It is generally recognized that a linguocultural analysis makes it possible to identify equivalents in the phraseology of different languages, to indicate what is common and unique for the languages analyzed and to reveal various kinds of translation difficulties, in particular, the rendition of phraseological units with somatic components. As the previous research shows, this issue has not been well-examined in relation to the political discourse yet. Thereby, the present study makes a contribution to the field of phraseology as well as to the area of translation. The article is devoted to the comparative analysis of the Russian phraseologisms with the somatic elements which were employed by N. S. Khrushchev in his report “On the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences” at the closed session of the 20th Communist Congress on February 25, 1956, and the ways of their translation into English. The paper describes the connotations that arise, while interpreting the paremia images in the space of historical and cultural knowledge, identifies cultural layers in the semantics of the idioms, allowing to highlight the commonalities or differences of the meanings that are characteristic for the languages in question. The contrastive analysis of Russian and English somatic metaphors reveals similarities in the processes and ways of phrase formation of a number of idioms which enable translators to use appropriate equivalents. Of particular interest are the cases when there is a lexical substitution of the Russian somatism for a different English phrase-lexeme which, in turn, creates certain challenges when translating such idioms.
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SOMATIC METAPHORS OF NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV’S SECRET SPEECH IN TRANSLATION

Общепризнано, что лингвокультурологический анализ дает возможность определить культурно-языковые эквиваленты во фразеологии разных языков, обнаружить общее и уникальное для анализируемых языков и выявить различного рода трудности перевода, в частности, передачу фразеологических единиц с компонентами-соматизмами. Как показывают исследования, обозначенная проблема недостаточно полно изучена в политическом дискурсе, поэтому данная работа вносит вклад в область фразеологии и перевода. Статья посвящена сравнительному анализу русских фразеологизмов с компонентами-
соматизмами, которые Н. С. Хрущев использовал в докладе «О культуре личности и его последствиях» на закрытом заседании XX съезда КПСС 25 февраля 1956 года, и способах их перевода на английский язык. Описываются коннотации, возникающие в ходе интерпретации образа паремий в пространстве историко-культурного знания, выявляются глубоко залегающие культурные слои в семантике идиом, позволяющие говорить о сходстве или различии смыслов, характерных для рассматриваемых языков. Проведенный сопоставительный анализ русских и английских соматических метафор обнаруживает сходство в процессах и способах фразообразования ряда идиоматических выражений, что позволяет переводчикам использовать соответствующие эквиваленты. Особый интерес представляют случаи, когда происходит лексическая мена русского соматизма на иную английскую фразеологическую единицу, что, в свою очередь, создает определенные трудности при переводе таких идиом.
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Introduction

It is a common claim that a language shapes cognition. Different languages, having their unique thesaurus and grammar rules, form different views of reality in the speakers of these languages. According to Whorf, “we dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages” [Whorf, 1956, p. 213].

“Language reflects extra-linguistic reality with the use of various means” [Laskowski & Pachoiski, 2007, p. 490] and, certainly, by way of phraseological units. In this regard, somatic metaphors (i.e., phraseological items containing a body-part name in their structure) are of particular interest.

Being generally the same for everyone, the human body offers “a ready-made segmentation in its parts which leaves very little option for the language variation” [Čermák, 1998, p. 110]. As forming components of somatic metaphors, “the names of body parts are used together with most of their traditional functions and symbolism” [Čermák, 1998, p. 110]. Because of the separation of the body parts’ function from their symbolism, different variations in the latter field appear, thereby highlighting the subsequent types of all possible dissimilarities. The symbolic purpose of certain parts of the body, the connotations of somatisms in the composition of idioms are considered not to be random. “Their apparent arbitrariness is due to the semiotization of the body in different cultures, thus giving somatic units certain meanings” [Kovshova, 2019, p. 15]. The generalization of the meanings of statements allows us to draw conclu-
sions about “the prevailing understanding of the role of a particular body part in different languages” [Lazutkina, 2005, p. 107].

It is generally agreed that somatic idioms are aimed at revealing the features of the object, emphasizing negative or positive characteristics and expressing an evaluative attitude towards them. However, the point should be made that the translation of somatic metaphors can “pose the challenges of approaching [them] culturally, linguistically or even conceptually” (Adiel & Ahmed, 2016, p. 46). Thereby, it is essential to encode and decode the employed body-part metaphors properly and be particularly mindful of the conceptual peculiarities of the source and target domains [Lacoff & Johnson, 2003].

Historically, phraseological units have evolved in the language as the fragments of the meaning of the statement. They are regularly reproduced in speech as “communicative blanks” that correspond to the author’s intention and the given style of communication. Let us give a closer look at the official public interaction in the political discourse where quite a number of famous world leaders “use proverbial expressions to add emotional intensity to their messages, clearly showing that this colloquial language enables them to let their feelings show during extremely stressful times” [Mieder, 2005, p. 200].

There is a view that Nikita Khrushchev’s name “should be associated with the first crack in the totalitarian political regime” [Strelets, 2016, p. 75], and his “speech denouncing Stalin was the bravest and most reckless thing he ever did” [Taubmann, 2003, p. 274]. In his secret report at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) delivered on February 25, 1956, Khrushchev “addressed to nearly fifteen hundred communist leaders from fifty-six countries, condemned the crimes of Stalin and announced the beginning of the cleansing from his dictatorship” [Fursenko & Naftali, 2018, p. 95]. The Soviet leader was sure that “the question was presented in absolutely the right way and at the right time” [Memoirs, 2006, p. 212]. He “longed for fundamental changes, rebelling against the deformities inherited from Stalin” [Khrushchev, 2016, p. 506].

While working on his speech, Khrushchev was not satisfied with the draft prepared by Pospelov and Aristov and dictated his own text, “including passages marked by particular passion and anger” [Taubmann, 2003, p. 280]. It happened that “the manuscript did not even have time to be retyped, and Khrushchev took it (all handwritten with colored pencils) with him to the Kremlin Congress meeting” [Khrushchev, 2019, p. 79]. There is some evidence that the Soviet politician “spoke with ‘agitation and emotion,’ <…> his speech was peppered with explosive asides” [Taubmann,
2003, p. 273]. He distracted from the written text and improvised. For any reason, his speech was not shorthanded.

After the Congress, a week was spent working on the report, Khrushchev had already delivered. It was reviewed and “enriched” with some quotations from Marx and Lenin. On March 1, 1956, the text was ready, and it was supposed to be sent all over the country. Although the manuscript included the passages that the politician had uttered, distracting himself from his pre-written report, some of the extracts were crossed out. The text was translated into English. It was read by Allen Dulles’ brother, United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. He decided to make this secret speech public. On June 4, 1956, Nikita Khrushchev’s anti-Stalinist report “On Overcoming the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences” was published. As it appears, the secret speech and its translation contain a plethora of somatic metaphors that have not been investigated yet. Thus, the present study is aimed at dealing with it.

The paper provides a contrastive analysis of the Russian somatic metaphors used in Nikita Khrushchev’s secret speech with their English translations. The etymology and cultural connotations of the selected somatisms are examined as well. Special attention is given to the discussion of dissimilarities of the analyzed phraseological items in the languages in question.

The crosscultural analysis of the excerpted examples of rendering the Russian somatic metaphors into English shows that the main method of their interpreting is the selection of phraseological counterparts with a similar body-part component. A number of idiomatic expressions are translated by way of the analogues having a different somatic element. A few Russian phraseological units are rendered by English metaphors based on the images of the material world or are lacking in somatic metaphorical imagery.

Methods and Materials

The current work is focused on the somatic metaphors employed by Nikita Khrushchev in his secret speech at the 20th Communist Congress on February 25, 1956 [Khrushchev, 1989] and their renditions into English [Khrushchev, 1970]. It is widely recognized that the examination of the parallel corpus, i.e., “a corpus that contains source texts and their translations” (McEnery & Xiao, 2007, p. 20), “can give new insights into the languages compared — insights that are not likely to be noticed in studies of monolingual corpora” [McEnery & Xiao, 2007, p. 18]. Such observations can be used in comparative research as well as in practice, for instance, in language teaching and translation.
In our study, we compiled a parallel corpus of Russian and English texts. After searching the source extracts and their renditions for the target somatic metaphors, the contextual passages with the body-part constituent elements were analyzed. The cognitive and linguistic manifestations of the selected idioms were scrutinized, thus identifying the commonalities and differences that can cause certain translation challenges for the languages in question.

Results and Discussion

In our analysis, the individual body parts are presented in an order according to the number of excerpted phrases. The human body has been divided into two groups: external and internal body parts within which we have distributed the individual parts of the body. In the divisions of the body parts, we have placed only those somatic key elements which we have singled out in the material chosen for the analysis.

The group “external body parts” comprises of an upper extremity (hand, little finger and shoulder), a head (head, eye and face), skin covering (skin and sore), a lower extremity (leg and foot), and a trunk (back). Table 1 gives us a best representation of the number of extracted somatic items included in this group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upper Extremity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hand</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little finger</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Head:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Skin Covering:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lower Extremity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trunk:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Body Parts

“It is certainly noticeable that the proverbial expressions with the ‘arm/hand’ constituent were used with high frequency in Khrushchev’s speeches” [Carter, 2015, p. 348]. In his secret report, the component hand was utilized as a symbol of labor and the characterization of human activity. By means of this body part, the human characteristics were expressed and valued as well. The majority of the phraseological items bore a negative evaluation.

“Двурушник” (lit. “two-armed man”) is the name of a person who hides his/her true face and weaves intrigues behind the backs of others. This noun comes from the adjective two-handed that is, made for two hands. It is assumed that the word penetrated into the Russian literary language from the lower stratum of the society. This is how pre-revolutionary professional beggars called their dishonest fellows who hid behind other beggars at church porches, putting not one but two begging hands between their elbows, managing to get a dole in each of them. The modern meaning of the word appeared in the twentieth century. It became quite different but also disapproving, contemptuous: a double-handed man is a person who serves two hostile forces, i.e., “a double-dealer” [Macura, 1999, p. 610].

A strong case could certainly be made that the “two-handed” metaphor has to originate in Russia, thus falling under the category of the so-called “language-specific idioms”. This may be the reason why it has been translated metaphorically but with a different English body-part image (”two-faced [Janus]”) from the ancient Roman mythology [Antonova, 2018]. The idiom definitely has a negative connotation in all the passages below:

Как же можно поверить, чтобы такие люди в период после политического разгрома зиновьевцев, троцкистов и правых, после великих побед социалистического строительства оказались “двурушниками” …? [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 137].

How then can we believe that such people could prove to be “two-faced” … during the era after the political liquidation Zinovievites, Trotskyites and rightist and after the great accomplishments of socialist construction? [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 573].

«…» в выступлениях ряда членов ЦК по существу высказывались сомнения в правильности намечавшегося курса на массовые репрессии под предлогом борьбы с “двурушниками” [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 139].

«…» many members actually questioned the rightness of the established course regarding mass repressions under the pretext of combating “two-facedness” [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 577].

Everywhere and in everything he saw “enemies,” “two-facers,” and “spies” [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 585].

The pattern “body parts and their specifics” names the parts of the body and their distinctive features. “It is about reflection of what certain words embody most intensively and most naturally for us” [Delova-Siljanova, 2021, p. 56]. For instance, hands are “responsible” for holding something. As for the metaphor в руках (in hands), it indicates a man’s power as well as his/her “high position in the society” [Lomakina, 2006, p. 432]. As can be seen from the following illustrations, there is a full equivalent of this Russian idiom in the English language:

«…» не все еще представляют себе, к чему на практике приводит культ личности, какой огромный ущерб был причинен «…» сосредоточением необъятной, неограниченной власти в руках одного лица «…» [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 150].

«…» not all as yet realize fully the practical consequences resulting from the cult of the individual, the great harm caused by «…» the accumulation of immense and limitless power in the hands of one person «…» [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 560].

“Тов. Сталин, сделавшись генсеком, сосредоточил в своих руках необъятную власть «…»” [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 130].

“After taking over the position of Secretary General Comrade Stalin accumulated in his hands immeasurable power «…»” [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 562].

The proverbial saying дело рук (lit. “the business of one’s hands”) is applied to a person who is “in charge of any activity” [Mokienko, Nikitina, 2008, p. 181]. The Russian somatism “disappears” in the English translation, being replaced by an expression lacking in metaphorical imagery:

Нет, было бы наивным считать это делом рук только Ежова [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 144].

No, it would be a display of naiveté to consider that the work of Yezhov alone [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 584].

It is assumed that “the gesture is capable of expressing the full range of meanings that arises from the speaker” [McNeil, 1992, p. 105]. The phrase шевелить мизинцем (lit. stir a little finger) may be labeled as expressing aggressive meaning, implying a threat to someone else. In the languages compared, the somatism мизинец (little finger) is attested in a number of “gestural” idioms.
“Вот шевельну мизинцем — и не будет Тито” [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 154].
“I will shake my little finger — and there will be no more Tito” [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 600].
Дорого нам обошлось это “шевеление мизинцем” [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 154].
We have dearly paid for this “shaking of the little finger” [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 600]. Сколько не шевелил Сталин не только мизинцем, но и всем, Тито не слетел [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 154].
No matter how much or how little Stalin shook, not only his little finger but everything else that he could shake, Tito did not fall [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 600].

The phraseological unit выносить на своих плечах (lit. carry on one’s shoulders) means “to cope with any kind of work or difficulties without anybody’s help” [Mokienko & Nikitina, 2008, p. 505]. As can be seen from the passages below, one and the same metaphor has been translated differently, though transferring the speaker’s positive attitude. The first two English extracts have the idioms with a similar somatic image (shoulder). The third one contains a phraseological unit with a different somaticism (back). In the last case, the body-part element has not been rendered into English.

‹…› до тех пор, пока нашему генералитету, который выносил на своих плечах всю тяжесть ведения войны, не удалось изменить положение дел ‹…› [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 150].
‹…› until our generals, on which shoulders rested the whole weight of conducting the war, succeeded in changing the situation ‹…› [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 594].

Спрашивается, а где же наши военные, которые на своих плечах вынесли всю тяжесть войны? [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 151].
The question arises: And where are the military on whose shoulders rested the burden of the war? [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 595].

Величайший подвиг совершили в войне наши советские женщины, которые вынесли на своих плечах огромную тяжесть производственной работы ‹…› [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 151].

Great and brave deeds during the war were accomplished by our Soviet women who bore on their backs the heavy load of production work ‹…› [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 595].

‹…› сложилась практика массовых репрессий по государственной линии ‹…› против тех кадров партии, которые вынесли на своих плечах гражданскую войну ‹…› [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 132].

‹…› the practice of mass repression through the government apparatus was born ‹…› against those Party cadres who had borne the heavy load of the Civil war ‹…› [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 565].
The second division within our analysis is the *head*, including such body-part components as *head*, *eye* and *face*. We shall start with the somatic expressions containing a *head* element.

“The conceptualization ‘human body=human being/human body=human life’ indicates the human body parts, which occur as representative that symbolizes either the whole body or the human being as a personality” [Delova-Siljanova, 2021, p. 56]. As the concept of *head* in this meaning is shared by the languages compared, there are full equivalents that help recipients easily “visualize” the metaphorical image of the proverbial phrases сохранить голову (save a head) and снять голову (take off a head/shorten one by a head):

“Выдержишь — сохранишь кочан (голову) …” [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 143].

“If you manage to endure it, you will *save your head* …” [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 583].

Если не добьетесь признания врачей, то с вас будет *снята голова* [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 155].

*If you do not obtain confessions from the doctors, we will *shorten you by a head* [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 601].

In the language picture, the *head* is often presented as a receptacle of unexpected and uncontrollable processes. The metaphor приходить в голову (lit. occur to one’s head) is an apt illustration of it. It seems to be a dubious case from a translation point of view due to the existence of the complimentary English terms (head/mind/brain) for the Russian somatism голова used in this meaning:

Трудно даже себе представить, как могли прийти в голову подобные предположения [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 153].

*It is impossible to imagine how such assumptions could enter anyone’s mind* [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 599].

The idiom во главе (at the head) designates a person’s leading position in any structures (economical, political, etc.). This phrase is common for both domains, and it does not cause difficulties for translation:

Как же так, ведь Сталин *стоял во главе партии и страны 30 лет* …? [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 161].

*How could it be? Stalin headed the Party and the country for 30 years* …[Khrushchev, 1970, p. 612].

The following case is the only one when because of the translator’s interpretation of the context, an English analogue with a *head* component has been chosen. Although the Russian idiom has been “enriched” with a
somatic constituent, the positive overtone has been appropriately transferred into the target domain:

Бессмертны заслуги советских воинов, наших военных командиров и политработников всех степеней, которые в первые же месяцы войны, лишившись значительной части армии, не растерялись (…) [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 151].

Immortal are the services of the Soviet soldiers, of our commanders and political workers of all ranks; after the loss of a considerable part of the army in the first war months they did not lose their heads (…) [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 596].

The ability to perceive reality in different ways is revealed by the Soviet leader with the help of the phraseological units with the somatism eye. These somatic idioms are further presented for a thorough examination.

“The location and functions of the eye in a human organism result from its biological and cognitive features” [Laskowski & Pachoiski, 2007, p. 492], viz. being an organ of vision (a sense organ). The semantic explanation of the lexeme eye in the phrase в его глазах (in his eyes) is similar for both languages compared (meaning an indicator of vicinity) and does not impede recipients’ comprehension:

Многие работники становились в его глазах врагами [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 144].

Many workers were becoming enemies before his very eyes [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 597].

(…) все видят, как буквально на глазах растет активность, развивается творческая инициатива широких масс трудящихся (…) [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 162].

Everyone saw how activity grew before their very eyes, how the creative activity of the broad working masses developed (…) [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 613].

Eyes are often called a man’s “window” to the world and the main tool of the perception of the environment. In the Russian tradition, eyes have a high status because the representations of life are associated with light (visibility), and the world of the dead implies darkness (invisibility). The contact between these spheres can be carried out precisely through the eyes. Hence, there is the ambivalent attitude to the eyes as a source of life as well as disease, spoilage or death in Russian culture (Savchenko, 2010). We can observe it in the somatic metaphor смотреть смерти в глаза (lit. look in the eyes of the death) that is addressed to people who are “in real danger” (Mokienko & Nikitina, 2008, p. 624). Even though the Eng-
lish analogue is lack of a vision somatic constituent, the image is vivid and can be comprehended properly:

«…» они храбро дрались с врагами, не раз смотрели в глаза смерти и не дрогнули [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 137].

«…» they fought their enemies valiantly, and often nervelessly **looked into the face of death** [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 573].

A range of different emotions and attitudes can be expressed by way of somatic metaphors. The Russian idioms **глаза бегают** (one has restless eyes) and **не смотреть прямо в глаза** (not to look straight in one’s eyes) clearly indicate a man’s nervous state and the fear of being punished:

«…» “что-то у вас сегодня глаза бегают”, или “почему вы сегодня часто отворачиваетесь, не смотрите прямо в глаза” [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 144].

«…» “Why are your eyes so shifty today,” or “Why are you turning so much today and avoiding to **look me directly in the eyes**?” [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 585].

The metaphor **из кожи лезть вон** (lit. “get out of the skin”) is considered to be of East Slavic origin. The proverbial phrase is usually employed to criticize someone for making great efforts to reach any goals. The somatic metaphor is associated with “mythical ideas about werewolves who can shed their human skins and turn into animals” (Birikh, 2005, p. 310). This idea from ancient times is also applied to angry people whose souls seem to be torn from their bodies. Due to the absence of the applicable English somatism, the translator has opted the analogue lacking in body-part metaphorical imagery:

A банда Берии, хозяйничавшая в органах госбезопасности, из кожи лезла вон «…» [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 144].

Meanwhile, Beria’s gang, which ran the organs of state security, **outdid itself** «…» [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 585].

The Russian proverbial expression **не обнажать язв** (lit. not to show one’s sores) means “not to reveal one’s weaknesses”. As can be seen, in the translation, it is replaced with a different English metaphor “wash one’s dirty linen in public” [Kunin, 1999, p. 483] that is slightly modified by way of the body-part image substitution:

«…» **не обнажать перед ними наших язв** [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 165].

«…» *we should not give ammunition to the enemy; we should not wash our dirty linen before their eyes* [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 617].
Legs are the support of the human body which can help a person to move in space. In the phraseological fund of the secret speech, Nikita Khrushchev employs one idiom with the somatism нога (lit. leg) to convey the physical state of a person “who is close to death” [Mokienko & Nikitina, 2008, p. 442]. Although the existence of the complimentary English terms (leg/foot) for the Russian somatic lexeme нога (lit. leg) may complicate the process of translation, the tragedy of the situation, being reflected on the body, could certainly be felt by English-speaking recipients:

«… нахождясь обеими ногами в могиле, я Вам тоже не вру [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 141].
«… finding my two feet in the grave, I am also not lying [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 579].

The last area of our division of the human body is the group “internal body parts”, compiling of the blood system (blood and heart) and the nervous system (brain/mind). It is presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blood System:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nervous System:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mind/brain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Body Parts**

The field of blood system is notable through the presence of such components as blood and heart in a number of extracted examples. They are definitely worthy of being scrutinized.

Blood is a universal symbol which is endowed with a cult status. In many cultures, blood is understood as a receptacle of life force and as a non-material beginning. In the phraseological picture of the world of the Russian and English languages, blood is a symbol of life. However, the lexeme кровь (blood) can be used metonymically to denote bloodshed and murder. Blood is closely connected with the basic archetypal opposi-
tion “life — death”: the deprivation of blood is tantamount to the deprivation of life.

In the situations analized, the Russian expressions with a blood element are utilized as a means of counting casualties, having a negative tone (high price for one’s incorrect decisions), in the first case, and a positive evaluation (insignificant cost for the victory), in the second event. Doubts exist regarding the adequacy of rendering the latter idiom due to the loss of the somatic component in the English variant:

Большой крови стоила нам и та тактика, на которой настаивал Сталин, не зная природы ведения боевых операций … [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 150].

The tactics on which Stalin insisted without knowing the essence of the conduct of battle operations cost us much blood … [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 594].

‹…› мы войну будем вести на территории противника и выиграем ее малой кровью [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 146].

‹…› we will battle the enemy on his soil and we will win without much harm to ourselves [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 587].

The Russian phraseological units with soul and heart components gain notice for being quite a challenge for translation into English because of the difference in the conceptual pictures of the somatic constituents of the languages in question [Wierzbicka, 1989]. The essence of the Russian man’ character is largely determined by Orthodox religion, as the desire for moral perfection and sacrifice is the fundamental dominant of Orthodox culture. The concept soul in phraseological expressions of the source domain often reflects a person’s positive feelings and emotions. “It is characterized by a special expressiveness” [Marinina, 2017, p. 134]. The linguocultural concept soul in the phraseological system of the target domain acts as an organ that is “responsible” for a man’s inner (spiritual) life. It can also act as a cultural phenomenon and an existentially marked mental structure associated with religious ethics. It has frequently been claimed that translators apply the idioms with the somatism heart to render Russian paremias, containing the lexeme soul, in cases when human qualities and states are described to exclude any association with the religious context [Ostanina-Olszewska & Despot, 2017]. The instance below supports this observation:

‹…› никогда у меня не было ни тени подлости на душе [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 141].

‹…› my heart is clean of even the shadow of haseness [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 586].
The nervous system is known to be presented through the brain and nerves. In this area, only one example of the Russian paremia with a constituent ум (lit. mind) has been found in our material. By appealing to this body part, the speaker underscores the value of making sober decisions, thus indicating its importance. For any reason, this somatic metaphor has not been transferred into English:

Но делать это надо с умом, без торопливости [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 164].

But this should be done calmly and slowly [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 616].

The last case is worth paying special attention to. We can observe the image metaphors in the original as well as in the translation. Even though it looks like the expression с куриным кругозором (lit. with a hen’s outlook) sounds more offensive due to the choice of the name of a certain bird species (in Russian culture, a hen is not considered an intelligent bird), the English somatic variant with a generalized avian lexeme represents a derogatory characterization as well.

Это — никчемный человек, с куриным кругозором ‹….› [Khrushchev, 1989, p. 145].

He is a vile person, with the brain of a bird ‹….› [Khrushchev, 1970, p. 586].

Conclusion

Thus, the research has brought to light how somatic metaphors were utilized by the Russian politician in his public report and the ways of their rendition into English. As the study has shown, the Russian and English phraseological world pictures reflect universality by revealing a similarity in the understanding of the role of particular body parts (e. g., a head, a shoulder). At the same time, they display the peculiarities of different peoples’ world perception (for example, in relation to the somatism skin), conditioned, on the one hand, by extralinguistic factors such as specific features of the historical development of each nation, the uniqueness of material as well as folk spiritual culture (myths, beliefs, customs, national psychology, etc.), and, on the other hand, by peculiarities of the Russian and English languages which categorize the same objective reality differently.

The comparative analysis of the extracted examples of Khrushchev’s secret report in languages compared reveals that the main method of interpreting somatic proverbial sayings is the selection of relative equiva-
lents with a similar body-part component (e. g., a head, a shoulder). A number of idioms are translated by way of phraseological analogues with a different somatic element (e. g., two-handed). A few paremias are rendered by English metaphors based on the images of the material world or by idioms lacking in imagery (e. g., sore, skin).

Obviously, the transfer of the original somatic metaphors by means of the English counterparts with different metaphorical images leads to the loss of the national identity of the phraseological units, though the semantic, stylistic and functional adequacy may remain. It clearly demonstrates the challenges of rendering body-part proverbial units from one language and culture to another. Thereby, such translation concerns in the field of phraseology demand more research in the future.
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