

Joanna SZERSZUNOWICZ

Uniwersytet w Białymstoku

joannaszersz@gmail.com

ON THE EVALUATIVE CONNOTATIONS OF ANTHROPONYMIC IDIOMS IN A CONTRASTIVE PERSPECTIVE (BASED ON ENGLISH AND ITALIAN)

1. EVALUATION IN LANGUAGE

In the present paper evaluation is defined as attributing a value to a person, an object etc. (Szerszunowicz 2010a). It is worth mentioning that evaluation is usually bipolar and tends to be scalar (cf. Čermák 1995: 73–84). What is interesting from the point of view of linguistics is the variety of means by which evaluation is expressed in language. Most of them are lexical or syntactico-lexical and they tend to be accompanied with particular prosodic characteristics and in many cases also with facial expressions and gestures. One of subgroups of units performing the evaluative function is composed of various fixed phrases, among which similes are particularly important in terms of conveying valuation (cf. Peters 2007).

Expressing evaluation is a very interesting phenomenon in a contrastive perspective, since some differences as well as similarities are bound to occur. Cross-linguistic analyses of evaluation can encompass a variety of aspects and phenomena found in language. For instance, it is possible to limit the research to the area of phraseological units. A phraseological unit is “a lexicalized polylexemic unit which is characterized, in principle, by semantic and syntactic stability, and to a great extent by idiomacity” (Fiedler 2007: 28). According to Pajdzińska (1991: 15), phraseologisms communicate evaluation, implicate evaluation or they are a source of the system of evaluation in a given community. One can focus

on evaluation expressed by idiomatic expressions with particular constituents, such animal terms or proper names.

The constituents at issue develop metaphorical meanings in a given culture; therefore, it can be assumed that differences are likely to occur in languages compared (cf. Morărașu 58). So far, the evaluative potential of Polish and Italian toponymic idioms has been discussed with a view to determining mechanism of evaluation exploited in the units and discussing their equivalence (Szerszunowicz 2009, 2010b). It is worth mentioning that English containing anthroponyms and toponyms have been researched by Pierini (2008), who made some comments on their evaluation load.

The aim of the paper is to analyze evaluative connotations of English and Italian idioms containing anthroponymic constituents with a view to discussing the means of evaluation implemented in phraseological units and presenting the typology of cross-linguistic equivalents of the phraseologisms at issue.

The units for the analysis have been excerpted from various lexico- and phraseographic sources, so that two corpora of units could be compiled. The works selected for the present study are dictionaries of contemporary English and Italian. The units included in lexico- and phraseographic works have been chosen for the analysis, since such a selection of material excludes occasional constructions with anthroponymic units, frequent in both languages, especially in journalese.

The excerption resulted in the compilation of two corpora: the English corpus is composed of 218 units, while the Italian one consists of 266 phraseologisms. Since the focal issue is to analyze evaluative connotations of anthroponyms, single-word metaphors are also discussed, as they tend to be included in many dictionaries of idioms (e.g. C, L, P, Q).

It should be stressed that the inclusion of single-word metaphors in a contrastive perspective is very important, since in some cases a phraseological unit has a cross-linguistic equivalent which is a word carrying the same allusion or picture (cf. Dobrovolskij, Piirainen 2005: 33–38). Therefore, irrespective of non-phraseological character of the equivalent it is a close one from the perspective of imagery. Thus, in terms of equivalence the inclusion of single-word metaphors renders it possible to present a more accurate analysis of equivalents.

2. ANTHROPONYMIC IDIOMS AS A SUBGROUP

Among notional areas providing constituents of idioms, such as colour terms, terms denoting parts of body or animal names, proper names constitute a subgroup “deeply rooted in the cultural tradition of a language community” (Fiedler 2007: 55–63). Onyms tend to be idioms carriers of cultural information, reflecting history, customs and beliefs etc. of a given group (cf. Teliya, Bragina, Oparina, Sandomirskaya 2001; Dobrovol’skij, Piirainen 2005: 245–247; Pierini 2008). Names at issue are rich in connotations and many of them are of intertextual character, since they allude to some texts of culture known to users of a given language. Textual dependence can be observed in references to a variety of texts, for instance, the Bible, fables, fairy tales, movies etc. (Piirainen 2008: 210).

Moreover, it should be emphasized that the status of proper names as constituents of phraseological units differs greatly depending on the degree of lexicalization as well as other factors, such as, for instance, the language user’s knowledge (Cieślikowa 2003: 66). This factor is of great importance, since language users can decode constituents at issue as proper names or they may not even know of the proprial origins of the elements (cf. Szerszunowicz 2006).

As to the origins and types of anthroponyms which are constituents of phraseological units a dichotic division into authentic and non-authentic names can be applied. Furthermore, it is possible to list the following sources and kinds (cf. Pierini 2008):

1. The Bible: *doubting Thomas, Judas kiss, il segno di Caino*.
2. Classical heritage, especially mythology: *Pandora’s box, il tallone d’Achille*.
3. Literary texts, both international and national: *Jekyll and Hyde, Alice in Wonderland, avere il naso lungo come Pinocchio*.
4. Anecdotes, legends etc.: *Columbus egg, peeping Tom*.
5. Popular culture: *Barbie doll, Rambo methods, the Ophra effect*.
6. History: *Napoleonic scale, parlare male di Garibaldi*.
7. Authentic names of people known for some reason, e.g. *Hobson’s choice, according to Hoyle, avere la memoria di Cardinal Mezzofanti*.
8. Common first names or surnames: *every Tom, Dick and Harry, keep up with Joneses, Signor Rossi*.
9. Ethnic/regional stereotypes: *sembrare un beduino, essere un genovese*.

10. Created names reinterpreted etymologically: *Miss Mop, il signor Tummistufi*.

The list above indicates that the cultural character of an onym can be of international or national character. As to the first kind mentioned, illustrative examples come from the Bible and Greek mythology as well as masterpieces of literature, history etc., part of the common world or European heritage, whereas the latter are, for instance, names of people or places important to a given language community (cf. Szerszunowicz 2011). Such names, part of collective memory of a given nation, may not be known to the majority of people not belonging to a given ethnic community or considered to be of relatively little importance. It is worth stressing that some anthroponymic units reflect local colour as well (cf. Laskowski 2003: 145).

The onyms which become constituents of idioms tend to be carriers of a stereotypical image of the designate. Therefore, precisely speaking, such onyms become depropriat derivatives, since the onym functions as a proper noun and an appellative noun which possesses some content; in other words, two homophonic names exist in the language, i.e. *nomen proprium* and *nomen appellativum* (Kucharzyk 2008: 58). It can be assumed that any kind of onym can become a constituent of an idiom, for instance: anthroponyms (*and Bob's your uncle*), toponyms (*from China to Peru*), chrematonyms (*like a Rolls-Royce*), heortonyms (*like turkeys voting for Christmas*), ideonyms (*Boys Own*), zoonyms (*since Hector was a pup*).

Idiomatic units containing anthroponymic constituents compose a largest group, which is to be interpreted as one of reflections of anthropocentric character of phraseology, followed by toponymic idioms (cf. Pierini 2008; Szerszunowicz 2009). It should be emphasized that there are various kinds of anthroponyms which are constituents of phraseological units, for example: first names (e.g. *a plain Jane*), surnames (e.g. *keep up with the Joneses*), nicknames (*ha da venì Baffone, Denis the Menace*), ethnonyms (*fare il portoghese*), teonyms (*Bacco, tabacco e Venere*).

As it has been mentioned, proper names become carriers of stereotyped image and it is not infrequent for them to become carriers of evaluation. According to Spagińska-Pruszk, who in her book analyzes Polish, Russian and Croatian phraseological units referring to the sphere of intellect, the onyms most frequently exploited as evaluation carriers

are the following: authentic anthroponyms, names of historical, religious and geographical objects, anthroponyms from literature, films etc., biblical and ancient names, names from folk literature as well as fictitious anthroponyms and toponyms (Spagińska-Pruszk 2003: 76–77).

The anthropocentric character of phraseology at issue manifests itself in a twofold way. First of all, anthroponyms, i.e. personal names, are constituents of phraseological units. Second, the majority units analyzed describe and evaluate man and man-related issues and phenomena, for instance, appearance (*sembrare una Madonna di Monte Negro*), intellectual potential (especially intelligence versus stupidity, e.g. *essere più' tondo di o di Giotto*), personality (*avere la pazienza di Giobe*), behaviour (*far la visita di Santa Elisabetta*), financial status (*più povero di san Quintino*).

As it was mentioned, evaluation tends to be bipolar. In fact, the vast majority of units expresses negative evaluation (151 English units and 208 Italian idioms), while relatively few units are carriers of positive evaluative load (respectively 67 and 58). Discussing English anthroponymic phraseological units, Pierini (2008) draws attention to the fact that the proportion of masculine versus feminine names is uneven, with the prevalence of the former ones. The same lack of proportion is observed in Italian phraseological units containing personal proper names, since as many as 81% names, which are constituents of phraseological units, are masculine.

3. THE ANALYSIS OF THE EVALUATIVE EFFECT OF ENGLISH AND ITALIAN ANTHROPONYMIC IDIOMS

The analysis of the phraseological units excerpted shows that anthroponymic idioms express evaluation by exploiting various means. For instance, the anthroponym can function as a core evaluative constituent of a given phraseologism. Second, in some units the anthroponymic constituent is interpreted etymologically, and as a result the evaluation conveyed by the idiom is decoded. Next, the appellative constituent carries direct evaluation, while the anthroponymic constituent intensifies the load. For instance, the onym at issue can be part of a rhyming expression. Moreover, cultural connotations can convey evaluations, since they are actualized in the unit.

3.1. THE ANTHROPONYM AS A CORE EVALUATIVE CONSTITUENT

In some idioms the anthroponym functions as an evaluative constituent, which means that the onym is the carrier of connotations known to language users. For instance, the unit *essere un Apollo* contains the name *Apollo*, which has a positive evaluative load, since it connotes masculine beauty (R: 17). The majority of such constituents can be used as a single word conventional metaphors and tend to be registered as such in lexicographic works. This group comprises both authentic and invented names, many of which are of biblical or mythological origins. Some of the anthroponyms appear both in English and Italian; yet, culture-bound units are present, too, for instance, in Italian such names are the ones from *commedia dell'arte*, e.g. *Arlecchino* is typical of the Italian culture and language: *essere un Arlecchino*, *essere il discorso di Arlecchino*.

Some names do not appear as single word metaphors; yet, they are key constituents of the units at issue. For instance, the Italian expressions *avere la memoria di Mitridate*, *avere la memoria di Pico della Mirandola*, *avere la memoria del Cardinal Mezzofanti* contain anthroponymic constituents conveying a positive evaluation. The personal names do not appear in their antonomastic use in dictionaries, but their connotative potential is realized in the units (cf. Hejwowski 2004: 91). The carriers of the names were persons famous for excellent memory, the knowledge about whom constitutes part of the collective memory of Italian language users.

In some cases it is the sound of the name that gives the units an evaluative character. The surname *Buggins*, which is the constituent of the English idiom *Buggins turn* (infml 'the procedure whereby posts are given not to those most capable of filling them but to relatively mediocre candidates as a reward for long and undistinguished service'; often preceded by *the principle of*) is "an invented name which to English ears is both undistinguished and slightly comic" (O: 81). In fact, the surname *Buggins* used in the Italian connotes only foreignness and does not carry additional connotations.

3.2. THE REINTERPRETATION OF THE ANTHROPONYMIC COMPONENT

In some units it is the anthroponymic constituent reinterpreted etymologically that conveys evaluative load. For example, the English

idiom *Paul Pry* contains the surname derived from the verb *to pry* meaning 'to be interested in someone's personal life in a way that is annoying or offensive' (M: 1136). Therefore, thanks to the etymological reinterpretation, the surname carries a negative axiological load.

It is worth mentioning that in some units more than one component can be reinterpreted etymologically. The Italian idiom *essere un Cornelio Tacito* (L: 312) contains two constituents, i.e. a first name and a surname, which are reinterpreted. The name *Cornelio* alluded to *corno* and the surname refers to the verb *tacere*. *Corno*, the Italian word meaning 'horn', is associated with being betrayed (cf. Lurati 2002: 13–24). The meaning of the idiom *Cornelio Tacito* is 'a cuckold who tolerates being betrayed in exchange for some favour' (L: 312).

As to the reinterpretation of anthroponymic components, some names etymologically reinterpreted in the process of decoding of idioms are of compound character. For instance, the Italian idiom of literary origins, from a novel *Promessi sposi* by Alessandro F. T. Manzoni (1822; the English title *The Betrothed*), *essere un Azzecagarbugli*, contains a surname which is a compound. The anthroponym is reinterpreted by the analysis of the meaning of the two base words, i.e. *azzeccare* 'hit', 'strike' and *garbuglio* 'tangle', fig. 'muddle, mess'. Analogically, the idiom *essere il signor Tummistufi/la signorina Tummistufi* (L: 181) is based on the expression *tu mi stufi* (*stufarsi* 'to grow weary of'; 'to get fed up with').

Moreover, in this subgroup of evaluative anthroponymic idioms some schemata are observed. For instance, in the English language the schema MR/MISS + SURNAME, in which anthroponymic component is a carrier of direct evaluation, has a number of realizations, e.g. *Clean* (*Mr Clean*), *Right* (*Mr Right*, *Miss Right*). Such names, interpreted literally as characterizing adjectives, are of direct evaluative character.

There are also word combinations composed of a generic names, evoking commonness, followed by appellatives used as surnames, e.g. *Joe Bloggs*, *Joe Blow*, *Joe Citizen*, *Joe Doakes*, *Joe Public*, *Joe Soap*, *Joe Sixpack*, *Joe Schmoe*, *Joe Developer*, *Joe Lunchbox*, *Joe Six-Chip*. It is worth observing that female names are found in the realizations of the schemata discussed, for instance, *Jane Doe*. However, it should be stressed that they are much less frequent than male names, which reflects the general tendency observed in idioms containing anthroponymic constituents.

3.3. THE COMBINED MEANING OF IDIOM COMPONENTS

In numerous idioms it is the combined meaning of constituents that expresses evaluation. For example, the Italian idiom of mythological origins, *esser come le stalle di Augia*, as a whole, carries a negative evaluation. It should be stressed that the onymic element, *Augia*, irrespective of its connotations, is not used independently as a conventional metaphor on its own. In fact, neither of the constituents of the idiom evokes evaluative connotations in language users if used on its own. It is the combination of words which expresses evaluation. Therefore, it is the combined meaning of the whole units which expresses the evaluative load of the phraseological unit.

It is worth adding that in some units the evaluation is expressed both by a directly evaluative appellative constituent and an onymic constituent rich in connotations, e.g. *as poor as Lazarus*, *as patient as Job*. In fact, the implementation of the structure of a simile AS + AN ADJECTIVE + AS + A NOUN is also indicative of expressing evaluation. Another example is the idiom *be no Sherlock Holmes*, in which the element of negation is of importance for expressing the evaluation. To decode the meaning of the unit the connotations of the name *Sherlock Holmes* have to be known to a given language user, who needs to combine them with the element of negation.

3.4. AN APPELLATIVE AS AN EVALUATION CORE ELEMENT

There are also idioms, in which the evaluative constituent is an appellative, conveying direct evaluation, e.g. *good*, *plain*. The anthroponymic constituent is a name used in a generic sense, for example, in the English language the names *Jane* ('woman') and *Joe* ('man'). Such names connote commonness, since are considered to be typical first names in a given culture. Some names belonging to the group discussed appear in a series of idiomatic expressions, for instance: *holy Joe*, *an ordinary/average/regular Joe*, *an honest Joe*, *a good Joe*.

Apart from the first names mentioned above, which are constituents of a series of idiomatic expressions, other names are occasionally used to form a phraseological unit, for instance, *Dick*, *Dora* or *Freddie*. The names listed appear in a combination composed of an adjective followed by a first name (*clever Dick*, *a dumb Dora*, *Blind Freddie* (AustrE)).

In some units the axiological load is contained in the appellative constituent, while the anthroponymic element, rhyming with the common name, performs an intensifying function. The following units belong to the subgroup at issue: *plain Jane*, *smelly Nellie*, *silly Billy*, *moaning Minnie*, *simple Simon*. In the first three examples listed the organization of the unit is based on rhyme, while in the last two alliteration is exploited.

3.5. CULTURAL CONNOTATIONS AS A MEANS OF EVALUATION

In some idioms cultural connotations are exploited in order to express evaluation (cf. Dobrovol'skij, Piirainen 2005: 243–251). For example, the English idiom *an Aunt Sally* meaning 'sb singled out as a target of abuse, criticism, or ridicule (...); an object, or idea, deliberately invented in order to attract destructive criticism, with the object of leading to constructive thought' (O: 141). The idiom originally was "the name given to an effigy used as a target for aiming at in fun fairs, etc" (O: 141).

Similarly, the Italian idiom *essere agile/leggero come l'uccello di San Marco* lit. to be agile (light) as St Mark's bird, meaning 'to be very heavy and awkward' and conveying negative evaluation, alludes to the commonly known pictorial presentations showing San Mark with a bull (L: 243). The examples discussed show how cultural connotations are exploited as a means of expressing evaluation by phraseological units containing anthroponymic constituents.

3.6. MEANS OF INTENSIFYING THE EVALUATION EXPRESSED BY ANTHROPONYMIC IDIOMS

The evaluation expressed by phraseologic units containing anthroponymic constituents can be intensified by means of certain devices, such as adding some words to intensify the evaluation as well as exploiting prosody and extralingual means.

The first of the listed techniques consists in inserting lexical units performing the intensifying function, such as axiologically marked adjectives and adverbs, for example the English word *very*, *extremely* ect. or Italian words *vero e proprio*, e.g. *very/extremely stupid Simon*. It is worth emphasizing that it is possible to put additional constituents, so that the units gains a more complex meaning and, as a result, the image it carries

is more vivid, e.g. *a dumb and numb Dora*. The modifications at issue tend to be of occasional character.

Second, prosodic features can function as very important intensifiers of evaluation. For instance, the intonation and accentuation of the evaluative anthroponymic phrase may increase the evaluative load of a given units in a particular communication context.

Third, extralingual means can be implemented, for instance facial expression and gestures can enhance the evaluation expressed by a given unit containing an athroponymic component. The Italian idiom *un Cornelio Tacito* based on an onomastic pun (Lurati 2002: 23) can be accompanied with a gesture, i.e. showing horns with the index finger and little finger (Diadori 1990: 55), which adds to its expressiveness.

3.7. SECONDARY EXPLOITATION OF ANTHROPONYMS AS EVALUATIVE CONSTITUENTS

Apart from being exploited as means of primary evaluation, i.e. the evaluation attributed to a given name or a given units containing *nominum proprium*, anthroponymic constituents can be used as carriers of evaluation opposite to the primary. It can be done thanks to the rhetorical inversion, so that the name *Apollo* can be used ironically to mean that a man is ugly.

It should be emphasized that prosodic features are of importance in terms of expressing secondary evaluation, since they also can change the character of evaluation conveyed by the phraseological unit. In fact, it can be either partial or complete change in the evaluation conveyed by a given fixed expression.

4. THE CROSS-LINGUISTIC EQUIVALENCE OF AXIOLOGICALLY MARKED ANTHROPONYMIC IDIOMS

Equivalence is one of the key terms in translation studies and cross-linguistics (cf. Burkhanov 2003: 91–114). It is also of great importance for research on phraseology is a confrontative perspective. Analyses of phraseological corpora of given languages enable determining cross-linguistic equivalents of phraseological units.

As a result of such analyses typologies of equivalents are developed, which tend to encompass the following types of equivalents: full (total) equivalents; partial equivalents; zero equivalents (cf. Gläser 1984; Hejwowski 2004: 108–112; Fiedler 2007: 118). On the basis of the traditional division of equivalents the typology of evaluative onymic English and Italian units is developed. Due to the specific character of units at issue, the additional criterion is introduced, i.e. the presence or absence of the onymic constituent. The equivalents of English and Italian anthroponymic phraseological units expressing evaluation are presented below.

The analysis shows that the dominant types of equivalents are full, partial and zero equivalents. The first group, i.e. full equivalents, is the smallest one, since it contains 41 units. Partial and zero equivalents constitute groups, which are comparable from the quantitative point of view, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Types of equivalents of English and Italian anthroponymic idioms

TYPE OF EQUIVALENT	Number of units	
	English	Italian
full	41	41
partial	97	116
zero	80	109

The main subgroups of equivalents will be discussed and exemplified along with two minor subgroups of cross-linguistic counterparts, which are of great interest from the point of view of translation, i.e. literal equivalents and false friends.

4.1. FULL EQUIVALENTS

The first group of equivalents is composed of full equivalents, i.e. units of identical structure, constituents and meaning (cf. Laskowski 2003: 146). In fact, as stated by Fiedler (2007: 118), the name quasi-equivalents is more appropriate to be applied to the units at issue, since two units are unlikely to be identical in all respects. In other words, if more parameters are taken into consideration, the units compared are bound to differ, for instance, in frequency or stylistic markedness.

The units which have full equivalents constitute a group of 41 phraseologisms, which amounts to 19% of all English units collected and 15% of Italian units. The number of units is relatively small and it should be stressed that many units belonging to the subgroup are internationalisms, mostly of biblical or mythological origins, for instance *rich as Croesus – ricco come un Creso*.

What is important is the fact their evaluation load is the same in the languages compared and the pictorial character of a given phraseological unit is retained in the target language. Both in English and Italian the units tend to be marked as 'literary' or 'educated' (cf. Fiedler 2007: 118), since decoding them requires knowledge of the Bible, Greek mythology or ancient literature (cf. Piirainen 2007: 209–210).

4.2. PARTIAL EQUIVALENTS

Another group is composed of units which have partial equivalents, i.e. phraseological units in the target language which have different lexical or structural constituents. The subgroup can be further divided into the following subgroups: equivalents with identical anthroponymic components and different structures; equivalents with substituted anthroponymic constituents; equivalents which do not contain anthroponymic constituents.

In the English corpus there are 97 units which have partial equivalents belonging to the subgroups listed below and the Italian one comprises 116 units, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Partial equivalents of English and Italian anthroponymic idioms

PARTIAL EQUIVALENTS	Number of units	
	English	Italian
with an identical anthroponym	5	5
with a substituted anthroponym	27	32
without an anthroponym	65	79

The quantitative analysis of the units having cross-linguistic partial equivalents leads to the conclusion that the group is a relatively large one, as it is more than forty per cent in case of either corpus analyzed (both 44%).

4.2.1. EQUIVALENTS WITH IDENTICAL ANTHROPONYMIC CONSTITUENTS

The sub-group discussed is composed of as few as five units. Equivalents belonging to the subgroup contain the same anthroponymic constituent and identical or similar appellative constituents. Yet, their structure is different. For instance, the Italian idiom *essere come san Tommaso* (lit. to be like Saint Thomas) has an equivalent in English which is not a simile, i.e. *to be a doubting Thomas*, and it has one extra constituent *doubting*.

This subgroup is composed of units whose anthroponymic constituents carry the same connotations. Yet, they may differ in imagery, as it is the case with the following pair of units: *Machiavellan cunning*, *avere la ciabatta di Machiavelli* (lit. to have the slipper of Machiavelli). The Italian idiom is of pictorial character, while the English is not; however, both idioms exploit the connotative potential of the surname *Machiavelli*.

It should be stressed that in cases of some units the same anthroponymic component may appear in idioms whose meanings differ, for example, the Italian unit *esser come le stalle di Augia* 'to be very dirty' and the English one *to cleanse the Augean stables* 'to thoroughly reform some sections of public life, big business, etc where there has been accumulation of corrupt practice' (O: 104).

4.2.2. EQUIVALENTS WITH SUBSTITUTED ANTHROPONYMIC COMPONENTS

The sub-group, composed of units which contain different anthroponyms in the languages compared, contains 27 English units and Italian 32 phraseologisms. The structures of both units are identical or similar, as in the following example: *essere Tizio, Caio e Sempronio*; *Tom, Dick and Harry*//*Harriet/Sheila*. As it can be seen, there are further, more subtle differences between the two units. The last component of the English units can be substituted with a feminine name, either *Harriet* or *Sheila*, while the Italian lexicographic works do not contain any information regarding the possibility of substitution the masculine name with a feminine one.

The substitution of onymic constituent tends to result in changes occurring in imagery conveyed. For instance, the meaning 'being dressed up in an exaggerated way' is expressed by means of phraseological units both in English and Italian. Yet, the onymic constituents differ greatly, since in Italian in two idioms there are two proprial elements referring

to the sphere of religious cult, i.e. *sembrare la Madonna di Monte Negro*, *sembrare la Madonna di Loreto* and in the third unit, *sembrare la Regina Taitù*, is the name of the Queen of Ethiopia (1856–1914), the wife of Menelik II (L: 181), while in English the proper name is a surname, mainly *to look like Bootles' baby* alludes to the novelette *Bootles' Baby* (1885) by Henrietta Eliza Vaughan Stannard who used the nom-de-plume John Strange Winter.

It should be noticed that there are equivalents which contain onyms of different kind. For example the Italian idiom of mythological origins *la tela di Penelope* 'never-ending work' (F268) has an English phraseological equivalent *like painting the Forth Bridge*, which also contains an onymic constituent. Likewise in the examples discussed above, the imagery of the two units in question is completely different and so is their stylistic markedness. In a number of cases it results from the proper name being culturally connoted in a given culture (cf. Dobrovolskij, Piirainen 2005: 245). Yet, irrespective of those, the evaluation they carry is similar.

4.2.3. EQUIVALENTS WITHOUT ANTHROPONYMIC COMPONENTS

The group, constituted by 65 English and 79 Italian units, is composed by equivalents which do not contain any anthroponymic constituents and differ greatly in imagery. Some of the units belonging to this subgroup have the same structure as the source language units, for instance, the Italian simile *fumare come un turco* (lit. to smoke like a Turk) has an English equivalent without a proprial constituents, e.g. *smoke like a chimney*.

Other units belonging to this sub-group have different constituents and structure. The phenomenon is illustrated by the following pair: *to have a memory like an elephant*, *avere la memoria di Cardinal Mezzofanti* (lit. to have the memory of the Cardinal Mezzofanti). Irrespective of differences in structure and components, the evaluation conveyed by the units compared is the same.

To sum up, it should be stressed that in this subgroup what is retained is the fossilized character of the equivalent. The question is whether the stylistic markedness is the same or similar. The vast majority of phraseological units at issue are colloquial expressions, for instance: *bestemmiare come un turco* (lit. to swear like a Turk) – *to swear like a trooper*; *più' povero di san Quintino* (lit. poorer than Saint Quintine) – *as poor as a church mouse*. The image conveyed by the units in question can differ greatly, too. It should be stressed that the context, in which a given unit

is used, is of importance from the point of view of equivalence. It may occur that the context excludes the usage of a unit primarily considered to be equivalent.

4.3. ZERO EQUIVALENCE

To complete the list of equivalents groups of phraseological units at issue zero equivalence will be discussed. According to Fiedler, "Zero equivalence may be caused by the fact that a PU is deeply rooted in the history of a language community and that it has a literary source. (...). When they have to be translated, explanatory paraphrases seem to be unavoidable" (2007: 119). Fiedler exemplifies zero equivalence with the idiom *a Catch-22 situation*, a unit of literary origins.

The English corpus contains as many as 80 units which have zero equivalents in Italian, which amounts to 37% of all units. As to the Italian corpus, as many as 109 Italian units do not have phraseological equivalents of any kind, which constitutes 41%; therefore, they are classified as having zero equivalents in English.

It is vital that some phraseologisms which convey evaluation and have zero equivalents in another language reflect the culture of a given language community; in other words, they express culture-bound notion, and, as a consequence, culture-bound evaluation. In the American variety of English there are some evaluating phrases referring to American Indians' and African-Americans' behaviour towards white Americans, for example, *Uncle Tom* 'an African-American who is accused of being servile to whites by other Africans', *Uncle Tomahawk* 'an American Indian who is accused of being servile to whites by other Indians (...)' (H: 743), *Aunt Jemima* '(...) was sometimes used to mean an African-American woman who liked to serve white people' (G: 31).

Another example of an idiom belonging to the subgroup discussed is the British idiom *Brown, Jones and Robinson* meaning 'vulgar rich, who get themselves airs, especially abroad, and look with scorn on all foreign manners and customs that differ from their own' (B: 1189). In the case of the units at issue, amplifications of explanatory character are necessary so that the meaning as well as evaluation could be expressed in the target language.

The subgroup also contains units which are not culture-bound, but still they have equivalents of non-phraseological character, in other words

non-fixed combination of words are equivalents of phraseological units, for instance, the English idiom *Jack of all trades* has a non-phraseological English equivalent (*uno*) *a che sa fare un po' di tutto* (I: 336). The English idiom is derived from the proverb *Jack of all trade and mater of none*, which implies that the evaluation of the person's skills is negative, while the Italian descriptive equivalent is less direct in evaluation.

The equivalents belonging to the group at issue are non-phraseological, in other words, loose combinations of words. Therefore, they are not stylistically marked, which affects seriously the degree of equivalents. In such a situation one should exploit the technique of compensation in translation. In fact, the connotative value of the unit can be compensated for so that its evaluation could be retained.

4.4. LITERAL EQUIVALENTS

In fact, in the case of some units it is possible to treat a literal translation of the source language unit as an equivalent. In general, loan translation of phraseological units is also possible, and by means of it units "(...) find their ways into other languages, with English playing a dominant role as a donor language at present" (Fiedler 2007: 123). As observed by Fiedler, such units tend to appear in the media as well as in literary texts.

First of all, it can be assumed that the evaluative potential of some anthroponyms. It can be assumed that some anthroponyms, such as *Shylock*, *Scroodge*, *Quasimodo*, *Pinocchio* etc., are known to both the English and Italians. Thanks to the knowledge, language users are likely to interpret the names used in calqued phraseological units. It should be emphasized that choosing such an equivalent depends greatly on the assumed knowledge of target readers.

As for phraseological units containing reinterpreted etymologically, onymic constituents in some contexts target language equivalents may be literal translation with re-created anthroponymic components. Therefore, in order to retain the stylistic markedness of the English unit *Paul Pry* the Italian equivalent of non-idiomatic character, i.e. *Paolo Curioso*, can be preferred.

4.5. FALSE FRIENDS

It is worth mentioning apparent equivalents of phraseological units, also called *false friends*, or *pseudo-equivalents*, which are structures whose

external similarity to the units present in the target language causes non-natives users to understand it to be the equivalent of a given phraseologism (cf. Daszczyńska 1987: 9; Gläser 1999; Gläser 2000; Szerszunowicz 2006; Szerszunowicz 2008). The analysis of the units belonging to the subgroup is of great importance from the point of view of foreign language teaching, phraseography and translation studies. Such units are not particularly common; yet, they deserve special attention because of their apparent similarity.

For instance, the English units *lead the life of Riley* and the Italian unit *fare l'arte/la vita di Michelaccio/Michelasso* have a similar structure and components; yet, the similarity is apparent and deceptive, since the meaning of the English unit is 'a luxurious or carefree existence' (S: 242–243), while the Italian idiom means 'be lazy; get out of doing any kind of work' (Q: 299) and is a carrier of negative evaluation.

It should be emphasized that it occurs that one meaning of a given units is identical to the meaning of the cross-linguistic equivalent, while another meaning exists in one language only, either L1 or L2. In other words, the idiom is polysemous in L1 and monosemous in L2, or vice versa. For instance, the Italian idiom *segno di Caino* lit. mark of Cain, whose structure and components are identical to those of the English one has two meanings registered in lexicographic works (Q: 76).

The first one, 'a sign of shame', is identical to the meaning of the English unit, i.e. 'a stigma of a murderer; a sign of infamy' (S: 184), while the other one, 'joined eyebrows', is different. It is worth stressing that some dictionaries of the Italian language (e.g. DeM: 2393, DO: 309), include only the meaning 'joined eyebrows'; yet, the same dictionaries register antonomastic use of the name *Caino* defined as 'one who has betrayed their own family and friends; fratricide' (Szerszunowicz 2008: 27–28). In fact, if the Italian idiom is used to mean 'joined eyebrows', it can be assumed that it carries no evaluation, while the English *mark of Cain* carries heavy load of negative evaluation whenever used.

5. CONCLUSION

English and Italian onymic phraseological units conveying evaluation do not constitute a homogenous group of units. A variety of mechanisms are exploited so as to express various kinds of evaluation. In both

languages in the case of many phraseological units the anthroponymic constituents, especially the ones showing textual dependence, are core evaluative elements. It should be stressed that appellative constituents can also perform the role of evaluative element. Moreover, in some units it is the combined meaning that expresses evaluation.

The units at issue also differ greatly in terms of widespreadness. While some of them are of international, or at least European character, others are limited to a given language or even dialect, which influences greatly their cross-linguistic equivalence. The smallest group is composed of idioms which have full equivalents expressing identical or similar evaluation in both languages compared. The majority of units belonging to the group at issue are the ones of biblical or mythological origins. Phraseological units which have either phraseological equivalents with other anthroponyms or without or non-phraseological equivalents are more numerous than the ones which have full equivalents.

Therefore, research on evaluation expressed by anthroponymic idioms, apart from purely theoretical analyses, is of importance in terms of translation studies, teaching foreign languages and phraseography. First of all relatively few units have full equivalent, which means that the translation equivalent is to be chosen and evaluation expressed by the source language unit is to be taken into consideration while deciding on the equivalent. Second, the evaluative function of anthroponymic phraseological units should be a component of teaching foreign languages, since it helps to develop students' language and intercultural skills. Third, studies on evaluative load of units at issue can contribute to a better description of idioms containing proper names as well as other idioms

REFERENCES

DICTIONARIES

- Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, 2002, (Millenium edition 1999), revised by A. Room, 8th ed., London. (B)
- Castoldi M., Salvi U., 2003, *Parole per ricordare. Dizionario della memoria collecttiva*, Bologna. (R)
- Collins Italian-English Dictionary*, 1998, eds. M. Clari, C. E. Love, 2nd ed., Italia. (I)
- Cowie A. P., Mackin R. R., McCaig I. R., 1994, *Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms*, 2nd ed., Oxford. (O)
- De Mauro T., 2000, *Il dizionario della lingua italiana*, 1st ed., Milano. (DeM)

- Devoto G., Oli G. C., 2001, *Il dizionario della lingua italiana*, 2nd ed., Firenze. (DO)
- Gulland D. M., Hinds-Howell D., 2002, *The Penguin Dictionary of English Idioms*, 11th ed., London. (P)
- Hendrickson R., 2004, *QPB Encyclopedia of Word and Phrase Origins*, 2nd ed., New York. (H)
- Lapucci C., 1990, *Dizionario dei modi di dire della lingua italiana*, 1st ed., Milano. (L)
- Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*, 2002, ed. M. Rundell, 1st ed., London. (M)
- Oxford Dictionary of Idioms*, 2005, ed. J. Siefring, 2nd ed., Oxford. (S)
- Oxford Guide to British and American Culture*, 1999, ed. J. Crowther, 1st ed., Oxford. (G)
- Pittàno G., 2001, *Frase fatta capo ha. Dizionario dei modi di dire, proverbi e Locuzioni*, 5th ed., Bologna. (F)
- Quartu B. M., 2000, *Dizionario dei modi di dire della lingua italiana*, 4th ed., Milano. (Q)
- Turrini G., Alberti C., Santullo M. L., Zanchi G., *Capire l'antifona. Dizionario dei modi di dire con esempi d'autore*, 2002, 6th ed., Bologna. (C)

LITERATURE

- Burkhanov I., 2003, *Translation: Theoretical Prerequisites*, Rzeszów,
- Čermák F., 1995, *Functional System and Evaluation*, in: *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague* n.s. Prague Linguistic Circle Papers, vol. I, eds E. Hajičová, M. Červenka, O. Leška, P. Sgall, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 73–84.
- Cieślíkowa A., 2003, "Ile pięt miał Achilles? Nazwy własne we frazeologizmach – trochę historii, trochę współczesności", in: *Anabasis. Prace ofiarowane Profesor Krystynie Pisarkowej*, I. Bobrowski, Kraków, pp. 61–71.
- Daszczyńska I., 1987, *Rosyjsko-polskie pozorne ekwiwalenty frazeologiczne*, Słupsk.
- Diadori P., 1990, *Senza parole. 100 gesti degli italiani*, Roma.
- Dobrowol'skij D., Piirainen E., 2005, *Figurative Language: Cross-Cultural and Cross-Linguistic Perspectives*, Amsterdam.
- Fiedler S., 2007, *English Phraseology*, Tübingen.
- Gläser R., 1984, *The Translation Aspect of Phraseological Units in English and German*, in: *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics. The Polish-English Contrastive Project*, ed. J. Fisiak, Poznań, pp. 123–134.
- Gläser R., 1999, *Phraseological Units as False Friends in English and German*, Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Naučnij Žurnal. Serija 19. "Lingvistika: meždunarodnaja komunikacija" 4, pp. 25–35.
- Gläser R., 2000, *Phraseologismen als falsche Freunde*, in: *English in the Modern Word. Festschrift for Hartmut Breitzkreuz on the Occasion on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. M. Dakowska, Frankfurt/M., pp. 213–226.
- Hejwowski K., 2004, *Kognitywno-komunikacyjna teoria przekładu*, Warszawa.

- Kucharzyk R., 2008, *Miejsce apelatywizacji we współczesnych badaniach językoznawczych*, "Poradnik Językowy" 9, pp. 54–63.
- Laskowski M., 2003, *Semantische und pragmatische Aspekte der deutschen und polnischen Phraseologie*, Zielona Góra.
- Levin M., Lindquist H., 2007, *Sticking one's nose in the data: Evaluation in phraseological sentences with nose*, *ICAME Journal* 31, pp. 87–110. <http://icame.uib.no/ij31/index.html> Accessed: 15.03.2009.
- Lurati O., 2002, *Per modo di dire ... Storia della lingua e antropologia nelle locuzioni italiane ed europee*, Bologna.
- Morărașu N. N., 2011, *Cross-linguistic Equivalence and translatability of English Toponymic Idioms*, "Translation Studies: Retrospective and Prospective Views" IV, 12, pp. 57–62. <http://www.lit.ugal.ro/TSRPV/Translation%20Studies%2012.%202011.pdf>. Accessed: 10.04.2011.
- Pajdzińska A., 1991, *Wartościowanie we frazeologii*, w: *Język a Kultura*, vol. 3, eds. J. Puzynina, J. Anusiewicz, Wrocław, pp. 15–28.
- Peters P., 2007, *Similes and other evaluative idioms in Australian English*, in: *Phraseology and Culture in English*, ed. P. Skandera, Berlin – New York, pp. 235–255.
- Pierini P., 2008, *Opening a Pandora's Box: Proper Names in English Phraseology*, "Linguistics Online" 36 (4), pp. 43–52. www.Linguistic-online.de/36_08/pierini.html Accessed: 28.03.2009.
- Piirainen E., 2007, *Phrasemes from a cultural semiotic perspective*, in: *Phraseologie. Phraseology. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, eds. H. Burger, D. Dobrovolskij, P. Kühn, N. R. Norrick, vol. I, Berlin–New York, pp. 208–219.
- Piirainen E., 2008, *Figurative phraseology and culture*, in: *Phraseology. An interdisciplinary perspective*, eds. S. Granger, F. Meunier, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 207–228.
- Spagińska-Pruszek A., 2003, *Intelekt we frazeologii polskiej, rosyjskiej i chorwackiej*, Gdańsk.
- Szerszunowicz J., 2006, *Pseudo-equivalents in English, Italian and Polish Faunal Phraseology*, in: *Proceedings XII EURALEX International Congress. Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale di Lessicografia, Torino 6–9 settembre 2006*, eds. E. Corino, C. Marelllo, C. Onesti, vol. II, Alessandria, pp. 1055–1060.
- Szerszunowicz J., 2008, *On Pseudo-Equivalents in English, Italian and Polish Onymic Phraseology*, in: *Valodu apguve: problemas un perspektiva. Zinatnisko rakstu krajums*, ed. Ā. Ptičkina, vol. VI, Liepāja, pp. 26–35.
- Szerszunowicz J., 2009, *Some remarks on the evaluative connotations of toponymic idioms in a contrastive perspective*, in: *Formulaic Language*, vol. I, *Distribution and historical change*, eds. R. Corrigan, E. A. Moravcsik, H. Ouali, K. M. Wheatley, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 171–183.

- Szerszunowicz J., 2010a, *Evaluation in Culture-Bound Proverbs and Proverbial Expressions as a Translation Problem*, in: 3^o Colóquio Interdisciplinar sobre Provérbios – ACTAS. 2nd Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Proverbs – PROCEEDINGS, eds. R. J. B. Soares, O. Lauhakangas, Tavira, pp. 222–234.
- Szerszunowicz J., 2010b, *Some remarks on cultural connotations of urbanonyms and idiomacity in a contrastive perspective*, "Acta Onomastica" LI, 2, pp. 547–555.
- Szerszunowicz J., 2011, *On selected source domains of onomastic phraseology in a cross-linguistic perspective*, in: *Linguo-Cultural Competence and Phraseological Motivation*, eds. A. Pamies, D. Dobrovol'skij, Baltmannsweiler, pp. 81–90.
- Teliya V., Bragina, N., Oparina, E., Sandomirskaya, I., 2001, *Phraseology as a Language of Culture: Its Role in the Representation of a Cultural Mentality*, in: *Phraseology. Theory, Analysis, and Applications*, ed. A. P. Cowie, Oxford, pp. 55–75.

**ON THE EVALUATIVE CONNOTATIONS OF ANTHROPONYMIC
IDIOMS IN A CONTRASTIVE PERSPECTIVE
(BASED ON ENGLISH AND ITALIAN)**

Summary

The paper is a presentation of part of research on evaluative connotations of onymic idioms in a contrastive perspective. In the present paper the evaluative connotations of English and Italian evaluative anthroponymic idioms are discussed with a special focus on their cross-linguistic equivalence. The research material consists of two corpora of English and Italian units excerpted from mono- and bilingual lexicographic works. The mechanisms of evaluation exploited in English and Italian phraseological units are discussed. The typology of equivalents, covering various types, such as full equivalents, partial equivalents, equivalents with re-created anthroponyms, non-phraseological equivalents, pseudo-equivalents, is presented and exemplified.

Key words: idiom, anthroponym, evaluative connotation, equivalent

**O KONOTACJACH WARTOŚCIUJĄCYCH IDIOMÓW
ANTROPONIMICZNYCH W PERSPEKTYWIE KONTRASTYWNEJ
(NA MATERIALE JĘZYKA ANGIELSKIEGO I WŁOSKIEGO)**

Streszczenie

Artykuł poświęcono omówieniu konotacji wartościujących idiomów z komponentem onimicznych w ujęciu kontrastywnym. Omówione zostały mechanizmy, które wykorzystywane są w angielskich i włoskich stałych połączeniach wyrazowych o charakterze idiomatycznym do wyrażania wartościowania. Materiał

badawczy tworzą dwa korpusy angielskich i włoskich jednostek frazeologicznych wyekscerpowanych z jedno- i dwujęzycznych opracowań leksykograficznych. Przeprowadzona analiza pozwoliła na opracowanie typologii międzyjęzykowych ekwiwalentów badanych związków. Tworzą ją takie rodzaje ekwiwalentów, jak: ekwiwalenty absolutne, ekwiwalenty częściowe, ekwiwalenty z odtworzonym antroponimem, ekwiwalenty niefrazologiczne i pseudoekwiwalenty.

Słowa kluczowe: idiom, antroponim, konotacja wartościująca, ekwiwalent