melody.
   **Focus Argument**

(3) Man is a wolf.
   **Principal subject Focus + subsidiary subject**
   **Tenor Vehicle**

In (1) and (2), plowed and argumentative represent a verbal and an adjectival focus respectively in their frames. In (3) man is the 'principal subject' (Black, 1962) that corresponds to Richard's (1936) tenor, and wolf is a nominal focus which is, at the same time, the 'subsidiary subject' (Black, 1962) corresponding to Richard's (1936) vehicle (Reinhart, 1976) (in the case of such a nominal metaphor a focus coincides with a vehicle). In the great majority of cases, tenor—vehicle combinations are reducible to the relations between nouns. However, following Brooke—Rose (1958: 206—237), Gräbe (1984:31—33; 1985:51) points out that a tenor—vehicle relationship may be established between any lexical items representing the same class of word (e.g. noun, verb, adjective) which have the same grammatical function (e.g. subject).²

Following Reinhart (1976), Gräbe (1985:4) postulates that in metaphorical expressions containing a violation of selectional restrictions (as in (1), (2) and (3) above), the adjective or verb will tend to be the focus and the noun(s) to which they are linked will form part of the frame. To capture the qualifying function of focal words in respect to a nominal in the frame, Gräbe (1985:4) subsequently distinguishes the nominal phrase in the frame as an **argument** modified by a **focus—expression**. A metaphorical construction will then contain at least one argument and one focus—expression which, however, need not be restricted to one word, but could also consist of a focal phrase or a focal sentence (Gräbe, 1985:4). For
instance, bibleisms can present a focal word such as *Hyga* (Judas), a focal phrase such as *святая святых* (the Holy of Holies) or a focal sentence such as *Вера горами гвигает* (Faith moves mountains).

The above examples represent two main types of metaphorical construction: the *focus-frame* construction (1 and 2) and the *tenor-vehicle* construction (3). An additional type, which contains elements of both focus-frame and tenor-vehicle relations, is a *genitive construction*. In the following instances of genitive constructions from Brooke–Rose (1958):

(4) The poor are the negroes of Europe

\[ A = B \text{ of } C \]

(5) The hostel of my heart (= my body)

\[ B \text{ of } C (=A) \]

(6) The smoke-screen of witnesses

\[ B \text{ of } C \]

the examples (4) and (5) in Brooke–Rose terms are three-term formulas expressed as "B of C = A". In such a formula, "A" may be either mentioned and equated as in (4) or just implied as in (5). The example (6) is the two-term formula expressed as "B of C", in which B = C. "C" is itself the proper term and "B" the metaphorical term (Brooke–Rose, 1958:148). In Grabe's terminology (1985:51) Brooke–Rose's "proper term" is called *tenor* and "the metaphorical term" is either *focus* in the "B of C = A" type or *vehicle* in the "B of C" type. "B of C" can also be a *vehicle*, or "B" can be a *focal term*. In some instances, the analysis of the internal interaction of the constituents of the vehicle may contribute to the fuller interpretation of the interaction between tenor and vehicle. The underlying tenor-vehicle relation in (4), (5) and (6) may be shown as follows:
Among bibleisms there are numerous expressions that present genitive constructions. For instance, козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution'), светая святых (the Holy of Holies) (these are discussed in Chapter 3). The internal interaction of the constituents of a bibleism results in the associations that are constantly present in it. They do not depend on the context in which it occurs (either its original biblical context or a new literary context) and contribute to those associations of a bibleism that are activated in its different interactive situations. Such associations may be viewed as relatively context-free or static. They result from what is termed in this study the static interaction of the constituents of a bibleism (as opposed to the dynamic interaction between a bibleism and its original biblical or a new literary context).
Although the phrase 'static interaction' seems to be a contradiction in terms, I apply it to the interaction that constantly occurs between the constituents of a bibleism. The associations that result from this interaction are not influenced by the context in which a bibleism occurs. For instance, in the bibleism козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution'), the associations of innocence, helplessness and remission result from the interaction of its constituents. This interaction may be viewed as relatively context-free or static. Other associations that this bibleism can create depend on its interaction with its original biblical context and different literary contexts in which it occurs (as will be shown in section 3.1.2). The interaction of a bibleism as a whole with different contexts may be viewed as a dynamic interaction of two types. One is the interaction between the constituents of a bibleism with its original biblical context, and another is the interaction of the intratextual specifications of a bibleism in a literary text with its original biblical associations. These result in dynamic or relatively context-dependent associations of a bibleism.
Breaking down a metaphor into its constituents as suggested in the above discussion provides the basis for the interpretation of metaphorical expressions in terms of interaction theories. Now we may proceed to discuss the characteristics of metaphor in terms of interaction theories in order to characterise the functioning of metaphorical expressions of biblical origin that occur in literary texts.

2.2.1.2 Characteristics of metaphor
An overview of current interaction theories reveals that all or most interactionists emphasise several main characteristics of metaphor. These characteristics may be summarised as follows:
1) Creativity: metaphors can create new meaning and new similarity.
2) Tension: metaphors involve tension either between a metaphor and its context or between its constituents.
3) The importance of difference as well as similarity: metaphors contain both similarities and differences among their components.
4) Reciprocity of the components of metaphors: the components of metaphors exert a reciprocal influence on one another, which results in changes in their meaning.
5) Unparaphrasability: metaphors cannot be paraphrased without some loss of meaning, content or significance.

I will discuss each of the above characteristics of metaphor in more detail below and relate them to bibleisms, which are the subject of this study.

The creative aspect of metaphor is addressed in the work of all interaction theorists. Richards (1936:100), whose work has been central to subsequent interaction theories, claims that the co—presence of the vehicle and tenor in metaphor results in an extended meaning "which is not attainable without
their interaction". Echoing Richards (1936), Black (1962:37; 1979:37 – 40) argues that metaphor creates new meaning and new similarity that cannot be completely accounted for in terms of some similarity existing antecedently. Ricoeur (1977) suggests that metaphor generates new meaning by providing models for reading reality in new ways or by reorganising our conceptual frameworks. Johnson (1980:63) holds that the metaphor creates sense by a new projective act resulting in new significance. All these scholars also point out that what metaphor creates is "not simply a new emphasis on some pre-existent, but hitherto unnoticed aspect of meaning or similarity" (Waggoner, 1990:93).

Metaphorical expressions of biblical origin are repeatedly used in similar contexts with relatively stable associations, i.e. they have become non-creative metaphors. However, I argue in this dissertation that even when a bibleism is used as a non-creative metaphor (as demonstrated in section 3.1), by analysing its intratextual relationships in different contexts, we can sometimes find new shades of meaning, new aspects and similarities previously unnoticed. The notion of intratextual relationship is understood here as the interdependence between a metaphorical expression and other components of the text in which it occurs. In different contexts, different features of a bibleism may come to the fore, creating a new configuration of its associations, a new similarity. The intertextual relationship between the Bible as a generating text of a bibleism and its new context is also a meaning-producing factor that must be considered when analysing intratextual relationships (Robinson, 1991:XXII). Furthermore, I will argue that although bibleisms seem to be non-creative, a bibleism may become meaning-creative when it is foregrounded in a literary text, i.e. when it presents some sort of tension between itself and its context.
Interaction theorists discuss several forms of tension in different ways. Black (1962), for instance, did not use the word 'tension' but did suggest that our ability to recognise metaphors depends partially on some incongruity between a metaphor and its context. Waggoner (1990:95) notices that incongruity and other words (banality, falsity) used by Black are similar to tension as described by others. Ricoeur (1978) distinguishes among three types of metaphorical tension: between the tenor and vehicle, between a literal and a nonliteral interpretation of metaphor, and tension that derives from the interplay of similarity and difference in the work of resemblance. Gräbe (1985:4) summarises what others call types of metaphorical tension as three types of focus—expressions: i) those with a violation of selectional restrictions within a focus itself (i.e., tension between the constituents of a focal expression); ii) those that do not contain a violation of selectional restrictions within a focus itself, but only present a direct inconsistency between the argument and the focus (i.e., tension between the argument and the focal expression); iii) those that do not present incompatibility in their combination either within a focus itself, or between a focus and an argument, but are only perceived as focal expressions because of their symbolic connotations (i.e., tension between a literal and a nonliteral interpretation of the focal expression, between metaphor and intratextual specifications of the focus).

When a metaphor becomes non—creative and is absorbed by the language, the distinction between the frame and the focal expression is no longer obvious, or tenor and vehicle merge with each other (Chhibber, 1987:170). In other words, no metaphorical tension is present. This is the case with bibleisms discussed in this study. For instance, if the metaphor козел отпущения (scapegoat) were creative, as in Мальчик был козлом отпущения (The boy was a scapegoat), modifying an argument мальчик (boy) it would have presented type ii of focal expression in Gräbe's (1985:4)
terms. In other words, there would have been tension within the frame between the argument and the focus. But this focal expression (that also has a function of the vehicle) is no longer creative, i.e. its configuration of associations is relatively stable. The tenor мальчик (boy) that has associations of 'someone punished for the offences of others' merges with the vehicle козел отпущения (scapegoat). Thus the tension that originally existed between them is released. All the same, an informed reader or speaker who is aware of the connection between the literal (in this case, the original biblical meaning) and the transferred meaning of this expression, may still feel this tension. Being informed of the origins of bibleisms, I will view them as focal expressions of one of Gräbe's (1985:4) three types even when they are used in literary texts as non—creative metaphors. This will allow me to analyse the influence of the syntactic environment (frame) on the bibleisms (focal expressions) and account for the development of their associations.

Interactionists acknowledge the importance of both similarity and difference in metaphor. Richards (1936) emphasises that there are many metaphors in which differences between tenor and vehicle are as operative as the similarities. Ricoeur (1977:173–215) also argues that the similarity in metaphor is a result of our ability to reconcile the initial disparities. This characteristic of metaphor emphasised by interactionists allows us to explain why some Russian bibleisms have acquired such new associations which are very different from their original biblical associations. For instance, the bibleism зелёное место (lit. 'green pastures') has become synonymous with 'a place of revelry' in Modern Russian, whereas in the Bible it implies a plentiful, pleasant place or state. The analysis and interpretation of the biblical associations of this expression, and its associations with places of depravity (discussed in detail in section 3.1.5) demonstrate the reconciliation
of the initial disparities, resulting in the similarity of the two notions that the expression злачное место (lit. 'green pastures') can signify. Also, the role of difference in metaphor is important for the creation of irony. This will be demonstrated in the usage of святая святых (the Holy of Holies) (example (1), (7) and (9), section 3.1.1), for instance, where some associations of the tenor oppose the relevant biblical associations of this expression and consequently produce irony.

The reciprocity of the influence of metaphorical components on one another is implied in the term interaction. Developing Richards' (1936) ideas, Black (1962) attempts to be more specific about the way in which the interaction takes place. In Black's view, the metaphor works by applying to the principal subject (tenor) what he calls a system of "associated commonplaces" which characterise the subsidiary subject (vehicle). This involves constructing a system of literal associations of the subsidiary subject and also a corresponding system, which may consist of any "deviant implications established ad hoc by the writer" (Black, 1962:44). To illustrate this statement, Black (1962) analyses the expression Man is a wolf.

(7)

\[
\text{Man is a wolf}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Principal subject (tenor)} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Subsidiary subject (vehicle)} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Argument} \\
\hline
\text{Frame}
\end{array}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>human</td>
<td>cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power of speech</td>
<td>dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bipedal</td>
<td>predatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{animal} \\
\hline
\text{no power of speech} \\
\text{quadrupedal}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{considerate} \\
\hline
\text{industrious} \\
\text{kind}
\end{array}
\]
Among the characteristics associated with the subsidiary subject *wolf*, all the genuinely animal features that are incongruent in this context become peripheral. But other characteristics surrounding *wolf*, namely cruel, dangerous and predatory are transferred to the principal subject (tenor) and supplant the features usually associated with *man*. In other words, the statement that *man is a wolf* may imply that he is a cruel and dangerous predator. Black (1962:44) also mentions that the syntactic environment of the tenor *man* makes the vehicle *wolf* "seem more human than he otherwise would". Thus both terms contribute to the meaning of metaphor and either of them may serve as an interpretative base. The interaction not only organises features of the tenor by selecting and emphasising certain features of the vehicle, but also makes it possible to see the focus in a new context which ascribes to it an extended meaning (Black, 1962). Furthermore, the reciprocity of influence need not be equivalent, but some changes in both terms should be observed (Waggoner, 1990:95) as in a "humanised" *wolf* in Black's (1962) example.

The reciprocity of the influence of metaphorical components is very important when we attempt to determine an extended range of associations of bibleisms. When we view the same bibleism as a focal expression in the syntactic environment of different frames (in different literary contexts), we may establish in each case the reciprocal influence of the focus and the frame on one another. In different interactive situations, the same focal expression may undergo different extensions and restrictions in its semantic organisation. Therefore, the analysis of different interactive situations may make it possible to ascribe to the focus (a bibleism in this case) an extended meaning.
Unparaphrasability is an aspect of interaction theories that illustrates the nonreductionistic character of metaphor. Metaphorical meaning cannot be reduced to antecedent literal meanings or to rule-governed extensions of those meanings (Waggoner, 1990:94). Criticising the substitution view of metaphor, which argues that metaphors are used "to communicate a meaning that might have been expressed literally" (Black, 1962:32), Black (1962:46) states that the view of metaphors as interactive implies that they cannot be paraphrased without the loss of some cognitive content. Johnson (1980) argues about the issue of unparaphrasability in a more complex way. He identifies a canonical, or comparative, and a noncanonical, or interactive, aspect of metaphor. On a canonical level, every metaphor implies a correlative simile that constitutes its basis in comparison (i.e., its "ground") (Johnson, 1980:55). This is what is recognised by the comparison view, which holds that metaphor is a condensed simile and that every metaphorical statement might be replaced by an equivalent literal comparison (this view is criticised by Black (1962:37) and also by Johnson (1980:55)). The view of metaphor as interactive holds that in addition to the comparative ground of every metaphor, there is a level at which one experiences the insight that two entire systems of implications ("systems of associated commonplaces" in Black's (1962:44) terms) are brought together (Johnson, 1980:55). The cognitive activity at this level cannot be reduced to that of the comparative level. Therefore, paraphrases of equivalent meaning might be given at the canonical level of metaphor, but they cannot be equivalent at the interactive or noncanonical level.

The question of unparaphrasability of metaphor is relevant to the translation issue addressed in the present study. In the tentative scheme of the ways in which metaphors may be translated, in order of preference (proposed in section 2.3), paraphrase holds the last position. This is because when paraphrase is chosen as a mode of translation, the resulting expression in the
target language reaches the level of commentary rather than of actual translation. Paraphrase does not induce the insight that comes from determining how the components of a metaphor may be brought into relationship (Black, 1962:46; Johnson, 1980:55; Waggoner, 1990:94).

It may be gathered from the above discussion of the characteristics of metaphor emphasised by interaction theories, that in terms of the first two characteristics (creativity and tension), metaphors may be divided into different interpretative types. The issue of the types of metaphor and the characteristics of interaction theories dealing with the way metaphor works (the importance of difference as well as similarity in metaphor; reciprocity of the components of metaphor; unparaphrasability of metaphor) pertain to the interpretation and translation of metaphorical expressions in this study.

2.2.1.3 Interpretative types of metaphor
Among metaphors that occur in literary texts, there are those that have lost their uniqueness. For instance, ножка стола in Russian and leg of the table in English, or Фома неверующий in Russian and a doubting Thomas in English. These expressions belong to idiomatic language use and are part of the established lexicon of the language. On the other hand, there are metaphors which appear to be unusual. They are constructed on the spot by the writer or speaker and their understanding requires special attention paid to the image they evoke. Generally, these two types of metaphor are often called dead and live metaphors respectively.

It is usually easy for a native speaker to recognise the difference between dead and live metaphors in his or her language. For one who is interpreting a particular metaphorical expression in order to establish the range of its associations and to translate it into another language, it is very important to
be able to make this distinction since there are certain peculiarities pertaining to the interpretation and translation of each type of metaphor.

Definitions and terminology of the types (or categories) of metaphor vary among scholars (e.g. Wellek & Warren, 1963; Leech, 1974; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Reyna, 1981; Lakoff, 1986; Van Den Broeck, 1981; Newmark, 1988; Steen, 1994). Van Den Broeck's (1981) classification has been found to be the most relevant to the present study of bibleisms, since he distinguishes the categories of metaphor for both interpretation and translation purposes. Notwithstanding, I propose some redefinition and clarification of Van Den Broeck's (1981) terminology.

Van Den Broeck (1981:74–76) elaborates the usual categorisations of metaphor into dead and live metaphors by suggesting three types (or what he calls categories), "according to their relative degree of being 'institutionalised' or not": lexicalised, conventional and private metaphors. Lexicalised metaphors are those that have gradually lost their uniqueness and have become 'institutionalised' items of the established semantic stock of the language. The abovementioned examples ножка стола and Фома неверующий in Russian, and leg of the table and a doubting Thomas in English, are lexicalised (or dead) metaphors in Van Den Broeck's terms. The notion of 'deadness' of metaphor is a relative matter. However, as Van Den Broeck (1981:75) notices, it may give us an insight into the process by which a metaphor shifts from 'performance' to 'competence'. Following Leech (1974:227–228), Van Den Broeck stresses that various stages may be distinguished in this process. Firstly, the reference and the ground of the comparison are limited by convention in that, for instance, a fox is 'a person who is like a fox in that he is cunning'. Further, when the transferred definition loses its analogical feeling, fox practically becomes synonymous with a cunning man (Leech, 1974:227; Van Den Broeck, 1981:75). But Leech
(1974) and Van Den Broeck (1981) emphasise that even at this stage, a feeling of the connection between the literal and transferred meanings may remain. The stage of absolute 'deadness' (i.e. when we say that a metaphor is *lexicalised*) is reached "when the literal meaning has died out entirely, or when no connection is felt between the literal and transferred meanings any more" (Leech, 1974:228).

According to Van Den Broeck's classification, such metaphors as ножка стола / leg of the table and Фома неверующий / a doubting Thomas belong to the same type of *lexicalised* metaphors. There does, however, seem to be a difference between them. The latter expression may also be referred to another type proposed by Van Den Broeck. It is the type of *conventional* metaphor which is closely connected to the type of *lexicalised* metaphor. *Conventional* metaphors are more or less 'institutionalised' by literary tradition, they are culture-bound. Such metaphors, which range from literal translation and paraphrase to imitation, have become part of the shared cultural inheritance of civilised mankind (e.g. the Jewish tradition, Christianity, Greek and Roman Antiquity, the literary and cultural inheritance of a particular country, etc.), and they now belong to world literature (Van Den Broeck, 1981:81). In Van Den Broeck's terms, shepherd (песячий, in Russian) as a metaphor for God, would be an instance of such 'shared poetic metaphors' in Judaeo-Christian tradition.

The third type of metaphor in Van Den Broeck's terms is that of *private* metaphors. This type includes poetic (literary) metaphors, i.e. innovative creations by individual writers. It is not always easy to draw strict boundaries between the types of metaphor, for some conventional metaphors may be more or less 'institutionalised', and many private systems overlap existing metaphorical traditions (Wellek & Warren, 1963:190; Van Den Broeck,
Thus the status of metaphor is not a static but a dynamic one (Dagut, 1976).

I agree with Van Den Broeck's general distinction of the three interpretative types of metaphor instead of just two, but I do not find his statements about the types of lexicalised and conventional metaphor descriptive enough. Although he states that conventional metaphors can clearly be distinguished from the more institutionalised patterns of the common language, it is not quite obvious from his discussion precisely how these two types of metaphor differ from one another. I therefore propose the following clarification and redefinition of Van Den Broeck's terminology.

In what follows, I refer to metaphors that are unique, i.e. produced on the spot by individual writers as innovative metaphors. These metaphors are creative and are recognised as metaphors because we can observe incongruity or tension between a metaphor and its context (cf. section 2.2.1.2). For instance, examples 1–6 in section 2.2.1.1 are innovative metaphors.

Metaphorical expressions that have lost their uniqueness (Van Den Broeck's lexicalised metaphors) belong, in my opinion, to the type of conventional metaphors, since the reference and the basis for comparison in such metaphors are limited by convention (Van Den Broeck 1981:75) as in the example with fox discussed above. Such expressions have lost their character as metaphors and are becoming more and more absorbed by the language. "We become aware of the fact that they were metaphors only once when we are caught mixing metaphors" (Chhibber, 1987:170). Original and new metaphorical meanings of such expressions have diverged psychologically to the extent that no connection is felt between them any more (Leech, 1974:228). As it has been discussed in section 2.2.1.2, in such metaphors
tenor and vehicle merge with each other, or the distinction between the frame and the focus is no longer operative. The linguistic mechanism that leads to the death of metaphor has been explained by Chhibber (1987:170–171). Chhibber has shown that a metaphorical expression undergoes both a restriction and an extension in its semantic organisation and acquires a stable configuration of its associations. This may be demonstrated in the case of bibleisms by taking an example like

(8) 

Ты — Фома неверующий
You are a doubting Thomas

when we address someone who is sceptical about something and whose name is not Фома (Thomas). Let us consider some characteristics of the constituents of this metaphorical construction.

(8)i

Ты
You

Фома неверующий
a doubting Thomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a person named some other name (not Thomas)</td>
<td>a person named Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lives at this time</td>
<td>lived at the time of Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies, works</td>
<td>apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drives a car</td>
<td>speaks Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaks Russian/English/...</td>
<td>does not believe in resurrection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not believe in something</td>
<td>unless sees for himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a sceptical person/a sceptic</td>
<td>a sceptical person/ a sceptic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the characteristics of Фома неверующий (a doubting Thomas) that when applied to мы (you) in the form of address to a sceptic above, it undergoes both a restriction and an extension in its semantic organisation. Characteristics like a person named Thomas, apostle, lived at the time of Jesus, speaks Hebrew become abnormal in the context of мы Фома неверующий (you are a doubting Thomas) where мы (you) is
someone sceptical whom the speaker addresses at present, whose name is not Thomas, etc. Thus, the characteristics of Фома неверующий (a doubting Thomas) that become abnormal in this context become peripheral (i.e. the expression undergoes a restriction in its semantic organisation), and such characteristics as a sceptic, a person who needs to see in order to believe become central in the semantic field of the expression Фома неверующий (a doubting Thomas). On the other hand, the expression may acquire new characteristics such as lives at this time or drives a car, etc., whatever characteristics of мы (you) may derive from the context (i.e. the expression undergoes an extension in its semantic organisation). Once the expression Фома неверующий (a doubting Thomas) is made to collocate with someone who is sceptical (like мы (you) in 8) its semantic field acquires a new configuration of characteristics. If the metaphor were creative, the juxtaposition of characteristics like a person named Thomas, apostle, etc. and a contemporary person whose name is not Thomas would have resulted in tension (cf. section 2.2.1.2). Now, when the metaphor is non-creative, the two sets of characteristics undergo a readjustment and reconciliation resulting in the release of the tensions that originally existed between them. 

When such a metaphor is used repeatedly in similar contexts, the new configuration of characteristics acquires a degree of stability. The semantic field of Фома неверующий (a doubting Thomas) in the context of someone who is sceptical has stabilised, thus the metaphor is dead, in other words, institutionalised in the language: it is registered with this meaning (i.e. with this configuration of characteristics) in the Russian dictionaries (e.g. Slovar', 1948–1969; Ozhegov, 1982; Walshe & Berkov, 1984). The vividness of its image (i.e. the literal image of the apostle Thomas who doubted the resurrection) does not play a crucial role in understanding of this metaphor any more. However, even at this stage, a feeling of the connection between the literal and transferred meanings may persist (for an informed reader or speaker, for instance) or may become reactivated as will be argued below.
Therefore, I avoid using the term *dead metaphor* in this dissertation and propose to refer to such expressions as *conventional metaphors*.

What Van Den Broeck (1981) describes as a category of *conventional metaphors* (culture-bound metaphors 'institutionalised' in the language by literary tradition), is connected with the notion of *intertextuality* (section 2.2.1.2). Intertextuality is a many-faceted phenomenon which is an integral part of culture and hence a part of literary art. It is "the web of functions that constitutes and regulates the relationships between text and intertext" (Riffaterre, 1990:57). Metaphors have the potential to indicate and establish intertextual relationships. It may be gathered that the second type in Van Den Broeck's classification includes metaphors that indicate and establish intertextual relationships more explicitly than those that he terms *lexicalised* metaphors. In other words, the creative aspect (cf. section 2.2.1.2), the reference to their historical, literary, or culture-bound source is still obvious in such metaphors. I propose to refer to such metaphors as *allusive metaphors*, since *allusion* is "an indirect reference to something known from history, mythology, scripture, literature, popular and contemporary culture" (Lass, et al, 1990). A degree of allusiveness, however, varies within the type of *allusive metaphors*. This corresponds to what is termed by Van Den Broeck (1981) as "more or less 'institutionalised' conventional metaphors. Those that are "less institutionalised" can be clearly distinguished from the more established patterns of the common language. The intertextual relationships that they establish are more explicit, and the metaphorical tension (cf. section 2.2.1.2) that they constitute between themselves and their contexts is not completely released. In other words, the reference to their historical, literary, or culture-bound source still persists. When metaphorical expressions eventually lose their allusiveness, i.e. become "more institutionalised", they join the type that I term *conventional metaphors*. 
Elaborating Dagut's (1976:23) argument that the status of a particular metaphorical expression is not a static but a dynamic one, Van Den Broeck (1981:76) suggests that if there is a shift from a unique metaphor to routine collective repetition, there may be a similar shift through which dead metaphors may become live metaphors again. His statement that conventional metaphors "belong to the restricted area of literature and are only conventional within the period, school or generation to which they belong" (Van Den Broeck, 1981: 75), followed by the remark (1981:81) that such "shared poetic metaphors" "now belong to world literature", supports the idea of dynamism in metaphor. Following Van Den Broeck's suggestion, I maintain in this dissertation that conventional metaphorical expressions may become meaning—creative in a literary text. This implies that in complex texts such as narratives, for instance, the structuring principle of artistic organisation to which the contextual patterns of ordinary language are subordinated (Lotman, 1977) may reactivate the symbolic force of the conventional metaphor, so that, in a sense, it becomes an allusive (demonstrated in section 3.2) or even an innovative metaphor again (demonstrated in section 3.3). For instance, within the context of the literary text, the literal and metaphorical associations of the conventional metaphor may become actualised or foregrounded. Thus, the effect caused is similar to that of a truly innovative metaphor. At the same time, however, a conventional metaphor retains its specific character of a familiar metaphor as opposed to a truly innovative metaphor and we observe an emerging contrast by which the tenor is played off against the vehicle as a result of this simultaneous occurrence (Van Den Broeck, 1981:83).

From the foregoing discussion I propose to form the following **hypothesis**:

Metaphors are dynamic. There are shifts through which innovative metaphors can become conventional and through which conventional metaphors can become innovative again. I assume that once an innovatively
used conventional metaphorical expression (i.e. a conventional metaphor that has rejoined the type of innovative metaphors) in its *renovated* form may become another (renovated) conventional metaphor (i.e. may again rejoin the type of conventional metaphors). Thus, the same metaphor in different interactive situations may be placed within different interpretative types. In what follows, I will attempt to confirm this hypothesis by the analysis and interpretation of some Russian bibleisms.

A distinction between interpretative types of metaphor is important from the point of view of translation (Van Den Broeck, 1981). For instance, the expressiveness and semantic depth of a metaphor may proceed from an allusion or a certain feature of the language, the full appreciation and adequate translation of which requires certain background knowledge on the part of the translator. Van Den Broeck (1981) also warns against the 'overtranslation' of *dead* metaphors.

Metaphors of biblical origin belong to the Judaeo-Christian tradition that has become part of the shared cultural inheritance (shared conventions) of civilised mankind (including Russian and English-speaking peoples). Such metaphors are capable of adequate translation and as noted by Van Den Broeck (1981:81), "It seems even reasonable to assume that translatability in this respect is merely a consequence of the necessity to translate, i.e., to domesticate, the works of classics". The translation of a conventional metaphor that can normally be rendered by a word-for-word translation may become problematic when the conventional metaphor is *foregrounded*, i.e. used as innovative metaphor. Such cases might pose a challenge to translators. In the case of metaphors that belong to the shared cultural inheritance of civilised mankind (such as bibleisms), most of these will concern the choice of an appropriate translation *mode* (discussed in section 2.3) rather than translatability as such (Van Den Broeck, 1981:81).
From the preceding discussion it is understood that the relation of a metaphorical expression to one of the interpretative types of metaphor (innovative, allusive or conventional), and hence the translation procedure, may only be determined in the course of analysing and interpreting each individual case.

2.3 A PROPOSED METHOD FOR THE INTERPRETATION AND TRANSLATION OF BIBLEISMS

I propose to investigate the functioning of Russian bibleisms that form part of Russian metaphorical (or poetic) usage on the basis of selected Russian narrative literary texts. The texts have been selected from narrative fiction written between 1960 to the present, namely novels and short stories by native Russian-speaking authors such as Aksyonov (1965; 1969; 1985b; 1987), Voinovich (1976; 1987b; 1990), Grossman (1970b), Druzhnikov (1989) and Dombrovskiy (1989). All these novels and short stories touch upon topics relating to the real state of affairs in the Soviet Union that were not allowed to be openly discussed in the press at that time. All these works describe the Soviet Union during the period when the Bible was not generally available as a source of knowledge for numerous expressions of biblical origin with which the Russian language still abounds.

Narrative literary texts, and not poetic texts, have been chosen for this study of bibleisms because in my view, the language of the narrative text generally reflects ordinary usage more closely than the language of a poem. Literary texts have been chosen for the study of bibleisms because such texts are seen as dynamic systems in which elements are structured in relations of foreground and background. This implies that literary language, when compared to everyday language, has a kind of emphasis, that there is a
greater awareness of the language itself in the case of literary language, and that it is perceived as more expressive than everyday language.

The analysis and interpretation of bibleisms that occur in literary texts are carried out in this dissertation within the framework of interaction theories of metaphor. It has been argued by Reinhart (1976) and further developed by Gräbe (1984;1985) that the process of understanding of a metaphor in literary contexts involves two interpretative procedures, focus interpretation and vehicle interpretation. Identifying the focus and the vehicle (section 2.2.1.1) provides the basis for the interpretation of a metaphor. To illustrate how these procedures apply to the understanding of a literary metaphor, I take Reinhart's (1976:391) example from Eliot's *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*:

(9)
The yellow fog that rubs its back upon the window panes.

A
Focus

Vehicle (reconstructed)

The foregrounded element in this sentence is *rubs its back*, since it presents a lexical deviation in combination with the argument *fog*. *Rubs its back* here is the focus. Focus interpretation involves a consideration of intratextual relations of the metaphorical term with other components of the text. It results in some literal equivalent of the metaphorical expression (e.g. *The yellow fog that touches the window panes*), and provides a rough understanding of the actual situation being depicted, as well as the way in which it ties in with the wider context of the metaphor (Reinhart, 1976:399). What is still to be accounted for is the 'image' aspect of the metaphor that may be captured by considering the extratextual relations that could be established by the focus. This is what Reinhart terms vehicle interpretation. The focus in a metaphorical expression serves to prompt a reconstruction of
an implied noun (cat in the example above), which may be combined with the focus in a literal sense, and may also be comparatively related to the argument in question, i.e. may have something in common with the argument (Gräbe, 1984; 1985). The implied noun in this metaphor is a cat (or some other animal which may be associated with the described gesture) which serves as a vehicle to the tenor fog. (Gräbe (1985:8) also suggests that the construction of a tenor instead of a vehicle may sometimes have far-reaching consequences in relation to Richard's (1936) definition of tenor and vehicle.) In other words, we place these two nouns in parallel on the basis of the gesture rubs its back that is usually associated with a cat or a similar animal in the established semantic stock of the language (viewed here as a sort of intertext). The notion of parallelism suggests semantic relationships between the fuzziness of the cat's fur and the texture of the fog. Several other construals of the cat—fog intertextual relation are possible. So although partial understanding of what the metaphor is about is possible on the basis of carrying out focus interpretation and establishing its intratextual relationships, full understanding of the metaphor involves consideration of its intertextual relationships and performance of vehicle interpretation that accomplishes this double perception or double vision of a cat and the fog.

The interpretative procedures proposed by Reinhart (1976) and modified by Gräbe (1985) are intended for creative literary metaphors (those that I term innovative metaphors). Such metaphors have an emphatically aesthetic function in a literary text. They attract attention and are perceived as uncommon, as 'deautomatised' or foregrounded (cf. section 2.2.1).

Reinhart (1976:396) emphasises that in what she terms dead metaphors (such as iron will) the vehicle has lost its vividness. In other words, the vehicle has merged with the tenor (as explained in sections 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.1.3). Consequently, in such cases only focus interpretation is relevant, and vehicle
interpretation does not apply (Reinhart, 1976). Understanding of such metaphors does not involve double vision (e.g. we do not reconstruct a second argument for will in iron will).

The bibleisms dealt with in this study have become part of ordinary usage, i.e. they may be viewed as conventional metaphors (section 2.2.1.3). When they are used in literary texts as conventional metaphors, although they present a lexical deviation (e.g. when we call a human being козел отпущения (scapegoat)), they are no longer seen as something very uncommon. Therefore, such expressions are not perceived as 'deautomatised' or foregrounded expressions (unless their allusiveness becomes reactivated within a literary context, and the effect caused is similar to that of an allusive or a truly innovative metaphor (section 2.2.1.3)). In the case of the Russian bibleisms discussed in this study, the vehicle has also lost its apparent vividness. The double perception carried by vehicle interpretation does not play a crucial role in the understanding of such metaphors any more (as demonstrated in example (8) in section 2.2.1.3). Therefore intertextual associations with the Bible are unlikely to be recovered in the mind of an ordinary reader.

Nevertheless, in spite of the remote connection between Russian metaphorical expressions of biblical origin and their sources, in this study I consider them as foregrounded elements of literary texts, even when they are used as conventional metaphors. This will allow me to apply to them both focus and vehicle interpretation and analyse the influence of different syntactic surroundings on the bibleism. The application of both interpretative procedures will enhance our understanding of these expressions. Focus interpretation will enable us to understand what the basic (cognitive) content of the bibleism is. Vehicle interpretation will make possible a double perception in the sense that both the argument modified
by the bibleism and the image evoked by this bibleism are interpreted. This will involve a consideration of the intertextual relationships established by the bibleism between the text in which it occurs, and its original biblical context. Thus it may become possible to account for associations that bibleisms have acquired and are acquiring in Modern Russian. I maintain that the associations that bibleisms create depend both on their intratextual and intertextual relationships. To show these relationships, I will 'recover', in the terms of Riffaterre (1990), a biblical intertext for every expression analysed in this study.

A proposed method for the interpretation and translation of bibleisms may be briefly illustrated by means of the expression *не от мира сего* (not of this world). It is registered in the Russian dictionaries (e.g. Walshe & Berkov, 1984) as an idiom, i.e. as a metaphorical expression that has lost its connection with its original image. I therefore categorise it as a conventional metaphor.

First, we identify the expression *не от мира сего* (not of this world) as coming from the following words of Jesus Christ about his Kingdom:

Иисус отвечал: Царство мое не от мира сего..... [Иоанн 18:36]
Jesus answered, My Kingdom is not of this world... [John 18:36]

It is implied in the original biblical text that Jesus's Kingdom is the Kingdom of God, eternal life that is not of earth, i.e. in "this world". The original associations of the expression *не от мира сего* (not of this world) are positive: something that does not belong to the present surroundings, to ordinary life and thus is unusual; something good, positive (like eternal life). These original associations have formed the basis for several new shades of meaning of the expression *не от мира сего* (not of this world) in Modern Russian. New metaphorical associations of this expression in Russian usage (as discussed by Babkin, 1970) are both positive and negative: (1) something
not of real life; strange, unusual, remarkable; (2) someone who is naive, unpractical; who is far removed from real life, its problems, demands, interests; who is concerned only with abstract matters (a scientist, artist, poet, etc.); who does not notice the reality around him; who is unusual, strange. Thus, the expression не от мира сего (not of this world) is used in Modern Russian not only as a positive characteristic, but also to express a jocular or ironic attitude to someone who lives in a world of his own.

The following extract shows the use of this expression in a Russian literary text where it is applied to an unpractical person.

(10)
Его неприспособленность к земной жизни вызывала насмешку и преклонение.............Он казался беспомощным, не от мира сего...
(Grossman, 1970b:154)

His inability to adapt to ordinary life aroused both amusement and admiration..................
He seemed helpless, to be not of this world... (Grossman (trans. by Whitney, T.) 1970a:186)

We may observe here a metaphorical construction as analysed in (10)i.

(10)i

He seemed helpless, to be not of this world...

\[ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow \]

A Frame Focus (adjectival)

the Kingdom of God

Vehicle(reconstructed)

The bibleism не от мира сего (not of this world) is viewed here as an adjectival focal expression of Grabe's (1985) type ii, i.e. as representing tension between the argument он (he) and itself. Focus interpretation takes into account the intratextual specifications of the focus, and results in a degree of literal equivalent to the metaphorical expression (Он казался беспомощным, непрактичным...//He seemed helpless, unpractical...). It
serves to prompt a reconstruction of an implied noun (vehicle in this case), which may be combined with the focus in a literal sense and may also be comparatively related to the argument in question. Establishing the intertextual relationship between this literary extract and the biblical intertext where the focal expression *не от мира сего* (not of this world) originally occurs [John 18:36] enables us to reconstruct an implied argument (vehicle) *the Kingdom of God*. The procedure of vehicle interpretation establishes the relation between the two concepts involved ('he' – 'the Kingdom of God'):

(10) ii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He</th>
<th>the Kingdom of God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vehicle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unable to adapt to ordinary life (life on earth)</td>
<td>not of ordinary life (not of earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helpless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By analysing the intratextual specifications of the tenor *he* in this literary context, and the intratextual specifications of the vehicle *the Kingdom of God* in the Bible, we can establish the reciprocal influence of the tenor and the vehicle on each other. We observe a similarity between the characteristics of the person in (10) who was unable to adapt to ordinary (in the Russian text literally 'earthly') life, and the characteristics of the Kingdom of God in the Bible as being different from life on earth. Thus, vehicle interpretation, i.e. a process of double perception or double vision (Reinhart, 1976:392) enhances our understanding of the new associations connected with an unpractical person that the bibleism *не от мира сего* (not of this world) has acquired in Modern Russian.
Babkin (1970), who analysed the expression *не от мира сего* (not of this world), considers that its new associations with an unpractical person have nothing in common with the original biblical associations. The above analysis and interpretation of this bibleism, however, allow for Babkin's statement to be reconsidered. Although the original associations connected with the expression *не от мира сего* (not of this world) are only positive, both sets of positive and negative (ironic) associations that this expression has acquired in Modern Russian derive from the original implications.

The English translation equivalent of this Russian bibleism is *not of this world*. Although it has not been found in any available English dictionary of popular expressions, we see that it is used by an English translator in the literary translation of (10) above and thus is assumed to be understood by English readers. Apparently, this metaphor also exists in English as a conventional metaphor and that is why it is translated in (10) *sensu stricto*, i.e. literally, word—for—word. But as the data have shown, this mode of translation cannot be applied to all Russian metaphorical expressions of biblical origin when translating them into English. For the purpose of accounting for Russian bibleisms in terms of translation procedure, I have surveyed current views on the translation of metaphor.

Summarising the views that advocate setting up models to describe the translation of actual metaphors (e.g. Van Den Broeck, 1981; Larson, 1984; Toury, 1985; Van Besein & Pelsmaekers, 1988), rather than giving normative statements about the way in which metaphors ought to be translated (e.g. Dagut, 1976; Newmark, 1981; 1988), a tentative scheme of such modes in order of preference may be presented as follows:

1. **Translation 'sensu stricto'**, when both source language (SL) tenor and SL vehicle are transferred into the target language (TL) (for conventional metaphors it may result either in idiomatic metaphor if the vehicle of SL,
when translated literally has the same associations in TL) or in semantic anomaly (if the vehicle of SL when translated literally has different associations in TL)).

(2) **Substitution**, when the SL vehicle is replaced by a different TL vehicle with more or less the same tenor

(3) **Translation by a simile**, retaining the vehicle (this can be done particularly if the TL text is not emotive in character)

(4) **Translation 'sensu stricto' combined with sense**, i.e. the tenor and/or the ground for comparison may be added

(5) **Omission**, when the SL metaphor is redundant or otiose. The criteria for such a decision can be set up specifically for each text after the translator has weighed up what he/she thinks is more important and what less important in the text in relation to its intention.

6) **Paraphrase**, when the resulting TL expression is on the level of commentary rather than of actual translation

According to the above list, the metaphor *He is not of this world* may be translated into the target language in the following six different ways:

(1) *He is not of this world.*

(2) *He is an alien.*

(3) *He is like someone not of this world.*

(4) *He is not of this world. He does not notice the reality around himself.*

(5) —

(6) *He is an unpractical person.*

In each case metaphors need to be analysed and interpreted carefully to be sure that the correct meaning is being communicated. Only after that can the translator successfully choose the correct translation procedure. In example (10) above, a *sensu stricto* translation is obviously the most successful. This translation of the Russian conventional (idiomatic) metaphor results in the identical English conventional (idiomatic) metaphor.
The example (10) above has been chosen to demonstrate the analysis and interpretation of a focal expression of biblical origin requiring the reconstruction of an implied argument (vehicle) for the argument in the frame. This applies to adjectival and verbal focal expressions. But when the focus is a nominal expression (e.g. as wolf in Black's (1962) *Man is a wolf*), the focus itself may serve as a vehicle for the argument in the frame. In such cases the reconstruction of another argument is not required.

The proposed method for the interpretation and translation of bibleisms in this study may be roughly summarised as follows:

- Establishing the original biblical associations of the bibleism under consideration (consulting the available dictionaries of Russian usage and verifying the expression in the Bible itself)
- Metaphorical analysis of the bibleism in a literary context
- Establishing the intratextual and intertextual associations of the bibleism in a literary context
- Metaphorical interpretation of the associations of the bibleism
- Description of the mode of translation of the Russian bibleism into English

This method of the interpretation and translation of bibleisms will be followed in the next chapter, which deals with the analysis and interpretation of data.
1 For instance, many Russian scholars (Vinogradov, 1946; Arkhangel'skii, 1964; Babkin, 1964 among others) categorise Russian phraseological units according to their internal makeup as phraseological unity (фразеологическое единство), phraseological fusion (фразеологическое сращение), phraseological combination (фразеологическое сочетание), phraseological expression (фразеологическое выражение). The meaning of phraseological unity could be partially motivated by the meanings of its constituents (e.g. a bibleism камень преткновения (stone of stumbling), whereas the meaning of phraseological fusion does not derive from the meanings of its components, i.e. its motivatedness is lost to an individual speaker of the language (e.g. a bibleism Лазарь пемь (lit. 'to sing the song of Lazarus', i.e. to try to arouse compassion). In phraseological combination there is always at least one word that can combine with a restricted number of words (e.g. a bibleism злачное место (lit. 'green pastures', i.e. a place of revelry), where злачное (lit. 'abundant with cereals', 'green') can only combine with the word место (place)). Phraseological expression is always a sentence consisting of words used metaphorically. According to some scholars only phraseological fusion may be considered idioms (Vinogradov, 1946), whereas the others (e.g. Makkai, 1972) consider all types of expressions described above to be idioms.

2 For instance (Gräbe's (1985:51) analysis), in Thomas's This Bread I Break, the verb break acquires a special metaphorical content, associating it with the violent destruction of former vitality. This kind of tenor-vehicle relationship may be applicable to the analysis of bibleisms that are sentence - metaphors.

3 This proposal of tenor-reconstruction may apply to the interpretation of bibleisms that are used metaphorically in the original context.
CHAPTER 3:
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

3.1. BIBLEISM AS CONVENTIONAL METAPHOR

The bibleisms discussed in this section are viewed as conventional metaphors (section 2.2.1.3) because they are used repeatedly in similar contexts with the same configurations of associations and are registered with these configurations of associations in the Russian dictionaries. In this study, however, I view bibleisms as foregrounded elements (section 2.2.1) of literary texts. For interpretation purposes I will consider them as focal expressions of one of Gräbe's (1985:4) three types (section 2.2.1.2). The analysis of different interactive situations in which the same bibleism (focal expression) occurs may make it possible to ascribe to it an extended range of associations. Bibleisms have become relatively non-creative in daily usage. However, I maintain here that in different contexts different features of a bibleism can come to the fore, in some cases creating a new configuration of its associations and suggesting a new similarity among these associations. Viewing the same bibleism as a focal expression in the syntactic environment of different frames (in different literary contexts), I establish and interpret in each case their reciprocal influence on one another. In different interactive situations the same focal expression may undergo different extensions and restrictions in its semantic organisation.

3.1.1 Святая святых (the Holy of Holies)

In the Bible the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) qualifies several things: an interior part of the Temple of Jerusalem which was accessible only to a high priest once a year,

И повесь завесу на крючках, и внеси туда за завесу ковчег откровения; и будет завеса отделять вам святилище от Святого—святых. [Исход 26:33]
And thou shall hang up the veil under the taches, that thou mayest bring in thither within the veil the ark of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy. [Exodus 26:33]

the sacrificial meat and bread that could be eaten only by a priest in the temple,

And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate and to sanctify them; but a stranger shall not eat thereof, because they are holy. [Exodus 29:33]

the altar,

Seven days thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and sanctify it; and it shall be an altar most holy... [Exodus 29:37]

and an atonement,

And Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of it once in a year.... it is most holy unto the Lord. [Exodus 30:10]

The original specifications of the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) based on the above biblical extracts may be summarised as follows: 1) a specially guarded place, not accessible to many (only a high priest could enter the inner chamber of the temple), 2) a very respected place (the inner chamber was accessible only to a high priest, i.e. a very respected person), 3) a place where some meaningful work is being done (an atonement was done in the inner chamber), 4) something sacred (the
inner chamber of the temple, the sacrificial bread, the altar, the process of atonement). One of the associations of the word святой (holy) in the Bible is set apart for the worship of God (Bible Dictionary, 1962:724).

The dictionaries (e.g. Slovar', 1948–1969; Ozhegov, 1982; Walshe & Berkov, 1984) state that the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is used in everyday Russian figuratively of any sacred place accessible only to the elect, the initiated. But as investigated and demonstrated by Babkin (1970), this definition of святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is not complete. This expression may have more metaphorical associations. Babkin (1970) grouped these associations around two semantic poles: for characterising particular premises, and for characterising an actual object or an abstract notion. He considers that these various metaphorical associations (he calls them shades of metaphorical meaning) have developed from the two associations that this expression has in the Bible in Babkin's view (i.e. the holy part of the temple accessible only to a high priest, and the sacrificial bread that could be eaten by priests only in the temple) (Babkin, 1970:153). In Russian usage, this expression has lost its apparent connection with its biblical prototype, i.e. the allusiveness to its biblical source is no longer obvious to an uninformed reader or speaker. I therefore view this expression as a conventional metaphor in Russian usage (section 2.2.1.3).

This expression constitutes a 'genitive link' (Brooke—Rose, 1968) of "B of C " type. In terms of interaction theories of metaphor (section 2.2.1.1), святая святых (the Holy of Holies) analysed as "B of C" may be viewed as a focal expression, which has the function of a vehicle for a nominal argument in the examples discussed below. The internal interaction of the constituents of the bibleism святая святых (the Holy of Holies) results in the associations of set apart for something important.
To account for the range of associations of the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies), I will take into consideration the relatively context-free (or static) interaction of its constituents and two types of the dynamic interaction (section 2.2.1.1): the interaction between its constituents and its original biblical specifications, and the interaction between the intratextual specifications of the tenor in a literary text and the original associations of the vehicle святая святых (the Holy of Holies).

The following examples from narrative literary texts illustrate the use of this expression as a conventional metaphor. This expression is analysed and interpreted below in terms of a focal expression of Gräbe's (1985) type ii (section 2.2.1.2).

The metaphorical association of святая святых (the Holy of Holies) with a specially guarded place, not accessible to many is based on the biblical fact that an interior chamber of the Jewish Temple was accessible only to a high priest, i.e. not to everybody. This association of the bibleism is prominent in the following extract from Aksyonov's (1985b) novel.

(1) Практически данная инструкция, конечно, была пустым звуком, потому что через электронный блок даже птица не могла пролететь без соответствующих многоступенчатых распоряжений, однако, вот ведь, оказывается, не зря инструкция — то писалась: гуляет себе паренек с "великом" и гуляет прямо по направлению к "святая святых", к секретнейшему из секретных теремов, где как раз в данный момент заседает наша мудрость.
(Aksyonov, 1985b:368)

° In fact these instructions were empty words because even a bird could not get through the electronic block without special complicated arrangements. It turned out, however, that the instructions were written with good reason: here walks a young fellow with a bike, and he walks in the direction of the Holy of Holies, to the most secret out of all secret towers where at the moment our wisdom dwells.
From the intratextual specifications of the focal expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) we understand that the young fellow walks to the government building inside the Kremlin. Thus, the tenor for the vehicle святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is здание правительства (the government building):

(1)i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>здание правительства — святая святых</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government building — the Holy of Holies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not accessible without special arrangements;</td>
<td>not accessible to many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guarded</td>
<td>guarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the most secret of all secret towers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessible to the young fellow</td>
<td>set apart for the worship of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The characteristics of the tenor "government building" as a place not accessible to many people and a specially guarded place, activate the same characteristics of the vehicle святая святых (the Holy of Holies). Among the intratextual specifications of this bibleism in (1), we encounter an expression секретнейший из секретных телеров (the most secret out of all secret towers) which has a similar structure. This repetition of the structure is functional here. It establishes the intertextual relationship with the biblical святая святых (the Holy of Holies).
It also becomes evident from the context that some associations of the tenor oppose each other and also oppose the associations of the vehicle. It is evident from the fact that although "even a bird could not get through the electronic block without special complicated arrangements", there was the young fellow walking towards this secret place. In terms of interaction theories, we encounter here both similarity and difference in metaphor (section 2.2.1.2). In this case it is so prominent that it creates irony.

The associations with a place where some meaningful work is being done, a secret place as well as a place set apart for something important (which is relatively context-free), are also present in this usage of святая святых (the Holy of Holies). Secrecy seems to be an element that is emphasised in this example ("the most secret out of all secret towers").

The characteristic of a very respected place which is based on the fact that in the Bible the most holy place was accessible only to a priest, i.e. a very respected person, a person anointed, elected by God, is activated in the following usage of святая святых (the Holy of Holies):

(2)

Классы. Лаборатории. Школьный музей. А вверху, на пятом этаже, на этаж выше, чем учительские — святая святых — кабинет директора. (Dombrovskiy, 1989:300)

(3)

Далее покатился ужин и последующие перемещения то в гостиную опять, кофе и чай, то в "святую святых", в кабинет Петра Севастьяновича... (Aksyonov, 1985b:294)

Classrooms. Laboratories. School museum. And upstairs, on the fourth floor, a floor above the teachers' room, there was the Holy of Holies — principal's office.
"Then the dinner followed and the subsequent shifts from the sitting room (again coffee and tea) to "the Holy of Holies" - Peter Sevastianovich's study...

In both examples above, the intertextual relationship between the Bible and the literary extracts is established by activating the following characteristics of the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies):

In (2) and (3), the meaning of the tenor for святая святых (the Holy of Holies) may be generalised as a respected, important person (the school principal in (2); Peter Sevastianovich in (3), the hostess's late husband who used to be a member of the government). Therefore, the configuration of associations of святая святых (the Holy of Holies) that is activated in both examples may be summarised as a very respected place.
In the following passages (4) and (5), the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is applied to a place where some meaningful work is being done.

(4)

Фишер соответствующим жестом пояснил своему спутнику, что вот теперь тот — в "святая святых", в таком, можно сказать, убежище свободного духа, где производится неподцензурный альбом "Скажи изюм". (Aksyonov, 1985b:77)

° Fisher explained to his companion with a meaningful gesture that he now was in the Holy of Holies — in the asylum of the free spirit, so to say, where the underground album "Say Cheese" was being created.

In (4)i, the vehicle святая святых (the Holy of Holies) qualifies a place (the tenor apartment which is present in the text) where a group of photographers were working on the photo album that they intended to publish without submitting it to censorship. This interactive situation establishes the intertextual relationship between the place qualified as святая святых (the Holy of Holies) in the literary text under
consideration and the holy part of the Temple in Jerusalem described in the Bible.

This may be interpreted as follows: this place (the apartment), where a secret work was being done (cf. an atonement was done in the inner chamber, the Holy of Holies, by a priest alone [Exodus 29:37]) was accessible only to a limited number of people, only a limited group of people could know about the photo album (cf. in the Bible only the priest was supposed to eat the sacrificial meat and bread — "but a stranger shall not eat thereof, because they are holy" [Exodus 29:33]). As it has been mentioned before, one of the associations of the word святой (holy) in the Bible is 'set apart for the worship of God' (Bible Dictionary, 1962:724). This association of the bibleism is also present here, since the tenor the photographers' apartment is characterised as a place set apart for production of the photo album.

In the next extract (5), we find this expression in a conversation of the two NKVD officers (NKVD is the Russian abbreviation for People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs). One of them, who is also a writer, says:

(5)

— Ну вот, по совести, — усмехнулся Роман, — тебе что? Литература нужна? Так ты читай Фадеева и Федина! Нет, ты в другой конец смотри — вот свет погас, занавес взвился, и открылось тайное тайных, святая святых — кабинет начальника следственной части НКВД... Ведь этого ни одна живая душа не видела и не слышала, а если видела, то она уже не живая...

(Dombrovskiy, 1989:496)

° To be honest, — grinned Roman, — do you need literature? Then read Fadeyev and Fedin! But you should look to the opposite direction — the lights go down, the curtains go up and the greatest mystery opens: the Holy of Holies — the office of the chief of the NKVD investigation department... This is what no living soul has seen nor heard, and if it has, then it is not a living soul any more...
The phrase *greatest mystery* in the English translation renders Russian *тайное тайных* (lit. may be translated as 'the secrecy of secrecies').

In (5), *святая святых* (the Holy of Holies) is an NKVD office where interrogations were held. The secrecy of the NKVD office is emphasised by the expression *тайное тайных* (lit. may be translated as 'the secrecy of secrecies') which is coined by the author following the model of *святая святых* (the Holy of Holies). This functional repetition of the structure of the bibleism establishes the intertextual relationships between this literary text and the Holy of Holies in the Bible.

(5)

The characteristic of *secrecy* is also emphasised by the last sentence of the extract. Therefore, *secrecy* is the main characteristic of the vehicle *святая святых* (the Holy of Holies) that is activated in this case.
The next group of metaphorical associations of the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is described by Babkin (1970) as a group of associations characterising some actual object and an abstract notion. I propose to divide this group in two: one in relation to an actual object, another — to an abstract notion, since these associations have developed on the basis of two different uses of this expression in the Bible. "Actual objects" to which святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is applied in the Bible are the altar [Exodus 29:37], sacrificial meat and bread [Exodus 29:33]. "Abstract notions" are an atonement and a sacrifice [Exodus 30:10].

To illustrate how the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) can be applied to an actual object to characterise it as something sacred, protected, the following extract from a literary text (6) may be used:

(6) Забывая все свои недуги, он ползал по ковру, умиленно поднимая и подавая младшему из Лесковых вещицы, которые последний святотатственно брал со святая святых — с писательского стола. (Leskov, A. Zhizn' N. Leskova, VII, 7.) (quoted from Slovar', 1948—1969)

° Forgetting all his illnesses, he was crawling on the carpet, picking up and sweetly giving to the youngest Leskov the things, which the latter sacrilegiously took from the Holy of Holies — the writer’s desk.

Here we observe an explicit tenor—vehicle relationship:
This may be interpreted as follows: the writer's desk in his house was protected and inviolable like the altar [Exodus 29:37] or sacrificial meat and bread [Exodus 29:33] in the Bible. Its violation would be as sacrilegious as a violation of the access to the altar or sacrificial meat and bread. The desk was set apart for the writer's important work just as the inner chamber of the temple was set apart for the worship of God. It is on the basis of this focal expression that the intertextual relationship between this literary extract and the Bible is established.

In the following extracts we can observe how the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is used to characterise abstract notions.

(7) "Они", как вы понимаете, это жильцы нашего дома, пайщики ЖСК "Московский писатель". То есть довольно большая группа людей, которая, когда нужно, называется коллективом. В условиях нашей системы коллектив — это чуть ли не святая святых. Будь собрание на стороне Иванько, он бы в своих дальнейших усилиях это обстоятельство непременно бы использовал. Он опирался бы на мнение коллектива, он поднимал бы авторитет коллектива, он призывал бы уважать коллектив. Но коллектив, голосующий против него, это уже не
"They", as you must realize, are the tenants of our building, the shareholders of the Moscow Writers' Housing Co-operative. That is a rather large group of people, which, when necessary, is called a collective. Under our system, the collective is practically the holy of holies. If the assembly had been on Ivanko's side, he would certainly have used it in his future efforts. He would lean on the opinion of the collective, he would hoist up the authority of the collective, he would call for respect for the collective. But the collective, since it voted against him, was no longer a collective, but a "they" which he intended to turn into a song—and—dance group. (Voinovich (trans. by Lapeza, D.), 1977a:45)

In this extract (7), from Voinovich's (1976) *Ivankiada*, the bibleism святая святых (the Holy of Holies) establishes the intertextual relationship with the biblical text through the activation of the following associations:

(7)i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>коллектив</td>
<td>святая святых</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a collective</td>
<td>the Holy of Holies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenor ↔ Vehicle

- opinion of which is important for its members
  - very important ritual for the believers
    - significant ritual
    - sacred ritual
  - respected ritual
- respected membership
- set apart for something important
  - set apart for the worship of God
- respected, important, etc., when needed vs always respected and sacred (holy)
We may observe in (7)i not only similarities but some differences between the tenor and the vehicle. In terms of interaction theories, these differences are as operative as the similarities (cf. section 2.2.1.2). In this case, the interaction of the similarities and the differences of the tenor and the vehicle produce irony. It is understood from the context that a collective (tenor) is called a collective (i.e. an important, respected organisation, etc.) only when necessary for somebody. And since the author mentions that under the Soviet system, "the collective is almost the holy of holies" (the translator renders 'чуть ли' as 'practically', 'almost', however, seems to be a more precise translation), it implies that святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is important and respected (or holy) only when necessary for somebody. This opposes the connotations of святая святых (the Holy of Holies) in the Bible (where it is always sacred) and thus, implies irony.

A similar configuration of associations of the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) is observed in the next example (8). Nevertheless, it is used here without ironisation.

(8)

Он говорил о том, как трудно распознать врага. Вот, говорит, Азеф был руководителем боевой организации — это самое святое святых, что было у эсеров, а оказался предателем. (Dombrovskiy, 1989:402)

° He was saying how difficult it was to recognise an enemy. Look, he said, — Azef was the leader of the military organisation. It was the Holy of Holies for the socialist—revolutionaries, but he turned out to be a traitor.

where
In the next extract (9) the expression свята святых (the Holy of Holies) stands for moral values, beliefs which form the essence of any society:

(9) Ты разве не встречал людей, которые упиваются тем, что они находятся в самом низу? Они всегда могут оправдывать свое неудачничество неправедивым устройством общества, своей исключительной честностью, скромностью и вообще необыкновенностью. Короче говоря, Генийалиссимус посягнул на святая святых общества. (Voinovich, 1987b:270)

You mean you’ve never met people who revel in the fact that they’re on the very bottom? They can always rationalize their failure because of social inequality, and their own outstanding honesty, modesty, uniqueness. To be brief, the Genialissimo had encroached upon society’s holy of holies. (Voinovich (trans. by Lourie, R.), 1987a:332)

Here again, as in (1) and (7) above, we encounter an element of irony in the usage of свята святых (the Holy of Holies).
Revelling in the fact of being on the very bottom does not comply with the beliefs of the Communist society, where nobody is supposed to be "on the very bottom". In other words, such an idea of the Holy of Holies confronts the real idea of the Holy of Holies of the Communist society (where everybody is supposed to be equal) and the Holy of Holies in the Bible. We observe here the differences between the associations of the tenor and the vehicle (section 2.2.1.2). This makes us perceive the whole passage (9) as ironical.

Having studied the data provided by Babkin (1970:152–162) for his investigation of the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies), and my own data, I have arrived at the following conclusion. I consider that Babkin's proposal to group the metaphorical associations of this expression around two semantic poles (first, for characterising particular premises and second, for characterising an actual object or an abstract notion) can be elaborated. The expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) may be metaphorically used in Modern Russian:

(I) For characterising premises:
1) a specially guarded place, not accessible to many; 2) a very respected place; 3) a place where some meaningful or secret work is being done; 4) a secret place.

(II) For characterising an actual object:
1) something sacred; 2) something inviolable; 3) something protected, not accessible to many; 4) something valuable, precious.

(III) For characterising an abstract notion: 1) something very important, significant; 2) something very private, intimate; 3) something secret; 4) moral values, beliefs.

Although the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) has become a conventional metaphor in Russian usage and has lost its apparent connection with its biblical source, the analysis of the above instances from literary texts in terms of interaction theories of metaphor reinforces our understanding of its new implications. It shows that all the abovementioned metaphorical associations of this bibleism derive from its original biblical associations. In other words, the meaning that the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies) has in the Bible plays an important role in the development of all new associations that it has already acquired and is acquiring in modern usage. The biblical associations serve as a basis for these new associations in all instances discussed above.

Functioning as a vehicle, святая святых (the Holy of Holies) may interact with at least three groups of tenors referring to premises, an object and an abstract notion. Each group may be divided into four more specific types of tenors where the configuration of the characteristics of each tenor is based on one of the four original specifications of святая святых (the Holy of Holies): 1) a specially guarded (protected) place, not accessible to many (only a high priest could enter the inner chamber of the temple), 2) a very respected (important) place (the inner chamber was accessible only to a high priest, i.e. a very respected person), 3) a place where some meaningful (important) work is being done (an atonement was done in the inner chamber), 4) something sacred (valuable) (the inner chamber of the temple, the sacrificial meat and bread, the altar, the process of atonement).
The possible interactive situations into which the conventional metaphor святая святых (the Holy of Holies) may enter as a vehicle are listed in Table 1 (Appendix 2). It indicates what specific characteristic of святая святых (the Holy of Holies) may be activated in each case. From this table one may see that at least four associations are always present in the expression святая святых (the Holy of Holies): protected, significant, not accessible to many, set apart for something important, valuable. These comprise the stable configuration of associations of the conventional metaphor святая святых (the Holy of Holies). The associations of set apart for something important may be considered as relatively context-free (section 2.2.1.1).

The English equivalent of the Russian expression святая святых that derives from the same biblical source is the Holy of Holies. Apparently, it has entered English usage in this form under the influence of the Latin translation sanctum sanatorium (Kunin, 1984). As a metaphorical construction itself (section 2.2.1.1), the English expression the Holy of Holies also presents a 'genitive link' (Brooke—Rose, 1968) of "B of C" type. The next example illustrates its usage as an expression characterising premises:

(10) 'I find it so difficult,' he said... 'to remember the various... passwords and devices with which I should approach the Holy of Holies. (Angus Wilson) (quoted from Longman Dictionary of English Idiom, 1979)

The expression the Holy of Holies here qualifies a place which cannot be entered without passwords and devices. A place that is protected by such passwords and devices is obviously not accessible to many (cf. in the Bible the inner chamber of the temple was not accessible to many), but only to the elect such as the speaker who knows these passwords and devices. Here we may observe the following tenor—vehicle relationship:
In other words, the place the speaker is talking about in (10) must be a very important and secret place, a place set apart for some meaningful or secret work. These associations coincide with the associations that the Russian expression святая святых may have when used to characterise some premises.

Apparently, the Holy of Holies in English has the same associations as святая святых when applied to abstract notions, as seen from the literary English translations of (7) and (9) above, where the Holy of Holies is used to translate святая святых.

Therefore, the expressions святая святых and the Holy of Holies when used as conventional metaphors (section 2.2.2.1) in both Russian and English are capable of a sensu stricto translation.
3.1.2 Козел отпущения (scapegoat)

In Russian usage, the metaphorical expression козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') has the following definitions: a person who constantly has to take the blame and responsibility for others (Slovär', 1948–1969; Ashukin & Ashukina, 1960); a person who is made responsible for everything (Ozhegov, 1982); one punished for the mistakes or offences of others (Walshe & Berkov, 1984).

To summarise these definitions, it may be said that the expression козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') in everyday usage is applied metaphorically to someone made responsible (and punished) for the mistakes or offences of others. Its connection with its biblical prototype is no longer apparent. I therefore view this expression as a conventional metaphor (section 2.2.1.3) in Russian usage. I analyse and interpret it in the following literary contexts in terms of a focal expression of Gräbe's (1985) type ii (section 2.2.1.2).

In terms of the constituents of metaphor (section 2.2.1.1), the metaphorical expression козел отпущения (lit. 'goat of remission/absolution' (its English equivalent scapegoat is discussed further below)) may be viewed as a focal expression that presents a 'genitive link' of "B of C" type (Brooke—Rose, 1958). We can observe an internal interaction of "B" (vehicle) and "C" (tenor) (Gräbe, 1985) and their partial equation. Even without knowing the origin on which the metaphorical associations of the expression козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') are based, we can partially understand them from the internal, relatively context—free (or static) interaction of its constituents (as explained in section 2.2.1.1). This tenor—vehicle relationship is implied in all three literary examples analysed below. This scheme, however, will not be repeated in the analyses to follow.
The expression symbolises a remission of somebody's sins at the expense of some helpless being, i.e. an element of atonement is present in the combination of the two words with their associations. This interpretation of the internal interaction gives us a partial understanding of the associations that the expression козел отпушения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') may have. I maintain that the meaning of this expression is composed both from the relatively context-free (or static) interaction of its constituents and its interaction as a whole with its original contextual specifications (a dynamic interaction) (section 2.2.1.1). In other words, a deeper insight into the associations of the expression козел отпушения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') may be gained by taking into account its biblical origin.

The expression козел отпушения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') has come to Russian usage from the Hebrew tradition described in the Bible:

И бросит Аарон о обоих козлах жребий: один жребий для Господа, а другой жребий для отпушения. [Левит 16:8]

And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat. [Leviticus 16:8]
In Israel, there was a Hebrew symbolic ceremony of putting the sins of the people on the live goat. On a special day the high priest laid his hands upon the head of the live goat, confessed over him all the sins of the people of Israel and sent the goat away into the wilderness [Leviticus 16:5—22]. Hence, the literal associations of the expression козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') are based on the following biblical description of the Hebrew ceremony.

Возложит Аарон обе руки свои на голову живого козла, и исповедует над ним все беззакония сынов Израилевых и все преступления их и все грехи их, и возложит их на голову козла, и отошлет с нарочным человеком в пустыню. И понесет козел на себе все беззакония их в землю непроходимую, и пустит он козла в пустыню. [Левит 16:21—22]

And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness. [Leviticus 16:21—22]

From the above extracts it is evident that the biblical козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') is characterised in the original biblical context as an innocent being who had to (was chosen by the circumstances not dependent on him) take the responsibility for the mistakes and transgressions of others; who had to be sacrificed for the atonement of others; someone helpless who had to be punished and sent away, an outcast. The biblical goat literally was a 'goat of remission', a scapegoat. Nevertheless, the act of confessing the sins of the people
"over" the goat is a symbolic act. Thus, we may say that generally the original associations of this expression are retained when it is applied metaphorically in common usage to "someone made responsible and/or punished for the mistakes or offences of others", although an ordinary individual speaker of Russian does not associate it with its biblical origin. The connection of this expression to its origin has become so remote that it has lost its allusiveness to the biblical goat, and has become a conventional metaphor in Russian usage.

To account for the range of associations of this bibleism, I will take into consideration the relatively context-free (or static) interaction of its constituents and two types of the dynamic interaction (section 2.2.1.1): the interaction between its constituents and its original biblical specifications, and the interaction between the intratextual specifications of the tenor in a literary text and the original associations of the vehicle козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution').

In the following literary extract, the character, who is an editor of one of the major Moscow newspapers, had been called to a meeting at the Central Committee of the Communist Party where he was told about the shortcomings of the work of his staff. In the passage (11) below, he is thinking about that meeting.

(11) Стало ясно, что Политбюро нужно найти козлов отпущения. Отделы ЦК были передаточным звеном, и взвалить вину за недостатки пропагандистской работы на плечи газет естественное всего. (Druzhnikov, 1989:53)

° It is obvious that the Politburo wants to find scapegoats. The Central Committee sections were nothing more than mediators and it was very natural to blame the newspapers for the shortcomings of the propagandistic campaign.

Here we may observe an explicit tenor—vehicle relationship:
(11)i

gazety как козлы отпущения
newspapers are (like) 'goats of remission' (=scapegoats)

Argument

Focus

Tenor ⇔ Vehicle

cannot be responsible for the whole process of propaganda

powerless against the Politburo (subordinate to it)

blamed (undeservedly, in the eyes of the speaker) for the shortcomings of the whole process of propaganda

have to be punished to conceal Central Committee's faults

chosen to take the blame by the Central Committee (the superior)

innocent blameless

speechless helpless against the human being

undeservedly blamed for the sins of others

punished for the atonement of others

chosen to take the undeserved blame by the priest (someone superior) casting lots (circumstances not dependent on him)

(The implied tenor-vehicle relashionship "B of C" in (11)i is anlaysed in (I).)

First, it should be noted that in this literary extract we deal with three cases of metonymy: Политбюро (Politburo), отделы ЦК (Central Committee sections), газеты (newspapers). These institutions (governing bodies and publishing organs of the Communist Party) stand here for the people associated with them. The primary subject in this construction (11)i, is in the plural — газеты (newspapers), so we see that the focal expression козлы отпущения (scapegoats, lit. 'goats of
remission/absolution') which has the function of the vehicle, can be used in the plural, too.

The analysis (11) above leads to the following interpretation: the statement that the Politburo looks for the scapegoats (meaning the newspapers), implies that the Politburo wants to blame the newspapers (in the Russian text literally "to put the blame upon the shoulders of the newspapers"), which are subordinate to the Politburo and Central Committee (i.e. powerless against them) just as the high priest was putting the transgressions of the people of Israel upon the head of the helpless (powerless) goat in the Bible [Leviticus 16:21]. The Politburo people want to blame and punish the people responsible for the propagandistic work of the newspapers, as if they were responsible for the whole process of propaganda for which the Central Committee and the Politburo were actually mainly responsible. In other words, the superior institutions want to conceal their mistakes at the expense of the subordinate ('helpless') institutions (cf. in the Bible, the atonement of the people of Israel was made at the expense of a helpless domestic animal).

The above analysis and interpretation show that the literary context activates more associations of козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') than just blame and punishment for the offences of the others as stated in the Russian dictionaries. This bibleism establishes at least five points of interaction between the literary extract (11) in which it occurs and its source (biblical) text: those who are called козлы отпущения (scapegoats, lit. 'goats of remission/absolution') are innocent, powerless, undeservedly blamed, punished for the remission of the sins of others and chosen to take the blame by someone superior. The associations of innocence, helplessness and remission may be viewed as relatively context-free (section 2.2.1.1).
In the following extract, the group of photographers who wanted to publish a photo album without submitting it to censorship (which was virtually impossible in the Soviet Union) were going to write a letter about it to Brezhnev – the leader of the Communist Party and the USSR at that time (he was jocularly known for his thick eyebrows, that is why he is referred to as "the Eyebrowed"). When the photographers gathered together, everybody looked up at Maxim, an informal leader of the group. He understood that they supposed that he was to write the letter.

(12)


"You are going to write to the Eyebrowed, go ahead. I will eagerly join all of you. Do I have to write for you? To create this filth? Why? Why not Slavka or Andrew... Who appointed me as a leader here, the scapegoat?"

In (12), the main idea expressed by the bibleism козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') is someone who has to take the responsibility for others, although the association of someone who has to take the blame and be punished, like in (11), is also present. These are activated by the phrase Сочинять эту пакость? (To create this filth?). In other words, Maxim (the leader) does not want to take a responsibility for something that could cause punishment. An author of a letter to the leader of the Communist Party and the USSR was very likely to be traced by KGB. This could have different consequences.

The tenor аугеп (leader) in (12) does not activate exactly the same configuration of associations of the vehicle козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') that have been activated in (11). It is
shown in the analysis (12)i below. The implied tenor—vehicle relationship "B of C" in (12)i is analysed in (I).

(12)i

лидер (Максим) как козел отпущения
a leader (Maxim) is (like) a 'goat of remission' (=scapegoat)

Argument

Focus

Tenor ↔ Vehicle

helpless (helplessness is felt in his words 'Why me?')

innocent

chosen to be a leader of the group for his strong character

chosen to be responsible for the group of people being a weak animal

chosen alone to be responsible for what a group of people has done

undeservedly chosen, in the eyes of the speaker, to be responsible for the group

undeservedly chosen to be responsible for the sins of the people of Israel

This may be interpreted as follows: Maxim, who is an informal leader of the group, is chosen by this group to be responsible for what the group decides to do. He resents this, for he does not want to take the responsibility and one may detect a feeling of helplessness in his questions that indicate his opinion on being undeservedly chosen. These intratextual specifications of the expression козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') correspond to the
characteristics of the scapegoat in the biblical text, and thus establish the intertextual relationship.

There is one interesting point in this relationship, however. Maxim has been chosen to be a leader of the group obviously for his strong character. In the Bible, the goat, a helpless, weak animal was chosen to take the responsibility for the sins of the people.

The interaction of the differences (cf. section 2.2.1.2) in this usage of the bibleism козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') adds one more dimension to this expression.

Another configuration of associations of this expression is activated by the following passage where it is an unsociable, lonely boy who is called козел отпущения (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution')

(13) Всё он что—то строгал, чинил, мастерил, соединял какие—то колесики, пружинки. Большую часть времени он проводил в заброшенной полуразвалившейся баньке. Смотрел он в землю. Естественно, что был он козлом отпущения среди ребят. Мало кто не дергал, не стукал его по голове, не щипал, не дразнил. Он всё сносил и только еще больше замыкал. (Aksyonov, 1965:26)

°He was constantly planing, repairing, making something, connecting some little wheels and springs. Most of the time he was spending in a deserted tumble—down little bathhouse. He was always looking down. Naturally, he was a scapegoat among the children. They pinched, pulled him, hit him on the head, made fun of him. He put up with everything and became more and more unsociable.

In (13) above, a weak boy who was unsociable and lonely, looked strange (and obviously unpleasant) to other children that could happily play in a group. The boy did not ever offend anybody or did not do anything wrong. He was innocent. He was, however, constantly bullied by the other children who were stronger than him. He was an object of mockery and
humiliation. They never accepted him to be one of them. The boy was an outcast, a victim of the cruelty of others.

(13)i

мальчик – козел отпущения
boy is (like) a 'goat of remission' (=scapegoat)

The intratextual characteristics of the tenor prompt the establishment of the intertextual relationship with the associations of the scapegoat in the biblical text: a helpless animal was undeservedly chosen by the superior power (the priest) to be cast out. The biblical goat may also be viewed as a victim and this association interacts with the above description of the boy in (13). The relatively context-free (section 2.2.1.1) associations of innocence, helplessness and remission are also present here ((13)i).
Another association that has not been activated in the previous examples, is *someone unattractive*. The children considered the lonely boy to be ugly — this corresponds with the image of a goat which is an unpleasant looking animal. This association does not depend on the original biblical context, it is present in the expression itself. However, it is not always activated (for instance, it is not activated in (11) and (12) above).

Thus, in this literary context the term *козел отпущения* (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') itself acquires new associations with an *object of undeserved humiliation or victimisation, an outcast*.

It has emerged from the data that different configurations of the characteristics of *козел отпущения* (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') activated by different contexts can be summarised as at least three different shades of meaning of this expression: (1) one punished for the mistakes or offenses of others; (2) one who has to take the responsibility for others; and (3) an object of humiliation, an outcast.

As a vehicle, the metaphorical expression *козел отпущения* (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') may interact with at least three types of tenors. These possible interactive situations are summarised in Table 2 (Appendix 2), which also indicates what specific characteristic of this bibleism may be activated in each case. This table makes it evident that at least four associations of the expression *козел отпущения* (scapegoat, lit. 'goat of remission/absolution') are present in its various uses: *innocent, helpless, taking the undeserved blame and responsibility (remission)*, and *chosen by a superior power*. (The first three associations may be considered as relatively context—free (section 2.2.1.1).) These four associations form a stable configuration of associations of this expression as a conventional metaphor.
The Russian conventional metaphorical expression козел отпущения, which is a genitive metaphorical construction (lit. 'goat of remission/absolution'), has an English equivalent of the same biblical origin in the form of a compound word scapegoat. Early English translators of the Bible (apparently, Tyndale (The Oxford English Dictionary, 1989)) invented a word that has survived through the centuries: "scape" (a form of "escape") + "goat" (Ehrlich and Scott, 1990). The element of atonement is also present in this English expression. The Oxford English Dictionary (1989) provides two definitions of the term, literal, referring to the goat of the Hebrew ritual, and metaphorical: 'one who is blamed or punished for the sins of others'. A more general definition of metaphorical word scapegoat is given by Ehrlich and Scott (1990): "an unwitting victim". This definition may imply someone who has to be responsible, has to be blamed or punished for the mistakes and offences of others, as well as an object of undeserved humiliation, an outcast. There does not seem to be anything unusual about the associations that the expression has in Russian, that would be unfamiliar to English speakers. The range of metaphorical associations of the Russian expression козел отпущения and its English equivalent scapegoat seems to coincide.

There is, however, one peculiar thing about the usage of scapegoat in the English language. This word in Modern English may be used as a verb as well as a noun. (Thus, if we say in Russian сделать кого-то козлом отпущения (lit. to make a scapegoat of someone), it can be translated into English as a single word 'to scapegoat'). For instance,

(14) A company is really too large to scapegoat. (Dunkan, 1978 (quoted from The Oxford English Dictionary, 1989)

In other words, a company is too large to be made a scapegoat of, i.e. to scapegoat is a verbal focus on the basis of which we may reconstruct the following tenor—vehicle relationship:
The contradiction of the characteristics (i.e. the interplay of the similarities and differences) (cf. section 2.2.1.2) as shown in the analysis (14)i above, activates the association of *scapegoat* as *an unwitting victim* who is helpless against some superior power. In other words, the company is too large for someone to blame it undeservedly and to get away with that (cf. in the Bible, the people could easily put the blame on the goat and did not have to answer to anybody for what they did to that animal).

The connection of the expression *scapegoat* to its origin in English usage has also become remote, but the original associations of the expression are retained.

This metaphorical expression has become a conventional metaphor in both Russian and English. Therefore, when it is used as conventional metaphor in Russian literary texts its translation into English can be done *sensu stricto.*
3.1.3 Притча во языцах (a proverb (and a byword) among all nations)

The expression притча во языцах (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') appears in the Bible in the fifth book of Moses, called Deuteronomy (28:37). It is one of the curses of disobedience to God.

И будешь ужасом, притчою и посмешищем у всех народов, к которым отведет тебя Господь. [Второзаконие, 28:37]

And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee. [Deuteronomy 28:37]

Притча (proverb) is a brief traditional saying or short story of a didactic or advisory nature. Языци is an Old Slavonic word for "languages" and also for "peoples". In the modern translation of the Russian Bible it is replaced by народы (nations). In Modern Russian, however, this biblical expression has retained its Old Slavonic form. The expression is used in the Bible metaphorically, meaning that one of the curses for disobedience to God is to become the object of general disapproval and derision (lit. to become a subject of a story told with a moralising intention). These metaphorical associations are retained when the expression is used in everyday language, but Russian speakers using it do not associate this expression with its original biblical context. I therefore view it as a conventional metaphor in Russian usage. This expression is analysed and interpreted below in terms of a focal expression of Gräbe's (1985) type ii (section 2.2.1.2).

In the literary extract below the character speaks of abstract art in the Soviet Union in 1960s. This kind of art was not welcome there at that time. That is why the character says that:

(15)

Абстрактная живопись была притчей во языцах. На выставках о ней спорили студенты, пенсионеры, врачи, рабочие. Большинство ругалось предпоследними словами и возмущалось. (Aksyonov, 1969:145)
Abstract art was a **subject that stirred passions**. At every art exhibition heated discussions were held by students, doctors, workers, old folks on pension. Most of them denounced it in no certain terms. (Aksyonov (trans. by Wettlin, M), 1970:228)

The phrase **a subject that stirred passions** in the English translation is a substitution for 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations' that is being discussed. In my opinion, the substitute is one of the associations of the tenor:

(15)i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>абстрактное искусство</th>
<th>притча во языцех</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abstract art</td>
<td>a proverb among all nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Argument**

- an object much spoken of
- a denounced object (by some people)
- an approved object (by the others who argued)
- an object that stirred passions
- "disobedience" to the rules of the classic art
- disobedience to God

**Focus**

- an object much spoken of

**Vehicle**

This explicit tenor—vehicle relationship shows that abstract art was a subject that was a lot spoken of, a subject of approval by some and disapproval by many. We may say that abstract art was not obedient to the rules of classic art (or to the Soviet art), i.e. it did not depict what was usually expected to be depicted — scenes of real life, etc., (cf. disobedience to God in the Bible). Then, becoming "a proverb" ("a subject of disapproval and derision by many") may be viewed like receiving a curse for disobedience. On the other hand, abstract art was defended by some people who argued about it in "heated discussions". In other words, it was a subject that stirred passions.
In the Bible, this metaphorical expression is applied to a human being (an animate object), whereas in the literary text above it refers to art (an inanimate object). The analysis shows that the expression притча во языцех (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') in this literary text (15) establishes the intertextual relationship with its biblical counterpart on three levels: an object of disapproval and derision by many; an object much spoken of; an object receiving a curse for not complying with the authoritative rules.

We see that in the English literary translation of (15), the Russian expression притча во языцех (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') is not rendered into English sensu stricto, i.e. the translator does not use its exact biblical equivalent a proverb (and a byword) among all nations, but substitutes it with another English metaphorical expression — a subject that stirred passions. It appears that the expression a proverb and a byword, among all nations has not entered Modern English as a popular idiom (in other words, it has not become a conventional metaphor in English usage). Several modern dictionaries of English have been consulted in which this expression does not appear. The partial equivalent of the Russian expression притча во языцех, however, has been registered by Smith (1928) in his list of the English idioms of biblical origin: (to become) a proverb (and a byword), with a meaning analogous to the meaning of its Russian counterpart — to become notorious. Now this English expression has become obsolete.

Smirnitskiy (1989) in his Russian—English Dictionary offers a substitution translation of the expression притча во языцех as the talk of the town. I will use this substitution to translate the expression притча во языцех in the next literary extract. (In the existing English translation of this Aksyonov's (1985a) novel, In Search of Melancholy Baby, by M. H. Heim,
this chapter is omitted.) In this passage, the character speaks of his neighbour.

(16)

Есть у меня сосед, можно сказать, притча во языце по всему миру. Повсюду его вспоминают и не всегда добрый словом: несдержанны, мол, на язык, жестковат, ничего, мол, удивительного — ковбойское прошлое. (Aksyonov, 1987:82)

"I have a neighbour, one can say, who is the talk of the town. He is being spoken of all over the world, and not always kindly: unrestrained in his speech, a little rough... Well, this is not surprising due to his cowboy past.

Here, in (16), the context emphasises various metaphorical associations of the expression притча во языце (lit. 'to be a proverb (and a byword) among all nations). For instance, Повсюду его вспоминают и не всегда добрым словом (He is being spoken of all over the world, and not always kindly). The "neighbour" that the character is talking about is the president of the USA. The wider context of the novel implies that the word "neighbour" is used metaphorically in (16). It is also emphasised by such intratextual associations as being spoken of all over the world, not... kindly, ... his cowboy past. Thus we may observe the following metaphorical construction:

(16)

президент — сосед — притча во языце

president — neighbour — a proverb among all nations

↓

Tenor 1 — Vehicle 1 — Focus

↓

Tenor 2 — Vehicle 2

(implicitly)

The following analysis shows how the focal expression притча во языце (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') metaphorically qualifies сосед (neighbour) and президент (president) in the above constellation.
The above analysis leads to the following interpretation: by becoming a proverb among all nations (lit. 'a proverb among all nations'), a well-known name of this president became notorious all over the world. Obviously the
president is disapproved of not only for some of his actions, but sometimes also for the way he is and for his background: his speech, his manners do not always comply with the general image of a president (such as an authoritative image). These intratextual associations relating to the vehicle притча во язычех (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') qualifying a man, may be viewed as interacting with the associations of man's disobedience to God (the authority of God) that the expression has in the Bible.

Thus, the expression притча во язычех (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') in (16) establishes the intertextual relationship with its biblical counterpart on the same three levels as in (15) (only in (15) it is applied to an inanimate object such as art): an object of general disapproval and derision; an object much spoken of; an object receiving a curse for not complying with the authoritative rules. In other words, it is an object that arouses different emotions, i.e. that stirs passions.

Table 3 (Appendix 2) summarises the possible interactive situations that the bibleism притча во язычех (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') may enter as a vehicle. This table indicates that at least two associations (much spoken of and disobedient to certain authoritative rules) form a stable configuration of characteristics of this conventional metaphor. These two associations also imply that притча во язычех (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations') is something argued about.

As it has been mentioned before, the conventional metaphor a proverb (and a byword) among all nations has not been found as a registered popular expression in the available modern dictionaries of English. Thus, a sensu stricto mode of translation of the Russian bibleism притча во язычех into English is not applicable. The suggested substitutions for it in English are: a subject that stirs passion; the talk of the town. These English metaphorical expressions have similar connotations of something
that arouses negative emotions, that is an object of general disapproval and derision. They may be considered as successful translations of the Russian expression притча во языце (lit. 'a proverb (and a byword) among all nations').

3.1.4 Злоба дня (the evil of the day)

Not many contemporary Russian speakers realise that the expression злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') has its origin in the Bible. It occurs in the following words of Jesus:

Довлеет дневи злоба его. [Матфей 6:34] (Church Slavonic Elizabeth Bible)

Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. [Matthew 6:34]

Jesus talked in this way about the concerns and problems that are part of every day. Having interpreted this metaphorical expression more literally, later translators of the Russian Bible paraphrased this passage as:

Довольно для каждого дня своей заботы. [Матфей 6:34]

which literally reads as "There is enough concern (or "there are enough problems") in every day".

As a metaphorical construction itself (cf. section 2.2.1.1), the bibleism злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') constitutes a 'genitive link' (Brooke-Rose, 1968) of "B of C " type. In terms of interaction theories of metaphor (section 2.2.1.1), злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') analysed as "B of C" may be viewed as a focal expression, which has the function of a vehicle for a nominal argument in the examples discussed below. The internal interaction of the constituents of the bibleism злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') may be analysed as follows.

The Russian word забота (concern) bears negative as well as positive connotations ("the concern may be for something good", or "there might
be a concern because of a really bad problem"), whereas the word зло́ба (the evil) has a negative meaning. But in the course of assimilation of the expression зло́ба дню́ in Modern Russian, the implied argument ("A") забота (concern) influenced the metaphorical term ("B") зло́ба (lit. 'spite, the evil) in the genitive construction (section 2.2.1.1) and the latter acquired positive associations in addition to the negative associations:

(II) 

\[
\text{ зло́ба дню́} = \text{ забота дню́}
\]

the evil of the day (= concern of the day)

\[B \text{ of } C \quad ( = \quad A )\]

- something bad (that happens during the day)
- concern may be for something good
- concern may be because of something bad
- something that attracts attention

Thus, the relatively context-free associations (section 2.2.1.1) of this bibelism may be summarised as *something that attracts attention*.

In Modern Russian the expression зло́ба дню́ (lit. 'the evil of the day') is applied to the burning question or topics of the day (which could be positive or negative). It can stand for something that is the centre of attention or for some problem that has to be solved immediately. These associations of the bibleism зло́ба дню́ (lit. 'the evil of the day') may be viewed as relatively dynamic or context-dependent (section 2.2.1.1). I view this expression as a conventional metaphor (section 2.2.1.3) in Russian usage.

Between the sixties and the eighties, almost every Soviet newspaper or magazine had a section with the heading На зло́бу дню́ (lit."Concerning the evil of the day") concerning the latest news, the topics of the day.
From my own experience, I know that the frequent occurrence of such a heading in the Soviet mass media sometimes would make foreigners (English speakers) wonder "Why are the Russians so evil, spiteful?" This happened to those who (even unaware of that he or she was doing so) unconsciously interpreted the metaphorical expression злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') as a "B of C" type where "C = B" (section 2.2.1.1):

(III)

злоба дня  (lit. the evil of the day)

\[ B \text{ of } C \]

\[ = \text{ день (как)/(имеет) зло (the day (is)/(has) the evil).} \]

\[ C = B \]

\[ \downarrow \]

\[ \downarrow \]

Tenor ↔ Vehicle

- a day with news
- something bad
- spite
- hostility
- anger

Apparently, the English identical analogue of the expression злоба дня which is 'the evil of the day' has not entered English usage as a conventional metaphorical expression with the same associations as its Russian counterpart. In Modern Russian this conventional metaphor has two shades of meaning: 1) the question that has to be solved, the matter that needs to be settled immediately; and 2) the topics, the issue of the day, something that attracts attention.

The first association of this bibleism may be demonstrated by the following example:

(17) Другое замечательное качество Белинского как критика было в его понимании того, что именно стоит на очереди, что требует немедленного разрешения, в чем сказывается "злоба дня".

(Turgenev, I. Vospominaniya o Belinskom) (quoted from Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka, 1948—1969: 1241)
Another remarkable quality of Belinskiy as a critic is his understanding of what comes first, what needs to be resolved immediately, what the burning question of the day is.

The phrase *the burning question of the day* in the English translation is a substitution for the bibleism злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') that is being discussed. The bibleism is viewed here as a focal expression of Grabe's (1985) type ii (section 2.2.1.2).

```
17
дeло, вопрос — злоба дня
question, matter — the evil of the day
 Argument Focus
↓
Tenor implied ⇔ Vehicle

- attracts attention
- comes first
- i.e. requires some action (needs to be resolved immediately)

concern (some negative matter) of the day that has to be settled
```

This may be interpreted as follows: the questions that have to be solved, the matters that need to be settled immediately may be like 'the evil of the day', i.e. they may present the problems of the day that are bad, evil.

In the English translation of (17), the Russian expression злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') has to be substituted by an analogous English metaphorical expression such as *the burning question of the day*, since 'the evil of the day' has not entered English usage as a conventional metaphor and thus a *sensu stricto* translation is not applicable. The substitution metaphor has analogous associations in TL, that are evident if we carry out both focus and vehicle interpretation of *the burning question of the day*. Since the focus here is *burning*, in Reinhart's (1976) (section 2.3) terms we can substitute another expression for it to yield a
literal expression, similar in meaning to the original, such as *the important* or *disturbing question of the day*. Thus, we gain a partial understanding of what the metaphor is about. The focus prompts the reconstruction of the vehicle such as *fire*. Then, the literal expression *the burning fire of the day* will not be similar in meaning to the original. Now we can establish the relation between the two concepts involved — *the question* and *the fire* and gain a full understanding of the metaphor:

(IV)  
question is (like) fire  
\[ \downarrow \]  
Tenor  
Vehicle  
being unanswered  
being destroying  
being disturbing  

Thus, *the burning question of the day* is something that is important, attracts attention, disturbs and needs to be resolved (like fire that needs to be extinguished). These are the associations of the Russian expression \(3\text{Ao6}a\) \(g\text{HR}\) (lit. 'the evil of the day'): the question that has to be solved, the matter that needs to be settled immediately.

In the following Russian literary extract, its author, Aksyonov, uses an English expression *an issue of the day* and translates it himself in a footnote as \(3\text{Ao6}a\) \(g\text{H}a\).

(18)  
Меня — то они как — раз знали: в ту весну "Ожер" продавался во всех книжных магазинах, и обо мне чуть ли не каждую неделю писали в больших газетах. Потому — то и записались в мой семинар, что я был, как говорится, an **issue of the day**.  

*Злобой дня*  
(Aksyonov, 1987:292)

In the existing English translation of this Aksyonov’s (1985a) novel, *In Search of Melancholy Baby*, by M. H. Heim, this chapter is omitted. I therefore offer the following translation:
They just happened to know me: that spring "The Burn" was being sold in every book store, and my name appeared almost every week in big newspapers. That is why they have enrolled in my seminar, I was so to say an issue of the day.

In the Russian extract of Aksyonov's novel we may observe the following tenor-vehicle relationship:

```
(18)
(написатель) есть злоба дня
I (writer) is the evil of the day
```

In (18), the intratextual specifications of the tenor я (писатель) (I (writer)), namely, "'The Burn' was being sold in every book store", "name appeared... every week in... newspapers" justify the usage of the vehicle злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') as topics (an issue) of the day.

Thus, the analysis and interpretation of the Russian expression злоба дня (lit. 'the evil of the day') in terms of its original usage may lead a student of Russian to the reinterpretation of this expression. For the informed reader the word злоба (the evil) in this expression will not be mistakenly associated with something spiteful and evil, but with an issue or topics.
The possible interactive situations into which the expression зло́ба гн́я (lit. 'the evil of the day') may enter as a vehicle are summarised in Table 4 (Appendix 2). It indicates that an association with something that attracts attention is present in both possible types of interactive situations.

As it has already been mentioned, the English identical analogue of the expression зло́ба гн́я which is 'the evil of the day' has not entered English usage as a conventional metaphorical expression with the same configuration of associations as its Russian counterpart. Therefore, in a literary translation into English a sensu stricto translation is not appropriate. When this Russian conventional metaphor is used in a sense of a question that has to be solved, a matter that needs to be settled immediately it has to be substituted in the English translation by an analogous metaphorical expression such as 'the burning question of the day'. When зло́ба гн́я (lit. 'the evil of the day') stands for something that attracts attention, in the translation into English it may be paraphrased as 'the issue of the day', or 'the topics of the day'.

3.1.5 Злачное место (green pastures)
The expression зло́че мес́то (lit. 'green pastures') derives from the funeral prayer:

Упокой душу раба твоего в месте светле, в месте злачне, в месте покойне. (quoted from Ashukin & Ashukina, 1960:233)


Господь — Пастырь мой; я ни в чем не буду нуждаться:
Он покойт меня на злачных пажитях и водит меня к водам тихим.
[Псалтырь 22:1-2]

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: he leadeth me beside the still waters.

[Psalm 23:1 - 2]

The phrase green pastures in the English quotation from the Bible renders Russian злаковое место (пажить) that is being discussed. Therefore it will be referred to as a literal translation of злаковое место henceforth.

In everyday Russian the expression злаковое место (lit. 'green pastures') is used jocularly and ironically with reference to a place of revelry or debauchery: место, где предаются кутежу, разврату (Slovar', 1948 - 1969; Ožegov, 1982; Ashukin & Ashukina, 1960; Walshe & Berkov, 1984). In the dictionaries of Ožegov (1982) and Smirnitskiy (1989) the expression злаковое место (lit. 'green pastures') bears a usage label "obsolete". This is obviously done by these authors because of the reasons mentioned by Mokienko (1986:132) (Chapter 1). The adjective злаковый in the expression злаковое место, which in the English version of the Bible is rendered as green, has become archaic in Modern Russian. It used to mean literally изобилующий злаками, i.e. 'abundant with cereals'. Now it functions only in the expression злаковое место (lit. 'green pastures').

It is too early to consider this expression obsolete. Злаковое место (lit. 'green pastures') in its present usage is not associated with its biblical origin and has become a conventional metaphor. This new metaphorical meaning seemingly has nothing in common with the original meaning that the expression злаковое место (lit. 'green pastures') has in the Bible. However, a complete metaphorical interpretation of this expression may reveal the role of the original meaning in the development of its new metaphorical associations.
The biblical sentence *Он покойт меня на злачных пажитях* (He [the Lord] maketh me to lie down in 'green pastures'), which at a first glance does not present any incompatibility between its internal constituents, is nevertheless, perceived as metaphorical. In Gråbe's (1985) terms it constitutes a focal expression of type iii (section 2.2.1.2). The initial sentence of the Psalm, *Господь — Пастырь мой* (The Lord is my shepherd), suggests the following 'vehicle—language' of this text:

(V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Господь</td>
<td>Пастырь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>я (люди)</td>
<td>овца(ы)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (people)</td>
<td>sheep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in the sentence *Он покойт меня на злачных пажитях* (He [the Lord] maketh me to lie down in 'green pastures') the verbal phrase qualifies *sheep* rather than a human being. So we may still speak about some sort of incompatibility, a different kind of *deviation*, since the combination of the tenor я (*I*) (a human being) and the reconstructed vehicle овца (*sheep*) presents a violation of selectional restrictions in terms of semantics (section 2.2.1). This textual evidence supports the symbolic connotations of the focal expression злачное место (lit. 'green pastures'). It may be viewed as a focal expression of Gråbe's (1985) type iii, which can be a vehicle for an implied *tenor* that we have to reconstruct in order to understand the metaphorical implications (section 2.3). It could be "a plentiful life ", "paradise on earth", or "a pleasant, plentiful place or state", etc.
The expression злачное место (lit. 'green pastures') in terms of its original context may lead to its new metaphorical associations with places of debauchery. This may be interpreted as follows: someone who first used the expression злачное место (lit. 'green pastures') in Russian to refer to a place of debauchery could have thought of such a place as very pleasant, as "paradise on earth" or "a place of ecstasy and happiness". In Modern Russian this expression is ironically associated with places of depravity. The new metaphorical associations of this expression derive from its original biblical associations. The possible interactive situations that the expression злачное место (lit. 'green pastures') may enter as a vehicle are summarised in Table 5 (Appendix 2).

The following extract demonstrates the use of this expression in a literary text as a conventional metaphor (section 2.2.1.3). Describing the merry times he spent with his friends having parties at their favourite restaurant, the character says:

(19) Появился известный в городе жур Вадим Клячка. Далеко не все знали его как эмгэбэшного куратора злачных мест майора Щердину. (Aksyonov, 1987:210)
In the existing English translation of this Aksyonov's (1985a) novel, *In Search of Melancholy Baby*, by M. H. Heim, this chapter is omitted. Therefore, I offer the following translation:

° Here comes Vadim Klyaksa, a well-known playboy in this town. He is not known to many though, as an undercover MGB curator of the dens of iniquity, major Shedrina.

The phrase the dens of iniquity in the English translation renders the Russian злачные места (lit. 'green pastures').

Knowing from the previous context that the character meets an undercover MGB (Ministry of State Security) agent in a restaurant, we may reconstruct the following implied tenor-vehicle relationship:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Argument} & \text{Focus} & \text{Implied tenor} \\
\text{рестораны} & \text{злачные места} & \leftrightarrow \\
\text{restaurants} & \text{'green pastures' ('dens of iniquity')} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Using the ironical expression злачные места (lit. 'green pastures') for the restaurants in relation to the secret agent of the Ministry of State Security, the character thus expresses the ironical attitude that he and his friends have towards this secret agent, who tries to pretend that he is one of the customers of such "dens of iniquity". The expression злачные места (lit. 'green pastures') that is used jocularly and ironically in
Modern Russian is employed here also to intensify the ironic attitude towards the Ministry of State Security itself, the Ministry that sends its agents to spy on the people in the places where people relax and "might behave loosely" or say something against the government.

Reference to the places of revelry and debauchery as злачные места (lit. 'green pastures') may be considered as a usage peculiar to Russian. This expression has become a conventional metaphor in Russian which is not the case with its literal biblical equivalent 'green pastures' in English. Therefore, it cannot be translated into English sensu stricto, i.e. by using the same biblical equivalent ('green pastures'), for it will not affect English speakers with the same force and additional meaning as it affects the speakers of the Russian language. In English, the expression green pastures refers to any pleasant place (Lass, Kiremidjian & Goldstein, 1990:90) but does not create the associations of places of depravity. Therefore, in the extract (18) above, I have used a substitution mode of translation as suggested by Smirnitskiy (1989) - "dens of iniquity". English-speaking readers will attach to this metaphorical expression connotations similar to those which the expression злачные места has for speakers of Russian. In terms of metaphorical construction, it presents a 'genitive link' of 'B of C' type (section 2.2.1.1), which can be analysed as follows:

(VII)

dens of iniquity

B of C

where

iniquity (is like) dens

C = B
depairty

immorality

relaxation

recreation room

amusement

relaxation

Tenor ↔ Vehicle
This English expression has associations of places of relaxation and immoral behaviour. These correspond to the associations of злачные места (lit. 'green pastures') in Russian. Therefore, a substitution by dens of iniquity may be considered to be a successful way of translating злачные места (lit. 'green pastures') into English.

It has emerged from the data discussed above that when a conventional metaphor such as a bibleism (viewed here as a focal expression) is used in different literary contexts, its associations are activated in different ways (in other words, some frames may activate certain associations that other frames do not).

The modes of translation of such bibleisms from Russian into English that have been encountered in the discussed examples are a sensu stricto translation, a substitution and a paraphrase. A sensu stricto translation is applicable only when a bibleism has become a conventional metaphor both in Russian and in English.

In conventional metaphors discussed in this section, a feeling of the connection between their original biblical and new meanings may still persist more for an informed than to an uninformed reader or speaker. Allusiveness in such expressions may become reactivated again for all readers or speakers when the context in which they occur establishes more explicit intertextual relationships with the Bible, as will be demonstrated in the following section.

3.2. BIBLEISM AS ALLUSIVE METAPHOR

It is demonstrated in this section how the bibleisms that have already entered the type of conventional metaphors may again regain their allusiveness in a literary context.
3.2.1 Ирод (Herod)

According to many Russian dictionaries (e.g. Slovar', 1948–1965; Ashukin & Ashukina, 1960; Ozhegov, 1982; Walshe & Berkov, 1984), the name of Ирод (Herod) in Russian came to be applied to cruel monsters and the worst kinds of tyrants. This name has come to the Russian language from the Bible.

Actually, there were several Herods in biblical history. Herod is the name of the royal family who ruled in Palestine, with the permission of the Romans, from about 55BC to 70AD (Ashukin & Ashukina, 1960). Herod the Great was the king at the time of Jesus’s birth. He ordered the Massacre of the Innocents, hoping to kill all male children under two years of age and thus to destroy the "Prince" who was prophesied to take his throne from him [Matthew 2].

Тогда Ирод, увидев себя осмеянным волхвами, весьма разгневался и послал избить всех младенцев в Вифлееме и во всех пределах его... [Матфей 2:16]

Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof... [Matthew 2: 16]

His son, Herod Antipas, beheaded John the Baptist [Mark 6:14–29]. His grandson, Herod Agrippa I, persecuted the church and put the apostle James to death [Acts 12:1–2]. Thus one can say that the name of Herod, as intratextually specified in the Bible, has the following associations: a despotic ruler, a tyrant, a child-killer, a murderer; a cruel, selfish, evil, i.e. a dangerous person for whom nothing sacred exists. These literal characteristics of Ирод (Herod) form the basis for its metaphorical associations in Modern Russian.

In the Russian language the name of Ирод (Herod) has become a common noun (it begins with a small letter, i.e. it has undergone a
typographical change). In everyday language it is a metaphorically used
abusive word, an oath. When using it, Russian speakers generally do not
consciously think of the biblical Herod. It is now a conventional metaphor
(section 2.2.1.3). The analysis and interpretation of the data below,
however, demonstrate that when this bibleism is used in literary texts, its
reference to the biblical Herod may become reactivated. This expression
is analysed and interpreted below in terms of a focal expression of
Gräbe's (1985) type ii (section 2.2.1.2).

In the following extracts from Russian narrative literary texts one can see
that the expression upog (Herod) is applied to different kinds of "bad"
people because the original negative characteristics of Herod are
extremely strong. As for its English equivalent Herod, one can see that it
does not always appear in the English literary translations in the place of
upog which is used in the Russian literary texts (a word rendering upog in
the English translations will be highlighted below). This expression of
biblical origin will be accounted for in terms of translation procedure —
below after the interpretation of its interactive functioning in Russian
literary texts.

In the following extracts we find the name of upog (Herod) used as a
conventional metaphor. It is used as an oath in the form of an address to
(a) person(s) in different situations. In (20) and (21) women refer to their
drinking husbands. In (20), a woman is selling pumice—stones by the
road to make some money for her husband's drinks:

(20)
- Вот видишь, — кивнула Шура на газету, — пемзы насобирала.
Торгую. Может насоберу своему ироду на сто грамм.
(Aksyonov, 1965: 59)

- See, — Shura pointed to the newspaper spread on the ground,
- I have collected some pumice—stones. I am selling them. Might
earn something to buy my tyrant a drink.
In the extract below a woman asks the doctor to cure her husband, who works as a horseman for the village hospital, from alcoholism.

(21)

— Полечили бы вы, Александр Дмитриевич, мужика моего. Совсем совести лишился, ни мне, ни детям жизни не даёт. Я уж ему говорю: стыдись, ирод, хоть ты и при коняге, а ведь тоже медицинский работник! (Aksyonov, 1969:105)

"If only you'd cure that man of mine! He's in such a state! Makes life miserable for me and the kids. 'You ought to be ashamed of yourself!' I say to him. 'After all, you're a public health worker, even if it's mostly in the stables.' " (Aksyonov, V. (trans. by Wettlin, M.), 1970: 164)

In this literary translation, in the sentence 'You ought to be ashamed of yourself!', upog (Herod) is omitted.

A husband is characterised in both literary contexts (20 and 21) as a drinking man abusing his family (in (20), who makes his wife earn for his drinks; in (21), who makes life miserable for the wife and the kids). In both contexts, a husband is selfish and careless about others. He is a person whose behaviour disturbs others, who acts as a tyrant towards his family. In certain situations such a person could even be dangerous. These intratextual specifications of the tenor in (21)i may be viewed as establishing the intertextual relationship with the biblical Herod:
In this case, such features of the biblical Herod as murderer, dictator, etc., are not activated by the characteristics of a drinking husband. The name of Herod in the Bible, however, is also characterised as abusive, cruel and powerful. He was a tyrant, an unscrupulous and dangerous person. These characteristics may be viewed as the points of interaction between the above literary extracts and the Bible. Thus in terms of the interpretation in (20) and (21) above, addressing a drinking husband as upog (Herod) implies that such a man acts as a tyrant, i.e. his behaviour disturbs his family.

In the next extract (22), a woman calls upog (Herod) a violent hooligan who started a fight in her home.

(22)

А в это время Бутров молча боролся со своим дядей.
Наконец, он стряхнул его и отбросил в угол. Дашкина мать встала в дверях со щёткой.
— Не подходи, ирод, порешу!
(Aksyonov, 1969: 122)

All this time Fyodor had been struggling to free himself from his uncle’s grasp. At last he shook him off and flung him into a
corner. At the door he was confronted by Dasha's mother with a broom in her hands.
"Don't dare come near me!" she cried.
(Aksyonov (trans. by Wettlin, M.), 1970:164)

In this literary translation, in the sentence "Don't dare come near me!", *upog* (Herod) is omitted.

Let us see what characteristics that typify *upog* (Herod) in the Bible can be activated by the tenor *хулиган* (hooligan) in this literary text (from the wider context of the novel we know that Bugrov was a young man who abused his fellow-villagers and in the end turned out to be a criminal).

The intertextual relationship with the biblical Herod is established here by such intratextual specifications of the tenor *хулиган* (hooligan) as *cruel, harmful, abusive, careless about others* and *disturbing others by his behaviour*.

As the analysis (22)i above shows, these features of the hooligan Bugrov correspond to the selected features of Herod in the Bible: Herod was
cruel and abusive towards others. To summarise these, *upog* (Herod) in this literary context refers to *someone disturbing others by his behaviour* and also, to a *criminal*.

In the next extract (23), an NKVD (NKVD is the Russian abbreviation for People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs) investigator yells at Chonkin, a soldier accused as "an enemy of the people", "a traitor to his country".

(23)

Следователи говорили "упорный очень", самые невозмутимые выходили из себя, кричали, топали ногами, пускали в ход кулаки и даже плевались. Один из них, доведенный до ручек, рухнул перед Чонкиным на колени: "Ты, *ипод* проклятый, себя не жалей, так хоть меня пожалей, у меня же семья". (Voinovich, 1990:470)

The investigator would say, "Very stubborn", and even the most imperturbable of them would fly into rages, shout, stamp their feet, use their fists, and even start spitting. One of them, at his wits' end, fell to his knees in front of Chonkin. "You damned *tyrant*, you, if you don't pity yourself, at least have pity on me. I'm a family man" (Voinovich (trans. by Lourie, R.), 1979:297)

In the eyes of the investigator Chonkin is an enemy, one who violated the Soviet laws which are sacred for this investigator. We know from the context and from the history of the Soviet time that accused people like Chonkin were innocent, but those who represented the Soviet laws were corrupt and wrong. The expression of biblical origin in the NKVD investigator's speech acquires an ironical dimension. However, no irony is meant by the speaker. For him *upog* (Herod) is an abusive word with negative connotations such as a *traitor, an evil and dangerous person*. In other words, *an enemy*. We may observe here the following tenor—vehicle relationship:
In this case, the intratextual characteristics of the tenor activate such original associations of the vehicle Herod as a cruel, selfish, evil and dangerous person, someone for whom nothing sacred exists. These are characteristics of an enemy or/and a criminal.

In the following passage the word upog (Herod) is addressed to a person whom the speaker strongly dislikes. Two neighbours quarrel and start fighting.

(24) Увидев Чонкина, Нюра осмеяла и перешла к активным действиям.
   — Ирод проклятый! — закричала она и вцепилась своему врагу в красное правое ухо. (Voinovich, 1990: 138)

The sight of Chonkin coming emboldened Nyura and she took the offensive. "You damned tyrant!" she cried, and grabbed hold of her enemy's red right ear. (Voinovich (trans. by Lourie), 1977:187)

At this moment the neighbours in (24) see each other as enemies. However, from the wider context of the novel we know that these two fighting people are not real enemies. Nyura just is not friendly with her neighbour. Once arguing with him, she dislikes him enough to start a fight like with an enemy and she calls him upog (Herod).
In this usage of upog (Herod) as a conventional metaphor, the general characteristic of the biblical Herod as a bad person is activated, since all associations of Herod in the Bible are extremely negative. In this case, the tenor may be described as someone whom the speaker dislikes and any of the characteristics of the vehicle upog (Herod) can be transferred to the tenor, in other words, those associations that the speaker has in mind. In Nyura's eyes, her neighbour is offending her by beating her cow, i.e. harming Nyura herself in her eyes. Apparently, the association of someone who harms others is prominent in (24).

In the following extract (25), the character remembers the time of starvation during Stalin's regime, and the lies that were published about it then in the newspapers.


I read it myself and I can still see that piece of newspaper right now. What did it mean? It meant that they were killing millions and keeping the whole thing quiet, deceiving the whole world!
Chicken soup! Cutlets! And on our farm they have eaten all the earthworms. And the old man said to the farm chairman: "When Nicholas was Czar, the whole world wrote about the famine and was urged to give: "Help, help! The peasantry is dying". And you Herods, you child—killers, are showing off Potemkin villages, making theatre out of it!" (Grossman (trans. by Whitney, T.), 1970a:58)

In this literary translation, the phrase "you child—killers" is added as a ground for comparison to accompany the metaphorical word уроды (Herods).

It is understood from the context that addressing the farm chairman, who is a representative of the Soviet power, the old man addresses the Soviet authorities, calling them уроды (Herods). Thus, the implied tenor in (25) may be represented as follows:

(25)i
представители Советской власти — уроды
Soviet authorities (are like) Herods
Argument
↓
Implied tenor ↔ Vehicle

- powerful people
- hypocrites
- dictators
- child—killers

Focus

- powerful
- cruel
- evil
- dangerous
- person
- dictator
- despot
- tyrant
- child—killer
- villain
- tormentor
- person for whom nothing sacred exists
The "chicken soup", the old man is talking about in (25), is a lie that was written in the newspaper about what school—children were given for lunch in the starvation areas. So the people responsible for the starvation and the lies about it, addressed as upogы (Herods) in this literary text, are literally murderers, child—killers and hypocrites. They are also dictators (representatives of the Soviet power which is a dictatorship). These intratextual specifications establish an intertextual relationship by placing in parallel the people addressed as upogы (Herods) in (25) and the biblical Herod, who is also known as a cruel dictator, murderer and a child—killer. The association hypocrites is highlighted in this usage by the old man’s words "...deceiving the whole world ", "you are... making theatre out of it". It is very prominent in relation to this usage of upog (Herod) and may be added to its range of metaphorical associations. In this case we can consider that all negative characteristics of the vehicle Herod are activated by the tenor and are specified by the context. Thus in terms of the interpretation in (25) above, addressing those that caused the starvation and lied about it as Herods, implies that their crime was equal to the crime of Herod. In this usage of the bibleism upog (Herod) as a conventional metaphor, one, however, may feel a certain degree of allusiveness to its original prototype. This is the case when the metaphorical expression cannot be placed within a certain interpretative type of metaphor strictly.

To summarise all the associations of upog (Herod) activated in (25), it may be said that this bibleism is applied in (25) to someone powerful, who can order a crime to be committed against others less powerful.

Further in the same novel, we encounter the expression Ирог (Herod) again. Here the character reflects on the same period of starvation mentioned above.

(26) А помощи нет! Да тогда уж и не просили! Я и теперь, когда про то думать начинаю, с ума схожу — неужели отказался
And no help came! And they no longer asked for any. Even now when I start thinking about it all, I begin to go out of my mind. How could Stalin have turned his back on human beings? He went to such length as this horrible massacre! After all, Stalin had bread. He had food to eat. What it adds up to is that he intentionally, deliberately, killed people by starvation. He refused to help even the children. And that makes Stalin worse than Herod. (Grossman (trans. by Whitney, T. R.), 1970a:59)

In this literary text, the speaker uses the name of Ирод (Herod) not as a common noun in the sense of an oath, but as a proper name (it starts here with a capital letter). It is applied to the tenor that has similar characteristics to the biblical Herod. So, we can speak here not of a metaphorically abusive word (conventional metaphor) but of an allusive metaphor (cf. section 2.2.1.3). This is the case when the original meaning of a conventional metaphor becomes reactivated for all readers, not only for an informed reader. This expression here calls forth the reference to the biblical Herod and acquires the status of an allusive metaphor. Thus more strongly implied intertextual relations should be considered. Understanding this usage of the name Herod requires knowledge of the biblical story for the expression Неужели Сталин хуже Ирода был (And that makes Stalin worse than Herod) causes the reader to compare two characters. Stalin is characterised as a cruel dictator who "refused to help even children". And in the syntactic environment of the vehicle Herod, the tenor Stalin acquires all the characteristics that typify Herod particularly as a tyrant and child—killer, not as just "a bad person" ((26)i).
The data have shown that in Modern Russian the name of *Herod* (Herod) has become a conventional metaphor, a common noun which is used as an abusive word and does not begin with a capital letter in such cases. A common noun *Ipop* (Herod) can be used to call not only "the worst kinds of tyrants", but also different sorts of "bad" people. Most frequently an abusive word *Ipop* (Herod) occurs as a term of address, and in this case, it hardly bears a direct reference to the biblical Herod. The allusiveness to the Bible may be said to be activated when it is used in a simile in a literary text.
It has emerged from the data, that different characteristics of *Upog* (Herod) (acting as a vehicle) activated by different contexts can be applied to at least five different types of tenors. The meanings of these tenors can be summarised as follows: (1) someone whose behaviour disturbs others, i.e. a hooligan; (2) an enemy; (3) someone who is disliked; (4) a criminal; and (5) someone powerful, who can order a crime to be committed, a dictator. What specific characteristic of this bibleism is activated in each case is shown in Table 6 (Appendix 2). It becomes evident from the table that at least three of them form a stable configuration of associations of *upog* (Herod) as a conventional metaphor. They are: *evil, unscrupulous, harmful.*

The analyses and interpretations presented above have shown that in terms of translation procedure, this expression of biblical origin concerns the choice of an appropriate translation *mode* rather than translatability as such. These modes of translation (cf. section 2.3) used by the English translators of the above literary extracts are: *substitution, omission, translation sensu stricto* combined with *sense and sensu stricto.*

According to Lass, Kiremidjian & Goldstein (1990:100), the expression *Herod* in the English language usually refers to the ferocious cruelty of the biblical Herod’s slaughtering innocent children. In other words, in English usage it has specific allusive characteristics of a cruel monster, a murderer and a child-killer. Therefore, when in Russian texts (such as (20), (21), (22) and (23) above), the name *upog* (Herod) is used as an abusive word (as a conventional metaphor), and its characteristics of a murderer, dictator, etc. are not relevant — it cannot be translated into English *sensu stricto,* i.e. as *Herod.* It is confirmed by the provided data: the translators (native-speakers of English) avoid rendering *upog* (Herod) *sensu stricto* when it is used in Russian as an abusive common noun. Obviously, the name of Herod is not used in this sense in English.
In examples (23) and (24), the translator, Lourie ((Voinovich, 1979:297 and 1977:187), has replaced *upog* (Herod) by a similar TL vehicle *tyrant* for the tenor *enemy* (or someone whom the speaker dislikes), i.e. used a mode of substitution to translate the given metaphor. A *sensu stricto* translation might have resulted in the activation in the TL text of such characteristics of Herod as murderer, etc., which are not meant to be expressed by a SL metaphor. Omission would have influenced the sense of the SL sentence and translation *sensu stricto combined with sense* seems inappropriate for such short colloquial sentences of the SL. For the same reasons, in my translation of extract (20) I have followed the mode of translation offered by Lourie in (23) and (24), i.e. a substitution by *tyrant*.

Another mode of translation of *upog* (Herod) as an abusive common noun is employed by Wettlin (Aksyonov, 1970) in (21) and (22) above. It is a complete omission of the name of Herod in the TL text. The criteria for such a decision are set up specifically for each text after the translator has weighed up what he or she thinks is more important and what less important in the text in relation to its intention. In these two cases, from the semantic point of view, the TL has not lost anything by the omission of the SL metaphor. However, I find that the TL text is less emotive in nature than the SL text. I would suggest that a substitution mode of translation (similar to the one employed by Lourie in (23) and (24)) would have been more successful in these cases.

In extract (25), we find that the address *bъl, upogъl* is translated into English by Whitney (Grossman, 1970a) as *you Herods, you child-killers*, i.e. *sensu stricto combined with sense*. In the Russian text, this metaphor is used as an abusive common noun with a certain degree of allusiveness to its biblical prototype. Its associations that are activated by this particular literary context are those of murderers and child-killers. In other words, they coincide with the characteristics normally associated
with the name of Herod in English usage. However, the translator uses a *sensu stricto* translation combined with *sense* to show more explicitly the ground for comparison ("child-killers") between the biblical Herod and the people addressed as *upogu* (Herods) in the ST, so that the use of this term as a common noun would be more understandable to English readers.

And finally, in (26), we find a Russian *Ирод* (Herod) used as a proper name and spelt with a capital letter. Here, the expressiveness and semantic depth of this metaphorical expression proceed from an allusion to the biblical Herod and thus, this allusive metaphor is translated by Whitney (Grossman, 1970a) into English *sensu stricto*. For English readers it bears the same connotations as for Russians readers.

Thus, the translation procedure into English of the Russian bibleism *Ирод* (Herod) depends on its function in the Russian text. Only when it is used as an allusive metaphor it can be translated into English *sensu stricto*. When it is used as a conventional metaphor, the mode of translation may vary. A metaphorical construction based on this expression in a literary text should be interpreted in terms of interaction theory of metaphor to be sure that the correct meaning is being communicated. Only after that the translator can successfully choose the correct translation procedure.

3.2.2 Блудный сын (prodigal son)

The expression б*л*у*д*ный сын (prodigal son) has its origin in the parable of Jesus (Luke 15:11–32) about a young man who took the goods that his father had set aside for him, travelled into a far country and wasted all his inheritance:

Po proshestvii nemnogikh_dney, mladshiy сын, sobрав_vse, poшел_v_dal'nuju_stranu_i_tam_rastochil_imenie_svoe, zhivy rasputno. [Лука 15:13]
And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living. [Luke 15:13]

The son returned home repentant, and his father rejoiced and forgave him.

The expression блудный сын (prodigal son) does not appear in this form in the text of the Russian Bible. It is introduced in the heading for Chapter 15 of the Gospel according to Luke in the Synodal Translation of the Russian Bible.

In the Bible, Jesus's parable of a prodigal son illustrates how generous God is in forgiving sinners who repent. In the biblical text, therefore, the image of a prodigal son was originally used metaphorically to denote a repentant and forgiven sinner. Thus, we may say that the image of a prodigal son in the Bible is specified by the literal associations of a young light-headed man, a disrespectful son who had left the parental home and then returned and was forgiven, and by the metaphorical associations established by the parable - a forgiven sinner. These literal and metaphorical associations of the biblical parable form the basis of the several shades of metaphorical meaning of the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) in Modern Russian.

The expression, according to the dictionary of Ozhegov (1982), is applied figuratively to 1) a disrespectful son who had left his home and then returned; 2) someone who repents after his misfortunes. Ashukin & Ashukina (1960) add to these associations of 3) "a dissipated man" and of 4) "a son who does not obey his father". All these metaphorical associations are based on the literal facts of the biblical parable (the numbers in brackets correspond to Ozhegov's (1982) and the Ashukins' (1960) terms mentioned above): the son having wasted his inheritance thus showed disrespect and disobedience to his father (1 and 4); after
having experienced hunger and poverty the son returned home repentant (2); the son led a depraved life in a far country (3). Shanskiy, et al (1987) summarise all metaphorical associations of блудный сын (prodigal son) as someone who left his home and returned and someone who repents after his misfortunes.

I view this expression as a conventional metaphor (section 2.2.1.3) in Russian usage, because it has lost an apparent connection with its biblical prototype. Even without knowing the origin on which the metaphorical associations of the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) are based, we can partially understand them from the meanings of its constituents. The Russian word блудный (prodigal) has connotations of extravagant, dissipated person, a wanderer. This gives us a partial understanding of the associations that the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) may have. I maintain, however, that the full understanding of metaphorical meaning of this expression involves both the relatively context–free (or static) interaction of its constituents (section 2.2.1.1) and its interaction as a whole with its original biblical context. In other words, a deeper insight into the associations of the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) could be gained by analysing its biblical origin.

The following passage demonstrates the use of the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) in the Russian narrative literary text as a conventional metaphor. I view it as a focal expression of Gräbe's (1985) type ii (section 2.2.1.2):

(27) Вот еще один виток дороги. На миг показалось ему, что невероятно яркий, никогда не виданный им свет залил землю. Еще несколько шагов, и в этом свете он увидит дом, и к нему, блудному сыну, подойдет матерь, и он станет перед ней на колени, и ее молодые прекрасные руки лягут на его плешивую и седую голову. (Grossman, 1970b:207)
Here was one more bend of the road. For a moment, it seemed to him as if an impossibly bright light, brighter that any he had ever seen in his life, had flooded the earth. A few steps more and in this light he would see that home, and his mother would come out to meet him, her prodigal son, and he would kneel down before her, and her young and beautiful hands would lie upon his grey, balding head. (Grossman (trans. by Whitney, T.), 1970a:247)

The character in (27), to whom the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) is applied, is a man who spent many years in Stalin's prisons and after the amnesty is going to the place where the house of his parents used to be. Imagining how he would have met his mother if she was alive (he knew she had been dead for many years then), he thinks of himself as of a prodigal son. But does this expression bear the connotation of someone dissipated or disrespectful? The answer is — no. The character was away not because he was like the son described in the biblical parable. The expression блудный сын (prodigal son) in this case (27) bears connotation of only someone who has been away (had to be) and returned to his family. In other words, the character in (27) is a returned exile, one who had suffered while apart from his family. These connotations derive from the facts that the son in the biblical parable was literally away from home and that he suffered. Here the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) serves as a vehicle for the tenor он (he) and is qualified as изгнаник, вернувшийся в свою семью (an exile who returned to his family). These characteristics allow the connection between the biblical prodigal son and the character of this literary extract not on all the possible levels of association, but only on those activated by the context.
In (27), in the character’s thoughts of returning home he thinks of his mother. This change from father to mother in a characteristic of the expression блудный сын (prodigal son) emphasises the general characteristic of блудный сын (prodigal son) as a someone returning to his parent (or home). We can also find that this is recognised by Shanskiy, et al (1987) and extended by Walshe & Berkov (1984) in their dictionary: "someone who has returned to his family, the circle of his friends, etc."

In Druzhnikov’s (1989) novel, the chapter in which the parents go to jail to collect their son and bring him home, headed as

(28)

Возвращение блудного сына (Druzhnikov, 1989:478 – 489)

*Return of the Prodigal Son.*

The father, Makartsev, who is an editor of one of the Moscow newspapers, uses his position to free his son Boris from jail, where the latter has been taken because he was drunk and because he had killed two people in a car accident. From the novel we know that the relationship of the father and son is very tense. Makartsev spends all his time at work in the newspaper to which he is very devoted, and does not
see much of his son. But when he does, Boris appears drunk and repulsive. Boris's behaviour is a protest against his father, since he considers his father (who is a Communist) to be a hypocrite. (At that period of time much of what the Soviet newspapers published was not true.) Having been brought home from jail, Boris is not grateful to his father. He calls him a hypocrite again, saying that his father helped him only to save his own career (it would not have been possible to keep the position of an editor of the Communist newspaper with a son in jail). However, after their conversation, Makartsev goes back to his room and thinks of forgiving his son: "У Бори цинизм от возраста — пройдет" ("Boris is cynical because of his young age — it will go away eventually") (Druzhnikov, 1989:489). The constituents of the metaphorical construction observed here are the following:

(28)i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boris</td>
<td>Boris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris</td>
<td>prodigal son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenor</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a disobedient son</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a young man</td>
<td>a young man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a son who left home</td>
<td>a son who left home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a son who returns home</td>
<td>a son who returns home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a forgiven son</td>
<td>a forgiven son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an unremorseful son</td>
<td>vs a repentant son</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The heading "Возвращение блудного сына" (lit. 'Return of the Prodigal Son') establishes the intertextual relationship between this chapter and the biblical parable. It puts the whole chapter in a perspective which allows a reader who is acquainted with the biblical parable to compare the story of this chapter with the parable of the prodigal son. I therefore
view the expression "блудный сын" (prodigal son) in this usage as an allusive metaphor (section 2.2.1.3). We know that in the Bible the return of a prodigal son is described to illustrate how generous God is in forgiving sinners who repent. In Druzhnikov's (1989) usage of the expression "блудный сын" (prodigal son) as an allusive metaphor we find a contradiction with its original implications. The heading "Возвращение блудного сына" (lit. 'Return of the Prodigal Son') here is a foregrounded element (section 2.2.1), not only in terms of its establishing the intertextual relationship through parallelism, but also in terms of deviation from its original metaphorical meaning. The heading is used to set up an implied contrast: God forgives sinners who repent — Makartsev's son does not repent, but Makartsev hopes that he will and forgives him in advance. Thus, the use of the expression "блудный сын" (prodigal son) for the chapter heading in Druzhnikov's (1989) novel is justified by the biblical metaphorical associations (forgiveness of sins). Although its literal associations ("a son who does not obey his father", "son literally returns home"), are important, they play a secondary role here.

Thus, the associations of the expression "блудный сын" (prodigal son) may be summarised as follows. As a vehicle, it may interact with the following types of tenors: 1) someone who had left his home, family, the circle of his friends and then returned; 2) a son who does not obey his father; 3) a dissipated person; 4) someone who repented after his misfortunes; 5) an exile. These metaphorical associations are developed on the basis of the literal associations of the biblical parable. The metaphorical meaning of a repentant and forgiven sinner which is implied in the biblical parable is not usually associated with the expression "блудный сын" (prodigal son) in everyday Russian usage since this metaphor has seemingly lost its connection with its biblical origin. This association, however, can be activated in the use of this expression as an allusive metaphor in a literary text, as shown in (28) above, and therefore, should be known by
readers in order to understand the implications of the literary text fully. How the associations of the expression ǎluhnyí ñyn (prodigal son) may be activated in each possible interactive situation is indicated in Table 7 (Appendix 2). It is demonstrated that at least two of those form a stable configuration of associations of this bibleism as a conventional metaphor: *a person who left home, a person who led a life not approved of by his relatives or friends.*

In the English language, the expression *prodigal son* is an equivalent of the Russian expression ǎluhnyí ñyn. The expression *prodigal son* was created in the English language in the same way as it was in Russian. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1989) gives the following etymological information about the creation of this expression: "those who first wrote marginal notes in the English Bible, put the heading *The parables of the loste shepe, of the groat that was lost, and of the prodigal sonne* for chapter 15 of the Gospel according to Luke".

In English it is commonly used to denote a type of a wayward child, a disrespectful son (Lass, *et al.*, 1990), the repentant sinner or returned wanderer (McMordie, 1968) as for instance, in the next extract:

(29)

His attitude towards his *prodigal son* was that of stern, unrelenting resentment. (*Fr. Norris, 'The Octopus', book II, ch.V*) (quoted from Kunin, 1984)

where we observe the following metaphorical construction:
Here the expression *prodigal son*, as a vehicle, qualifies *a son that arouses the resentment of his father*. Apparently, such a son does not live up to his father’s expectations and is a wayward child. In other words, it is a disrespectful son.

The metaphorical associations of the Russian bibleism ḟlугный сын and of the English expression *prodigal son* coincide whether they are used as conventional or as allusive metaphors. The distinction between two types of metaphor, however, enhances our understanding of exactly what is implied in each case. The translation procedures in both types of usage of this bibleism are the same. *Prodigal son* is a *sensu stricto* translation of the Russian bibleism ḟlугный сын which successfully renders all the metaphorical associations from the Russian language into English.

It has been shown in this section that in complex texts such as narratives, artistic organisation (Lotman, 1977) (section 2.2.1.3) may reactivate the allusiveness or symbolic connotations of conventional metaphors.

The same Russian bibleism may be translated into English differently depending on whether it is used in a literary text as a conventional metaphor or as an allusive metaphor. This may happen if the bibleism has become a conventional metaphor only in Russian (such as *upog* (Herod)). When the same bibleism has become a conventional metaphor in both
languages, the translation procedures applied to it will be the same whether it is used as a conventional metaphor in a particular case or as an allusive metaphor (such as блудный сын and prodigal son).

Sometimes metaphorical associations of the conventional metaphor can become foregrounded in a literary text to such an extent that the effect caused is similar to that of an innovative metaphor. However, such a metaphorical expression has certain features that distinguish it from a truly innovative metaphor (Van Den Broeck, 1981), as will be demonstrated in the next section.

3.3 BIBLEISM AS INNOVATIVE METAPHOR

The following discussion demonstrates the metaphorically innovative use of bibleisms that have already become conventional metaphors in Russian usage. At the same time, however, such a metaphor retains its specific character of a familiar expression as opposed to a truly innovative metaphor. We may observe an emerging contrast by which the tenor is played off against the vehicle as a result of this simultaneous occurrence.

3.3.1 Кесарю кесарево, а божие бого (отдать\возгать) (Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's)

Sirot (in Kotova, 1993:44) traces this proverb to the following sentence in the Old Testament: Бойся, сын мой, господа и царя. [Притчи 24:21] (My son fear thou the Lord and the king [Proverbs 24:21]). Kotova (1993:44), however, argues that the proverb has entered common usage under the influence of the gospels [Matthew 22:21; Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25]. Looking at the penny that must be paid to Caesar as a tribute, Jesus asked the Pharisees whose image was on it. They answered it was Caesar's. Then Jesus said:

Итак отдайте кесарю кесарево, а Божие Богу. [Матфея 22:21]
Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. [Matthew 22:21]

In the Bible Jesus often speaks allegorically, i.e. his words and stories are meant as symbols. In this sentence each word also has a symbolic meaning. In the case with the penny bearing Caesar’s image, by saying 'give it to Caesar' Jesus implies that each person should receive what is rightfully his or hers. With this meaning the proverb кесарю (Цезарю) кесарево (цезарево), а божие богу has entered Russian common usage (the word Caesar has two variants of pronunciation in Russian кесарь and цезарь). One may say that one part of this expression (about Caesar) has negative characteristics in the eyes of the speaker, and another part (about God) has positive characteristics: Caesar is described negatively (e.g. he ordered the killing of people; received taxes from the working people [Matthew 22:13; 22:17]), and God has a positive and respected image throughout the whole Bible. Here, material values that are characteristic of Caesar oppose spiritual values, associated with God, i.e. low versus high.

In Gräbe's (1985) terms, this expression may be analysed as type iii of focal expressions (section 2.2.1.2). It is perceived as a focal expression because of its symbolic connotations. This is an expanded metaphor (or sentence metaphor) since all words in it have symbolic implications. By implying that each person should receive what is rightfully his or hers, it also suggests that one who appreciates things of low value (such as money in Jesus's view) should receive the things that are of low value, and one who treasures really worthy things should receive such worthy things. I view this proverb as a conventional metaphor in Russian usage since it is registered with this set of associations in the dictionaries (e.g. Slovar', 1948–1969) which I summarise in Table 8 (Appendix 2).
In the following extract from a Russian narrative literary text we perceive this proverb as a *foregrounded* element (section 2.2.1) because it is innovatively used by the author:

(30)


In the existing English translation of this Aksyonov’s (1985a) novel, *In Search of Melancholy Baby*, by M. H. Heim, this chapter is omitted. Therefore, I offer the following translation:

"To be honest, I cannot stand this "reggae" rhythm, but being a tourist one is somewhat obliged to admire everything exotic. Once, a crowd of fifty "chocolate Dutchmen" on the beach danced to the same tune for about four hours. "Do you enjoy our music?" — a policeman asked me. "The music is fine — I cheated — but something seems to be wrong with the tape. The same song all the time." — "No, my friend — exclaimed the policeman. "These are 44 absolutely different songs". *Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto bull the things that are bull's.*

We see here a deviation in the generally recognised metaphorical expression: Цезарю — цезарево, быку — быково (Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto bull the things that are bull’s). This implies a knowledge of the original proverb. Thus, through allusion to the commonly used conventional metaphor, the innovatively used proverb achieves a humorous effect. The part that is substituted in the recognised proverb is божие боги (render unto God the things that are God’s). As mentioned above, божие боги (render unto God the things that are God’s) is a "positive" part of the original proverb. The substitution быку —
**Бык** (render unto bull the things that are bull's) in (29), however, bears negative connotations and expresses an ironical, contemptuous attitude. It means that in this case цезарь (Caesar) acquires a more positive image as opposed to the image of бык (bull), i.e. the associations of the original proverb have switched their position in this usage.

As the original expression, the renovated expression is also an expanded metaphor with an integral meaning: everyone gets what he deserves, what is rightfully his. Every component of this renovated expression also acquires a symbolic meaning. *Caesar* acquires here the associations of a person with a bad taste as:

(30)i  
\[ \text{кто-либо} \quad \text{цеzarь} \]  
\[ \text{someone} \quad \text{Caesar} \]  
\[ \text{Implied tenor} \quad \text{Vehicle} \]  
\[ \text{poor education} \quad \text{has low spiritual values} \]  
\[ \text{bad taste} \]  
\[ \text{low cultural values} \]

Цезарево (the things that are Caesar's) then, acquires associations of low cultural values, bad taste, etc.

(30)i  
\[ \text{понятия/вещи низкого качества} \quad \text{цеzarево} \]  
\[ \text{notions/things of low value} \quad \text{the things that are Caesar's} \]  
\[ \text{Implied tenor} \quad \text{Vehicle} \]  
\[ \text{bad music} \quad \text{low spiritual values} \]

**Бык** (bull) in Russian, when applied metaphorically, has connotations of a very healthy, or stubborn, or sullen looking person who is not clever (*Slovar', 1948–1965). The policeman and the "chocolate Dutchmen" in
the eyes of the speaker are very stupid, since they like "this 'reggae' rhythm", so бык (bull) here may be viewed as a vehicle for a reggae fan.

(30)iii

 implied tenor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fond of low quality music</th>
<th>no cultural values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happy (listening to bad music)</td>
<td>healthy, strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low cultural values</td>
<td>stubborn, stupid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicle

БЫКОВО (the things that are bull's) in this case symbolises reggae music:

(30)iv

 implied tenor

| reggae music | low spiritual values |

The original expression Кесарю (Цезарю) кесарево (цезарево), а божие боры, which is being alluded to in (30), implies to render to someone who is low (bad) (as Caesar) the things that are low (bad) (as things that are characteristic of Caesar), and to someone who is high (holy, good) (as God) — the things that are high (holy, good) (as things that are associated with God). And the innovatively used conventional metaphor Цезарю — цезарево, быку — быкovo (Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto bull the things that are bull's) implies to render to someone who is low (bad) (e.g., someone who has a bad taste), the things that are low (bad) (e.g., bad music), and to someone who is even lower (worse) (as those reggae fans) — the things that are even lower (worse) (reggae music).
Another device that the writer employs for achieving humorous effect, is playing on the words 6or (God) and 6ык (bull). The knowledge of the original lends something sacrilegious to the last part of the expression. The Russian words 6or (God) and 6ык (bull) consist of one syllable (consonant–vowel–consonant) and are pronounced [boh] and [bik] respectively. Both words begin with the sound [b]. This is an alliteration, a type of sound repetition based on Jakobson’s (1960:358) equivalence principle (as discussed in section 2.2.1). It establishes equivalence for which a corresponding equivalence is sought on another level of poetic organisation. This phonic foregrounding establishes parallelism between the text of the Bible and the present literary text, implying a semantic relationship between the elements that are placed in parallel (6or (God) [boh] and 6ык (bull) [bik]). The reader observes here a varied repetition of the premise that occurs in the Bible, the expression кесарю (Цезарю) кесарево (цесарево), а божие богу (render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's) and registers a contemptuous contradiction due to the replacement of the word 6or (God), which is a divine image of superior mind, by 6ык (bull), which bears the association of nonsense.

For English speakers, the proverb render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's (which is a sensu stricto translation of the Russian expression) is also a familiar biblical quotation that has entered common usage (Kunin, 1984). Therefore, the Russian expression has its English equivalent which functions in English with similar associations. However, in a case like (30), where this conventional metaphor is foregrounded, its sensu stricto translation into English loses some of the implications present in Russian, which result from the alliteration in Russian. It happens because the English words God and bull do not resemble each other as the Russian words 6ор [bok] and 6ык [bik]. But nevertheless the antithesis is extremely powerful. Bull in
English also has connotations of nonsense and slang associations with a policeman (*Roget's II: The New Thesaurus, 1991*). Thus, in the English translation the reference to the policeman as a bull will be more explicitly implied. Therefore, a *sensu stricto* translation of Цезарю — цезарево, быку — быково (lit. 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto bull the things that are bull's') in (30), is also capable of affecting an English reader with a similar force and additional meaning as it affects the speakers of the Russian language, achieving a similar humorous effect.

It has been shown in this section that when the allusiveness and symbolic connotations of the conventional metaphor are reactivated to the extent that it becomes an innovative metaphor, the process of its translating into a foreign language may be compared to the process of translating an innovative metaphor. It involves a translator in the process of creating a new metaphor.

**3.4 BIBLEISM AS RENOVATED CONVENTIONAL METAPHOR**

In this section it will be demonstrated how a bibleism that has become a conventional metaphor shifts to the type of innovative metaphors, and in its new form becomes another conventional metaphor (i.e. "dies" again).

**3.4.1 Иуга (Judas)**

A number of references to the biblical character Иуга (Judas) may be found in novels depicting the Soviet regime. As it is known from the gospels, Judas was the disciple who betrayed Jesus to the authorities for thirty pieces of silver [Matthew 26; Mark 14; Luke 22; John 13].
Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iskariot went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. [Matthew 26:14–15]

When soldiers came to arrest Jesus, Judas identified their victim by kissing him.

The original characteristics that describe Иыга (Judas) may be summarised as follows: a disciple who learned from his teacher, a disciple who betrayed his teacher/friend, a hypocrite who pretended to be a friend, a betrayer who virtually sold his friend/teacher for money, a helper of the murderers, an unknown enemy. In contemporary Russian usage, the name of Иыга (Judas) has become a synonym for a betrayer, wearing a mask of friendship, and very often begins with a small letter (Slovar', 1948–1969; Ozhegov, 1982). In other words, it has already acquired the status of a conventional metaphor (section 2.2.1.3) in Russian usage.

Often in Soviet prose, we find that Иыга (Judas) applies to a traitor to the homeland, to the Communist party. If we analyse the intertextual relationship that this expression establishes between a literary text and its original context, we will see that the associations relating to a traitor of the homeland are based on the fact that Judas was a disciple of Jesus, in other words, Jesus reared and educated him, like a country (a party) moulds its citizens (members).

The following literary examples demonstrate the use of Иыга (Judas) by the leaders and representatives of the Communist regime in relation to their opponents and enemies.

Extract (31) presents the thoughts of Stalin about those he considered enemies and "betrayers of the homeland". Here уyga (Judas) is used as a
conventional metaphor. I view it in (31) and in the extracts below as a focal expression of Gräbe's (1985) type ii (section 2.2.1.2).

(31)

Нет, не просто "непримиримыми врагами Советской власти", а "ныне разоблаченными врагами народа" их надо называть.
Злодеями — убийцами! Предателями родины, иудами!
(Dombrovskiy,1989:556)

"No, not simply they should be called "the implacable enemies of the Soviet power" but "presently exposed enemies of the people". Villains, murderers! Betrayers of the homeland! Judases!

In terms of metaphorical construction, in (31) we observe a tenor-vehicle relationship where the vehicle uyga (Judas) is applied to the tenor that may be called "an enemy of the people". An enemy of the people in the eyes of the accusing authorities had the following characteristics:

(31)i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an enemy of the people</td>
<td>Judas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>citizen of his country</td>
<td>disciple of his teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murderer</td>
<td>helper of the murderers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betrayer of his homeland (party)</td>
<td>betrayer of his teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypocrite</td>
<td>false friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-conformist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Viewing the expression uyga (Judas) as a metaphor that establishes the intertextual relationship between this literary text and the texts of the gospels through the characteristics summarised in (31)i, we can also analyse another set of intertextual relations established by it. This will give us deeper insight into the associations connected with a traitor of the homeland (party). The fact that Judas was a disciple of Jesus — in other
words, Jesus reared and educated him — may be viewed as similar to a country (a party) moulding its citizens (members). Thus, it is possible to reconstruct the following:

(31)ii

Родина\партия\лидер партии — Иисус
[homeland\the Party\the leader of the party — Jesus]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implied tenor</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guiding</td>
<td>guiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring</td>
<td>loving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of (31)i leads to the following interpretation: the homeland (or the party) in (31) loved, reared and educated its citizen or member just as Jesus loved and educated his disciple Judas, and this person betrayed his homeland (party) by becoming a foreign spy in the way that Judas betrayed Jesus. The traitor must have received his reward like Judas received his thirty pieces of silver. We know from the wider context of the novel, however, that the accused individuals were innocent, but those who represented the "homeland" and the Communist party were wrong and corrupt. Thus we see that although the first level of analogy remains similar (an individual betrays the leader of a close group/a close group for monetary gain), another ironical dimension has been added to the word "uyga" (Judas) in the sense of a betrayer (however, no irony is meant in (31) by the speaker): in the original text Judas was a real traitor, he was guilty; but the accused in (31) were innocent, whereas in the Bible Jesus was innocent, but the party and the country in (31) were iniquitous.

In (32), there is a description of the NKVD (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs) colonel talking to the accused.

(32)
He was fatherly toward accused men, often calling them "son". "What's this now, son, I see that the motherland has reared and raised you and you betrayed it like that Judas for thirty silver kopecks". He handed out only two sentences — the firing squad or a penal brigade — and it would seem that they left no trace on his soul. (Voinovich (trans. by Lourie, R.), 1979:161)

As in (31), a tenor—vehicle relationship may be observed in (32) where the vehicle uyga (Judas) is used for an implied tenor "an enemy of the people". The addition of the expression "for thirty pieces of silver" in the above example (32) strengthens the biblical origin of the term Hyga (Judas), establishing the intertextual relationship with the Bible more explicitly. In other words, the allusiveness of this metaphor becomes stronger. It may even be viewed here as an allusive metaphor (section 2.2.1.3). The expression betrayed it like that Judas for thirty silver kopecks ("kopecks", a word referring to Russian coins) in (32) may be viewed as a varied repetition in the literary text of the premise that occurs in the texts of the gospels: the fact that Judas Iskariot betrayed Jesus for thirty pieces of silver. Thus, another implied tenor—vehicle relationship may be observed:

(32)iii

sometimes the name of Hyga (Judas) in Russian can be found with a diminutive suffix -yux- [ushk-] : Hygyuxka (Iudushka, lit. Little—Judas, as translated by Walshe & Berkov (1984)). (A diminutive suffix in Russian may express either endearment or a pejorative attitude.) The
origin of this usage can be traced to Saltykov—Shchedrin’s (1875) novel Господа Головлевы (“The Golovlyov Family”) where the nickname Иудушка (Iudushka) is given to the principal character, Porphyry Golovlyov. Porphyry Golovlyov is a canting hypocrite who conceals his greed by pious talk. He is constantly turning things to his own advantage, cheating everybody, including himself with words. Iudushka’s speech is full of words of endearment (hypocoristic) suffixes (e.g. гружок, маменька, гушенъка, голубушка, племяннушка). The members of his family feel his hypocrisy in such words:

— Ишь ведь как пишет! иишь как языком—то вертит! — восклицала она,— недаром Степка—балбес Иудушкой его прозвал! Ни одного—то слова верного нет! все—то он лжет! и "милый дружок маменька", и про тягости—то мои, и про крест мой... ничего он этого не чувствует! (Saltykov—Shchedrin, 1875 (1982): 13)

"Just think how he writes! What twists and turns he gives to his tongue!" she [Porphyry’s mother—O.Y.] exclaimed. "It’s not for nothing Styopka the dolt [Porphyry’s brother—O.Y.] has nicknamed him Judas! There’s not a word of truth in what he says! It’s all lies—'dear friend mamma', and about my burdens, and about the cross ...He does not feel any of it, really!" (Saltykov—Shchedrin (trans. by Duddington, N.), 1934:15)

His parasaiical loquacity is the mask of a hidden enemy (a traitor). For this he has been nicknamed as Иудушка (Iudushka) and also кровопи/вушка (kro/opusjuhka, lit. a petty 'bloodsucker', as translated by Duddington (Saltykov—Shchedrin, 1934)). These nicknames, words that also contain a diminutive suffix, parody Porphyry Golovlyov’s speech. At the same time here such a suffix adds a pejorative connotation, and an expression of derision and contempt to the words. Thus, we observe in Saltykov—Shchedrin’s (1875) novel an innovative use of the conventional metaphorical expression уьга (Judas) by adding to it a diminutive—pejorative suffix —у/жк—[—ushk—]. This nickname Иудушка (Iudushka) expresses the feeling of the Golovlyov family towards Porphyry. The Golovlyovs think of him as a hidden enemy inside their family (cf. Judas Iskariot in relation to Jesus) and they feel contempt towards him (expressed in the suffix —у/жк—[—ushk—]). Therefore, a metaphorical
expression of biblical origin *uyga* (Judas) that has become a *conventional* metaphor in Russian usage, acquires the status of an *allusive* and an *innovative* metaphor, i.e. shifts to the other interpretative types of metaphor in Saltykov—Shchedrin’s novel.

The name of Иудушка Головлёв (Iudushka Golovlyov) is used in common Russian usage and in literary texts as an *allusive* metaphor with reference to the character in Saltykov—Shchedrin’s novel. The expression is registered in the Ashukins’ (1960) dictionary of *winged words* as referring to a canting hypocrite wearing the mask of innocence. It should be noted, however, that in Modern Russian, the name Иудушка (iudushka) loses its direct reference to Saltykov—Shchedrin’s character. It is often found without Головлёв (Golovlyov) and sometimes begins with a small letter (as will be demonstrated in the examples below). This indicates that a *renovated conventional* metaphor *uyga* (Judas) in the form of *uygywKa* (iudushka) has acquired the status of a *conventional* metaphor. It has shifted from innovative creation to routine collective repetition, i.e. it has become a *renovated conventional* metaphor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal expression</th>
<th>Allusive metaphor</th>
<th>Conventional metaphor</th>
<th>Innovative &amp; Allusive metaphor</th>
<th>Allusive metaphor</th>
<th>Renovated conventional metaphor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Иуда Искариот → Иуда → iuda → Иудушка Головлёв → Иудушка(Головлёв) → iudushka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas Iskariot → Judas → judas → Iudushka Golovlyov → Iudushka (Golovlyov) → iudushka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following analysis of literary extracts containing the expression Иудушка (Iudushka), I maintain that there may be a double intertextual relationship established by this metaphor: intertextual relations between the literary text and the Bible and Saltykov—Schedrin’s novel.

In the next passages we find the name Иудушка (Iudushka) applied to Trotsky, one of the prominent politicians of the 20th century whose views
on the revolution and the ways of social development differed from those of Lenin and his followers.

(33) 
Чтобы эти слова вбивались в голову гвоздями, чтобы невольно вылетало из глотки не просто, скажем, Троцкий, а непременно — "враг народа, Иудушка Троцкий"! Не оппозиция, а "банду политических убийц"! Эти слова понятны всем. (Dombrovskiy, 1989:556)

°These words must be hammered into the heads of the people, so they will instinctively utter, not simply "Trotzky", but obligatorily — "the enemy of the people, Judas Trotsky". That is what must spontaneously fly out of their throats. Not "the opposition" but "the gang of political murderers"! These words are understandable to everybody.

The following are the thoughts of Joseph Stalin about what he would call the enemies of his regime. Trotsky is among them:

(34) 
Весь мир теперь смотрит на наш Колонный зал — поэтому и факты должны быть убедительные, яркие, простые. 
— И правдивые?
— И правдивые! И, конечно, прежде всего правдивые. А что, разве у тебя есть причины сомневаться, что, скажем, Каменев или Зиновьев не враги народа? Или что Рыков не боролся против сплошной коллективизации, или что Иудушка Троцкий из-за рубежа не ведет борьбу на фашистские деньги против нашего ленинского ЦК и лично против товарища Сталина? Есть у тебя такие факты, что этого не было? (Dombrovskiy, 1989:320)

°The whole world is now looking at our Column Hall. Hence the facts must be convincing, vivid and simple. 
— And truthful?
— And truthful! And of course, in the first place, truthful. But do you have any reason to doubt that, let's say, Kamenev or Zinoviev were not the enemies of the people? Or did not Rykov fight against complete collectivisation, or does not Judas Trotsky fight against our Lenin's Central Committee of the party from abroad with the fascist money and personally against comrade Stalin? Do you have a proof that all this is not true?

The expression Judas Trotsky in the English translations literally reads iudushka Trotsky in the Russian texts.
From (33) and (34), we can reconstruct the following tenor—vehicle relations: Троцкий — угушка (Trotsky (is like) Iudushka) ((34)i). The Bolsheviks considered their opponents to be traitors. So the tenor Trotsky in this metaphorical construction acquires the characteristic of a traitor in the eyes of the Bolsheviks. It is also well-known that Trotsky was a very good orator; but whatever Trotsky would say about revolution for the Bolsheviks would be a “parasaical loquacity” and hypocrisy.

Therefore, by calling Trotsky угушка (iudushka), the Bolsheviks express their pejorative attitude towards him as being a traitor, a hidden enemy, embedded in the diminutive suffix -yus [ushk] that this form of уюга (Judas) has. The tenor’s characteristic of a traitor establishes intertextual relationship between the given literary extracts and the text in the Bible. It reactivates the reference to the biblical Иуга (Judas) (betrayer) in the name of Игушка (Iudushka (lit. Little—Judas)). Another characteristic of the tenor, “a good orator, speaking of the revolution, but having different ideas about it from those of the Bolsheviks”, may be said to establish the connection with Saltykov—Shchedrin’s Iudushka Golovlyov’s characteristic of a person who concealed his evil intentions by pious loquacity. Therefore, we find in (33) and (34) the embedded implications of Judas Iskariot and Iudushka (lit. Little—Judas) Golovlyov in the name of угушка (lit. Little—Judas). In other words, the metaphorical term угушка (iudushka (lit. Little—Judas)) establishes intertextual relations which cross the boundaries not only of specific texts, but also of text types, or genres (section 2.2.1).

In a literary text, this expression establishes a double intertextual relationship between the literary text in which it occurs — the Russian classical literary text (Saltykov—Shchedrin’s novel) and the biblical texts (the Gospels). It serves as a point of interaction for the three different types of literary texts, leading to the recovery of one intertext through
another: a biblical intertext can be recovered through the Saltykov–Shchedrin intertext.

(34)i

Троцкий — Иудушка
Trotsky — Judushka
(lit. Little—Judas)

The possible interactive situations into which the conventional metaphor uyga (Judas) may enter as a vehicle are summarised in Table 9 (Appendix 2). This indicates that the associations of a betrayer and a liar arousing contempt form a stable configuration of characteristics of this conventional metaphor.
As in the Russian language, in English, allusions to Judas Iskariot refer to anyone who betrays a friend; a hypocrite, a traitor (Lass, Kiremidjian & Goldstein, 1990). The name of the biblical Judas has also entered English usage as a common noun (a Judas) referring to a person who is disloyal to another person by revealing him or his secrets to an enemy. It is often used as a term of address, as in you Judas! (Long, 1979). Therefore, the expression Hyga will not cause problems when translating it into the English language.

However, when the name of Judas is used in the form of uygyuška (judushka, lit. Little—Judas) in Russian literary texts, as in (33) and (34) the associations of a hypocrite, concealing his evil intentions by eloquent talk, and a pejorative attitude towards the addressee that this form has in Russian will inevitably be lost when it is translated into English simply as Judas or as Little—Judas. This is because in Russian uygyuška (judushka, lit. Little—Judas) refers not only to the biblical Judas but also to the character of the Russian classical literary text, and because in the Russian language, the diminutive suffix itself adds an expression of contempt and pejorative attitude to someone who is called Hyga (Judas). This is impossible to express by grammatical means in English. The translation might be improved by adding an adjective to Judas such as paltry, petty or worthless in an English translation.

Thus, the mode of translation of uygyuška (judushka, lit. Little—Judas) into English is a substitution of it by Judas or by Judas combined with one of such adjectives as paltry, petty or worthless which would produce a similar, but not identical metaphor.

This section has demonstrated that when a metaphor from the type of conventional metaphors shifts to the type of innovative metaphors, and as a renovated conventional metaphor, shifts back to the type of
conventional metaphors, its translation into a foreign language may become problematic. This happens when a renovation of the conventional metaphor in Russian is based on the linguistic peculiarity of the Russian language.

3.5 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In this study, the analysis and interpretation of each bibleism have been carried out within the framework of interaction theories of metaphor. This has resulted in highlighting the stable configuration of associations of particular bibleisms, and in indicating their features that may or may not be activated in a particular usage (Appendix 2). The range of stable associations of several bibleisms discussed in this study (e.g. святая святых (the Holy of Holies), козел отпущения (scapegoat), урод (Herod)) has been extended. This has been made possible by utilising the procedure of vehicle interpretation in the analysis and interpretation of a literary metaphor in terms of interaction theories.

The analysis of those bibleisms that are nominal expressions has demonstrated that when the focus is a nominal expression, it has the function of a vehicle for the argument in the frame where the frame is not part of the bibleism itself, but of the literary context. In such cases, the reconstruction of another argument is not required. Therefore, focus interpretation coincides with vehicle interpretation in these cases.

In spite of the remote connection between Russian metaphorical expressions of biblical origin and their sources, bibleisms occurring in literary texts may be viewed as specialised signs which establish the intertextual relationships between their new literary contexts and their original biblical context. These intertextual relationships are established through the semantic stock of the Modern Russian language. The analysis of the intertextual and intratextual relationships of the bibleisms in this study has demonstrated the role of their metaphorical origins in the
development of their new associations. The original associations of the bibleisms form the basis for the development of their new metaphorical associations.

The foregoing discussion demonstrates that there can be no strict boundaries in the categorisation of Russian metaphorical expressions of biblical origin. The same bibleism (e.g. Ирод (Herod) discussed in section 3.2; Иуда (Judas), discussed in section 3.4), may slide between all three interpretative types of metaphor defined here as conventional, allusive and innovative. Thus, the status of a Russian bibleism as a metaphor is not a static but a dynamic one.

The analysis and interpretation of several Russian bibleisms functioning in literary texts confirm the hypothesis about the status of a metaphorical expression formed in section 2.2.1.3. The analysis and interpretation of data have demonstrated that bibleisms that were once used as innovative metaphors, and then shifted to the type of allusive metaphors, have finally become part of common usage, i.e. they have become conventional metaphors. In literary texts, however, we may observe another shift through which bibleisms that have become conventional metaphors may again become allusive or even innovative metaphors. It has also been demonstrated that a bibleism that has become a conventional metaphor, and in a literary text has shifted to the type of innovative metaphors, in its renovated form may again rejoin the type of conventional metaphors (e.g. the bibleism Иуда (Judas) discussed in section 3.4).

It is essential, from the point of view of translation, to make a distinction between different interpretative types of metaphor. Metaphorical expressions of biblical origin that belong to the shared cultural inheritance of Russian— and English—speaking peoples are capable of adequate translation, and in most cases, the concern is with the choice of an appropriate translation mode rather than translatability as such.
The modes of translation of bibleisms from Russian into English that have been encountered in the discussed examples are a *sensu stricto* translation, a substitution, *sensu stricto* translation combined with sense, omission and a paraphrase. The same Russian bibleism may be translated into English differently, depending on whether it is used in a literary text as a *conventional* metaphor, or as an *allusive* metaphor. If the bibleism has become a conventional metaphor only in Russian usage (e.g. *upog* (lit. 'Herod', i.e. tyrant), *злачное место* (lit. 'green pastures', i.e. a place of revelry)), when it is used in a Russian literary text as a conventional metaphor the mode of its translation into English may be different from the one applied when this bibleism is used allusively in a Russian text. (For instance, *upog* (lit. 'Herod') as a conventional metaphor can be translated into English as *tyrant* (i.e. substitution) and as an allusive metaphor — as *Herod* (i.e. *sensu stricto*). When the same bibleism has become a conventional metaphor in both languages, the translation procedures applied to it will be the same, whether it is used as a conventional metaphor in a particular case, or as an allusive metaphor (e.g. *блудный сын* and *prodigal son*). When a Russian bibleism becomes an innovative metaphor, the process of its translation into English involves a translator in the process of creating a new metaphor. When a Russian bibleism from the type of conventional metaphors shifts to the type of innovative metaphors and as a renovated conventional metaphor shifts back to the type of conventional metaphors, its translation into English may become problematic if its renovation is based on the linguistic peculiarity of the Russian language (e.g. adding a diminutive suffix to *Иуда* (Judas)).
CHAPTER 4:

CONCLUSION

The analysis and interpretation of Russian bibleisms as a special case of metaphorical language use has served to enhance our understanding of these expressions.

An overview of the available literature on bibleisms has revealed that new metaphorical associations connected with these expressions have generally been viewed as being very remote from the associations of their prototypes. However, analysis of the data in terms of interaction theories of metaphor has shown that all the new associations related to bibleisms in Modern Russian are based on and derive from their original associations. In spite of the distant connection of Russian bibleisms to their sources, I maintain that the associations they already have and continue to create depend on the intertextual relationship that these expressions establish between the new context in which they occur and their original biblical context. To account for this, the bibleisms in this study have been viewed as foregrounded elements of the literary texts that establish intertextual relationships with the Bible through parallelism.

A survey of relevant views on metaphorical language has revealed the importance of the distinction between the types of metaphor for the interpretation and translation of metaphorical expressions. The general distinction of two types of metaphor (live and dead metaphors) has been redefined in this dissertation following and refining Van Den Broeck's (1981) categorisation of metaphors. It has been proposed to distinguish between three types of metaphor (conventional, allusive and innovative metaphors).
It has been argued that there can be no strict boundaries in the categorisation of metaphorical expressions, since the dynamic character of a metaphor suggests that if there is a shift through which innovative metaphors become conventional, there may also be a shift through which conventional metaphors become innovative again. On the basis of this argument, it has been assumed that there may also be another kind of shift through which a conventional metaphorical expression sifts to the type of innovative metaphors in a literary text, and then rejoins the type of conventional metaphors in its renovated form. The hypothesis that this may be a continuous cyclical process has been confirmed in this study by the analysis and interpretation of several Russian bibleisms functioning in literary texts. The following figure summarises the dynamic character of metaphorical expressions:

Thus the same metaphorical expression in different interactive situations may be referred to different interpretative types of metaphor.

The relation of a particular bibleism to a particular type of metaphor enhances our understanding of exactly what is implied by the bibleism in each case of its occurrence. Hence the translation procedure may only be determined in each individual case since there are certain peculiarities pertaining to each type of metaphor. For instance, with innovative or with renovated conventional metaphors the process of translation is equal to the
process of creating a new metaphor. Translation of a renovated conventional metaphor may become problematic when its renovation is based on the linguistic peculiarity of the language.

The interaction theories of metaphor applied in the present study have made it possible to account for the semantic function and an extended range of associations of some bibleisms registered in Russian dictionaries as conventional metaphors, by emphasising the procedure of vehicle interpretation that is involved in the understanding of a literary metaphor.

Since the Judaeo—Christian heritage plays a significant role in Russian culture and the culture of English—speaking countries, and because bibleisms form a significant part of both languages, it is very important to study these expressions in both Russian and English. For different reasons, the basic knowledge of the Bible, which is essential for our cultural education, has declined among Russian speakers as well as among English speakers. Therefore it is considered in this study that creating awareness of the influence of the Bible on the Russian and English languages must be supported as a way of fostering cultural literacy, both in Russia and in the English—speaking countries. Such knowledge could result in more effective cross—cultural communication.

The data contained in this dissertation may be found useful by teachers of Russian as a foreign language (and as a native language, too). The literary texts that have been selected for this study could be used for reading in a Russian literature class when English—speaking students are exposed to contemporary Russian authors. The passages that contain bibleisms quoted in this dissertation could be used for discussion by students with the purpose of enhancing their understanding of these expressions and mastering their translation skills. To a certain extent, the same data could be also used by Russian teachers of English in a translation class for improving
the translation skills of their students. The list of the bibleisms presented in Appendix 1, and the tables in Appendix 2, which summarise the possible interactive situations of the expressions interpreted in this dissertation, may give an idea of the similarities and differences that occur in the use of bibleisms in both languages.

This study provides a database of bibleisms used only in the context of narrative literary texts, whereas the functioning of these expressions may also be studied on the basis of mass media or colloquial speech. An added dimension of this study, therefore, is that it may be viewed as an avenue for further stylistic research in the field of metaphorical expressions of biblical and sacral origin both in Russian and English.
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APPENDIX 1

RUSSIAN METAPHORICAL EXPRESSIONS OF BIBLICAL AND SACRAL ORIGIN WITH THEIR ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

This list is compiled from various dictionaries of Russian usage consulted in the course of this study. It contains biblical quotations as well as expressions that do not appear in the Bible, but created later on the basis of the stories described in the Bible. The specific reference to the sources of the expressions given in this list is therefore to be understood as conventional. English translations of the Russian bibleisms are taken from the dictionary of Walshe & Berkov (1984) and in some instances from the King James Bible. They do not imply that these bibleisms have entered English usage in their given forms.

1. Алчущие и жаждущие
   [Матфея 5:6] Hungry and thirsty
   [Matthew 5:6]
2. Алфав и омега
   [Откровение 1:8] Alfa and Omega
   [Revelation 1:8]
3. Аллилуийо петь
   [1 Паралипomenon 16:36] Sing alleluia / hallelujah
   [1 Chronicles 16:36]
4. Беден, как Лазарь
   [Лука 16:19—25] (As) poor as Lazarus
5. Бесплодная смоковница
   [Матфея 21:19] The barren fig tree
   [Matthew 21:19]
6. Благую часть избрать
   [Лука 10:38—42] Choose the good part
   [Luke 10:38—42]
7. Блаженны миротворцы
   [Матфея 5:9] Blessed are the peacemakers
   [Matthew 5:9]
8. Блудница вавилонская
   [Откровение 17:1 и 5] The whore of Babylon
   [Revelation 17:1 and 5]
9. Блудный сын
   [Лука 15:11—32] The Prodigal Son
10. Божьей милостью [1 Послание коринфянам 3:10]

11. Бросать камень в кого-то [Иоанн 8:7]

12. Вавилон [Откровение 17:5 и др.]

13. Вавилонская башня [Бытие 11:1−9]

14. Вавилонское столпотворение [Бытие 11:1−9]

15. Балаамова ослица [Числа 22:27−28]

16. Валтасаров пир [Даниил 5]

17. Вера без дел мертва есть [Иаков 2:20]

18. Вера горами двигает [Матфей 17:20]

19. Ветхий Адам (человек)

20. Взявшие меч от меча и погибнут [Матфей 26:52]

21. Видеть (замечать) сучок в чужом глазу (и не видеть (не замечать) бревна в своем) [Матфей 7:3]

22. В костюме Адама; в костюме Евы [Бытие 2:3]

23. Вкушать от древа познания добра и зла [Бытие 3]
24. Власть тьмы [Лука 22:53] 
The power of darkness [Luke 22:53]

25. Вложить меч в ножны [Иоанн 18:11] 
Put one's sword into the sheath [Luke 18:11]

26. Вложить персты в язвы [Иоанн 20:24—29] 
Put one's fingers into the print of the nails [John 20:24—29]

27. В начале было слово [Иоанн 1:1] 
In the beginning was the word [John 1:1]

28. Внести свою лепту [Марк 12:42] 
Contribute one's mite [Mark 12:42]

29. Во веки веков [Михей 4:5 и др.] 
For ever and ever [Micah 4:5 etc.]

30. Возвращается ветер на круги свои [Екклесиаст 1:6] 
The wind returneth again to his circuit [Ecclesiastes 1:6]

31. Возлюби ближнего твоего (как самого себя) [Матфей 22:39 и др.] 
(Thou shalt) love thy neighbour (as thyself) [Matthew 22:39 etc.]

32. Волк в овечьей шкуре [Матфей 7:15] 
Wolf in the sheep's clothing [Matthew 7:15]

33. Волосы встали дыбом [Иов 4:15] 
His hair stood on end [Job 4:15]

34. Во многоглагонии несть спасения [Мафей 6:7] 
Use not vain repetition [Matthew 6:7]

35. Во многой мудрости много печали [Екклесиаст 1:18] 
In much wisdom is much grief [Ecclesiastes 1:18]

36. Вопить гласом великим [Бытие 27:34] 
To cry with a loud voice [Genesis 27:34]

37. Во плоти [Иов 19:26] 
In the flesh [Job 19:26]
38. Воскрешение Лазаря
[Иоанн 11:44]

The raising Lazarus from the dead [John 11:44]

39. Впав в искушение
[1 Послание к Тимофею 6:9]

Fall into temptation [1 Epistle to Timothy 6:9]

40. В поте лица своего
[Бытие 3:9]

By the sweat of thy face (brow) [Genesis 3:9]

41. Врачу, исцелился сам
[Лука 4:23]


42. Всемирный потоп
[Бытие 6:8]

The flood, Noah's flood [Genesis 6:8]

43. Всему свое время [и время всякой вещи под небом]
[Екклесиаст 3:1]

To every thing there is a season and a time to every purpose under the heaven [Ecclesiastes 3:1]

44. Всякое даяние благо
[Послание Иакова 1:17]

Any gift is a blessing [The Epistle of James 1:17]

45. Всякой твари по паре
[Бытие 6:19 - 20]

Two of every living creature under the sun [Genesis 6:19 - 20]

46. Выпить чашу до дна
[Исаия 51:17]

Drain the cup of bitterness to the dregs [Isaiah 51:17]

47. Геена огненная
[Матфей 18:9 и др.]

Hell fire [Matthew 18:9 etc.]

48. Глас вопиющего в пустыне
[Исаия 40:3 и др.]

Voice crying in the wilderness [Isaiah 40:3 etc.]

49. Глупые девы
[Матфей 25:1 - 13]

Foolish virgins [Matthew 25:1 - 13]

50. Голгофа
[Матфей 27 и др.]

Calvary [Matthew 27 etc.]

51. Голиаф
[1 Книга Царств 17]

Goliath [1 Samuel 17]
52. Голубь мира (символ мира)  
[Бытие 8:10—11]  
Dove (symbol of peace)  
[Genesis 8:10—11]

53. Грехи молодости  
[Псалтырь 24:7 и др.]  
Sins of youth  
[Psalms 25:7 etc.]

54. Грехопадение  
[Бытие 3]  
The fall  
[Genesis 3]

55. Гробы поваленные  
[Матфей 23:27]  
Whited sepulchres  
[Matthew 23:27]

56. Да будет свет!  
[Бытие 1:3]  
Let there be light!  
[Genesis 1:3]

57. Да минует меня чаша сия  
[Матфей 26:39 и др.]  
Let this cup pass from me  
[Matthew 26:39 etc.]

58. Дар божий  
[Екклезиаст 3:13 и др.]  
Gift of God  
[Ecclesiastes 3:13 etc.]

59. Дело рук твоих  
[Иеремия 32:30]  
The work of their hands  
[Jeremiah 32:30]

60. Дни его сокрены  
[Даниил 5:26]  
His days are numbered  
[Daniel 5:26]

61. Довлеет дневи злоба его  
[Матфей 6:34]  
Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof  
[Matthew 6:34]

62. Дух бодр, плоть же немощна  
[Матфей 26:41 и др.]  
The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak  
[Matthew 26:41 etc.]

63. Ева  
[Бытие 3:20]  
Eve  
[Genesis 3:20]

64. Египетская тьма  
[Исход 10:22]  
Egyptian darkness  
[Exodus 10:22]

65. Египетские казни  
[Исход 7—12]  
The plagues of Egypt  
[Exodus 7—12]
66. Жнет, где не сеял  
[Матфей 25:24 и др.]
Reap where one has not sown  
[Matthew 25:24 etc.]

67. Заблудшая овца  
[Матфей 18:12 и др.]
The lost sheep  
[Matthew 18:12 etc.]

68. Заднюю созерцать  
[Исход 33:23]
To see one's back parts  
[Exodus 33:23]

69. Запретный плод  
[Бытие 2:16 - 17]
The forbidden fruit  
[Genesis 2:16 - 17]

70. Зарыть свой талант (в землю)  
[Матфей 25:15 - 30]
To bury one's talents (in the earth)  
[Matthew 25:15 - 30]

71. Заснуть вечным сном  
[Иеремия 51:29]
To sleep a perpetual sleep  
[Jeremiah 51:29]

72. Звезда от звезды разнствует во славе [1 Посланное Коринфиянам 15:41]  
One star differeth from another star in glory  
[1 Corinthians 15:41]

73. Златой телец  
[Исход 32]
The golden calf  
[Exodus 32]

74. Злачное место  
[Заупокойная молитва и Псалтырь 22:2]
Green pastures  
[Funeral Prayer and Psalms 22:2]

75. Злоба дня  
[Матфей 6:34]
The evil of the day  
[Matthew 6:34]

76. Змий – искушитель  
[Бытие 3]
The Old Serpent. The Tempter  
[Genesis 3]

77. Знамение времени  
[Матфей 16:3]
Sign of the time  
[Matthew 16:3]

78. Избиение младенцев  
[Матфей 2:1 - 5, 16]
The slaughter of the innocents  
[Matthew 2:1 - 5, 16]

79. Избранный народ  
[1 Послание Петра 2:9]
The chosen people  
[1 Peter 2:9]
80. Из Назарета может ли быть что доброе?
[Иоанн 1:46]

81. Имеющий уши, да услышит
[Матфей 1:15]

82. Имя им легион
[Лука 8:30 и др.]

83. Иов многострадальный
[Книга Иова]

84. Иосиф прекрасный
(целомудренный)
[Бытие 39:7—20]

85. Ирод
[Матфей 4:6—11 и др.]

86. Испустить дух
[Бытие 35:29 и др.]

87. Иуда
[Матфей 26:14—50 и др.]

88. Иудин поцелуй
[Матфей 26:48—49 и др.]

89. Ищите и обречете
[Матфей 7:7 и др.]

90. Кай
[Бытие 4]

91. Кайнова печать
[Бытие 4:15]

92. Как один человек
[Судьи 20:1 и др.]

93. Камень преткновения
[Иссаия 8:14 и др.]
94. Камни вопиют  
[Лука 19:14]  
The stones would cry out  
[Luke 19:14]  

95. Камня на камне не оставить  
[Матфей 24:2 и др.]  
Not to leave one stone upon another  
[Matthew 24:2 etc.]  

96. Капля в море  
[Сирах 18:8]  
A drop in the ocean  
[The Book of Sirah 18:8]  

97. Кающаяся Магдалина  
[Марк 16:9 и др.]  
The repentant Magdalena  
[Mark 16:9 etc.]  

98. Кесарева кесарю, а божье богу  
[Матфей 22:21]  
Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and unto God the things that are God’s  
[Matthew 22:21]  

99. Кипеть млечом и медом  
[Исход 3:8]  
To flow with milk and honey  
[Exodus 3:8]  

100. Книга за семью печатями  
[Откровение 5:1 – 3]  
A book sealed with seven seals  
[Revelation 5:1 – 3]  

101. Книжники и фарисеи  
[Матфей 23:4 и др.]  
Scribes and Pharisees  
[Matthew 23:4 etc.]  

102. Козел отпущения  
[Левит 16:21 – 22]  
Scapegoat  
[Leviticus 16:21 – 22]  

103. Колосс на глиняных ногах  
[Данниел 2:31 – 35]  
A colossus with feet of clay  
[Daniel 2:31 – 35]  

104. Копать яму другому  
[Екклесиаст 10:8 и др.]  
Dig a pit for another man to fall into  
[Ecclesiastes 10:8 etc.]  

105. Корень зла  
[Иов 19:28]  
The root of evil  
[Job 19:28]  

106. Кость от кости плоть от плоти  
[Бытие 2:21 – 23]  
Bone of the bone, and flesh of the flesh  
[Genesis 2:21 – 23]  

107. Краеугольный камень  
[Исайя 28:16]  
Cornerstone  
[Isaiah 28:16]
108. Крошки с барского стола  
[Матфей 15:27]

109. Кто не работает, тот не ест  
[2 Послание к фессалоникийцам 3:10]

110. Кто не с нами, тот против нас  
[Матфей 12:30]

111. Кто сеет ветер, пожнёт бурю  
[Осия 8:7]

112. Кто ударит тебя в правую щеку, обрати к нему и другую  
[Матфей 5:39]

113. Лазарь петь  
[Лука 16:19—25]

114. Левая рука не ведает, что делает правая  
[Матфей 6:3]

115. Левиафан  
[Иов 40:20]

116. Легче верблюду пройти в игольное ушко, чем...  
[Матфей 19:24 и др.]

117. Лепта вдовицы  
[Марк 12:41—44 и др.]

118. Лицом к лицу  
[Исход 33:11]

119. Ложь во спасение  
[Псалтырь 32:17]

120. Манна небесная  
[Исход 16:31—35]

121. Медь звонящая  
[1 Послание к коринфянам 13:1]
122. Между небом и землей
[2 Книга Царств 18:9]
Between the heaven and the earth
[2 Samuel 18:9]

123. Мерзость запустения
[Даниил 9:27 и др.]
The abomination of desolation
[Daniel 9:27 etc.]

124. Метать бисер перед свиньями
[Матфей 7:6]
Cast pearls before swine
[Matthew 7:6]

125. Милосердный самаритянин
[Лука 10:30—37]
A good Samaritan
[Luke 10:30—37]

126. Мир вам!
[Лука 24:36]
Peace be unto (with) you!
[Luke 24:36]

127. Мир дому сему!
[Лука 10:5]
Peace be to this house!

128. Много званных, но мало избранных
[Матфей 20:16, 22:14]
Many are called, but few are chosen
[Matthew 20:16, 22:14]

129. Мудрые девы
[Матфей 25:1—13]
Wise virgins
[Matthew 25:1—13]

130. На песке строить
[Матфей 7:26—27]
Build on sand
[Matthew 7:26—27]

131. Не ведают, что творят
[Лука 23:34]
They know not what they do
[Luke 23:34]

132. Невзирая на лица
[Матфей 22:16 и др.]
Without respect of persons
[Matthew 22:16 etc.]

133. Не вливают молодое вино в мехи старые
[Матфей 9:17 и др.]
No man potteth new wine into old bottle
[Matthew 9:17 etc.]

134. Не достоин развязать ремень у сапог его
[Матфей 1:7 и др.]
Not (to be) worthy to unloose the latchet of smb.’s shoes
[Matthew 1:7 etc.]

135. Не иметь, где приклонить голову
[Лука 9:58]
To have nowhere to lay one’s head
[Luke 9:58]
136. Неисповедимы пути Господни  
[Послание к римлянам 11:33]

137. Не от мира сего  
[Иоанн 18:36]

138. Не сотвори себе кумира  
[Исход 20:4]

139. Нести свой крест  
[Иоанн 19:17]

140. Нет пророка в своем отечестве  
[Матфей 13:57 и др.]

141. Не судите, да не будете судимы  
[Матфей 7:1]

142. Ничего тайного, что сделалось бы ясным  
[Марк 4:22 и др.]

143. Ман не живет от хлеба одного  
[Матфей 4:4 и др.]

144. Ни на йоту  
[Матфей 5:18]

145. Ни одна живая душа  
[Бытие 2:7 и др.]

146. Ничто не вечно под луной  
[Екклезиаст 1:4—7]

147. Ничто не ново под луной  
[Екклезиаст 1:9—10]

148. Ничто иное не сей  
[Иаков 1:6]

149. Нищие духом  
[Матфей 5:3]
150. Ноеv ковчег  
[Бытие 6 — 7]  
Noah’s Ark  
[Genesis 6 — 7]

151. Ныне отпущаеши  
[Лука 2:29]  
Lord, now letest thou thy servant depart in peace  
[Luke 2:29]

152. Обетованная земля  
[Посланіе к еўреям 11:9]  
The Promised Land  
[Hebrews 11:9]

153. Обоюдоострый меч  
[Посланіе к еўреям 4:12 и др.]  
Two-edged sword  
[Hebrews 4:12 etc.]

154. Обратить свои стопы куда—либо  
[Псалтырь 118:59]  
Turn one’s steps to...  
[Psalms 118:59]

155. Око за око, зуб за зуб  
[Исход 21:24 и др.]  
Eye for eye, tooth for tooth  
[Exodus 21:24 etc.]

156. Оливковая ветвь  
[Бытие 8:10]  
The olive branch  
[Genesis 8:10]

157. Отделять овец от козлиц  
[Матфея 25:31 — 33]  
Separate the sheep from the goats  
[Matthew 25:31 — 33]

158. Отделять пшеницы от пшеницы  
[Матфея 13:24 — 30]  
Separate the wheat from the chaff  
[Matthew 13:24 — 30]

159. От лукового  
[Матфея 5:37]  
Of evil  
[Matthew 5:37]

160. Отойди от зла и сотвори благо  
[Псалтырь 36:27]  
Depart from evil and do good  
[Psalms 37:27]

161. Отрясти прах от ног своих  
[Матфея 10:14 и др.]  
Shake off the dust from one’s feet  
[Matthew 10:14 etc.]

162. Перековать мечи на орала  
[Исайя 2:4]  
Beat one’s swords into plowshares  
[Isaiah 2:4]

163. Перст божий  
[Исход 8:19]  
The finger of God  
[Exodus 8:19]
164. Песнь песней

The song of songs

165. Плодитесь и размножайтесь
[Бытие 1:28]

Be fruitful, and multiply
[Genesis 1:28]

166. Под своей смоковницеей
[Иоанн 1:48]

Under one's fig tree
[John 1:48]

167. По образу и подобию
[Бытие 1:26]

In his own image and likeness
[Genesis 1:26]

168. Посылать от Понтия к Пилату
[Лука 23:1–12]

Send smb. from Pontius to Pilate

169. Посыпать пеплом голову
[Есфирь 4:1 и др.]

Spinkle ashes upon one's head
[Esther 4:1 etc.]

170. Притча во языцах
[Второзаконие 28:37]

A proverb (and a byword) among all nations
[Deuteronomy 28:37]

171. Почитъ от дел
[Бытие 2:3]

To rest from all the work
[Genesis 2:3]

172. Продать свое первородство за чечевичную похлебку
[Бытие 25:31–34]

Sell one's birthright for a mass of pottage
[Genesis 25:31–34]

173. Против рожна идти
[Деяния 26:14]

Kick against the pricks
[Acts 26:14]

174. Разве я сторож брату моему?
[Бытие 4:9]

Am I my brother's keeper?
[Genesis 4:9]

175. Разверзлись хлеби небесные
[Бытие 7:11]

The windows of heaven have opened
[Genesis 7:11]

176. Распни его
[Марк 15:13]

Crusify him!
[Mark 15:13]
177. One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh: but the earth abideth for ever. [Ecclesiastes 1:4]

178. His own received him not [John 1:11]

179. The Holy of Holies [Exodus 26:33–34]

180. Make oneself a name [Genesis 11:4]

181. Gnashing of teeth [Matthew 8:12]

182. Serve God and Mammon [Matthew 6:24]

183. Mortal (or deadly) sin [1 John 5:16–17]


185. Solomonian decision [1 Kings 3:16–28]

186. The salt of the earth [Matthew 5:13]

187. With fear and trembling [Philippians 2:12]

188. Old as Mathuselah [Genesis 5:27]

189. Change from Saul into Paul [Acts 9 and 13:9]

190. Off the face of the earth [Genesis 2:6]
191. Страха ради иудейска
[Иоанн 19:38]  
For fear of the Jews
[John 19:38]

192. Суббота для человека, а не человек для субботы
[Марк 2:27]  
The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath
[Mark 2:27]

193. Суета сует и всяческая суета
[Екклесиаст 1:2]  
Vanity of vanities; all is vanity
[Ecclesiastes 1:2]

194. Тайна сия велика есть
[Послание к ефесянам 5:32]  
This is a great mystery
[Ephesians 5:32]

195. Темна вода в облачех
[Псалтырь 17:12]  
Dark are the water in the clouds
[Psalms 18:11]

196. Терновый венец
[Марк 15:17]  
A crown of thorns
[Mark 15:17]

197. Тридцать сребреников
[Матфей 26:15]  
Thirty pieces of silver
[Matthew 26:15]

198. Труба иерихонская
[Иисус Навин 6:2—20]  
The trumpet of Jericho
[Joshua 6:2—20]

199. Тьма кромешная
[Матфей 22:13]  
The outer darkness
[Matthew 22:13]

200. Умыть руки
[Матфей 27:24]  
Wash one's hands
[Matthew 27:24]

201. Упасть на добрую почву
[Матфей 13:8]  
Fall into good ground
[Matthew 13:8]

202. Фарисей
[Матфей 5:20 и др.]  
Pharisee
[Matthew 5:20 etc.]

203. Фиговый листок
[Бытие 3:7]  
Fig leaf
[Genesis 3:7]

204. Фома неверующий
[Иоанн 20:24—29]  
A doubting Thomas
[John 20:24—29]
Our daily bread [Matthew 6:11]

Keep as the apple of an eye [Deuteronomy 32:10 etc.]

Be lame in both legs [1 Kings 18:21]

My cup runneth over [Psalms 23:5]

Honour thy father and thy mother [Exodus 20:12]

That thou doest, do quickly [John 13:27]

What is truth? [John 18:38]

Eden [Genesis 2:8]

The vale of tears [Psalms 84:6]

My tongue cleaveth to my jaws [Psalms 22:15]

As a thief in the night [1 Peter 5:2 etc.]
APPENDIX 2

TABLES OF INTERACTIVE SITUATIONS OF THE BIBLEISMS DISCUSSED
IN THIS DISSERTATION

Symbols:

+ activation of association in a metaphorical construction

(+) possible activation of association

The tables present the summaries of possible interactive situations of the bibleisms discussed in this dissertation. They demonstrate the semantic functions of these bibleisms.

Highlighted associations form a stable configuration of associations of a bibleism. Other associations form a group of silent features of a bibleism that may or may not be activated in a particular usage.
3.1.1 Святая святы (the Holy of Holies)
Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREMISES</th>
<th>OBJECT</th>
<th>ABSTRACT NOTION</th>
<th>СВЯТАЯ СВЯТЫХ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(the Holy of Holies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guarded place</td>
<td>very respected place</td>
<td>place where meaningful or secret work is done</td>
<td>smth sacred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- +: Presence
- (+): Not relevant

- Protected
- Not accessible to many
- Very respected
- Significant
- Sacred
- Secret
- Set apart for something important
- Important
- Valuable
### 3.1.2 Козел отпущения (scapegoat)

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a punished person</td>
<td>an outcast (undeserved victim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.1.3 Притча во языцех (a proverb (and a byword) among all nations)

Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an object that has become notorious</td>
<td>a person whose name has become notorious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.4 Злоба дни (the evil of the day)

Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a problem that has to be resolved</td>
<td>злоба дни (the evil of the day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>attracts attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>requires some action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.5 Злачное место (green pastures)

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a place of revelry or debauchery</td>
<td>злачное место (green pastures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>pleasant place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>plentiful place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>quiet place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>paradise on earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>place of ecstasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>good life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>place of depravity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.1 Ἡρῴδ (Herod)

Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenor</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hooligan</td>
<td>enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(++)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(++)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.2 Блудный сын (prodigal son)

Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>someone who returned to his family (friends)</th>
<th>a disobedient son</th>
<th>a dissipated person</th>
<th>someone who repented after his misfortunes</th>
<th>an exile</th>
<th>a forgiven sinner</th>
<th>блудный сын (prodigal son)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>a young man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>a disobedient son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a disrespectful son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>a person who left home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>a person who led a life not approved of by his relatives or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a person who suffered (away from home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a person who returned to his family (friends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a sinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a sinner who is repentant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a sinner who is forgiven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.1 *Kecapio kecapeso, a bozhe bogu* (отдать\воздать) (*Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's*)

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to give each person what is rightfully his or hers</th>
<th><em>Kecapio kecapeso, a bozhe bogu</em> (отдать\воздать) (<em>Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>if appreciates things of low value should receive the things that are of low value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>if treasures really worthy things should receive such worthy things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1 *Иуда (Judas)*

Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>false friend</th>
<th>traitor of his homeland</th>
<th>hypocrite</th>
<th>Иуда (Judas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>disciple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>betrayer of his friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>betrayer of his teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>liar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>arouses negative feelings (contempt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>