

UDC 811.112.2'373.7
doi: 10.15330/jpnu.2.2-3.9-21

Section:

GENERAL THEORETICAL ISSUES OF MODERN LINGUISTICS

NATIONAL STATE VARIATION OF GERMAN PHRASEOLOGY. ANTHROPOCENTRIC, COGNITIVE AND CORPUS-BASED APPROACHE

O.Y. OSTAPOVYCH

Abstract. The article deals with the elaboration of the modern theoretical concept in study of the variation of German phraseology abroad Germany. It is based on the synthesis of the theory of equal-righted pluricentrism and the hypothesis of double linguistic additivity with the new achievements of the cognitive linguistics. As a result the notions of the "non-predominant national state linguistic variant" different from the regional, normatively non-codified and dialectal variation, cluster variant idiomatic thesaurus, national communicative area in the sphere of phraseology have been introduced. The empirical reality of the categories of "national phraseological system/microsystem", "pluricentric archisystem", "correlation hierarchy", "phraseological world picture", "phraseological concept" has also been falsified.

Keywords: language pluricentricity, double linguistic additivity, cognitive linguistics, non-predominant national state linguistic variant, cluster variant idiomatic thesaurus, national communicative area, phraseological system, "pluricentric archisystem", "correlation hierarchy", "phraseological world picture", "phraseological concept".

1. INTRODUCTION

Explanatory and anthropocentric foundations of the contemporary cognitive-oriented linguistics, specifically – of linguoculturology involves not only and not as much a reflection by the linguistic units of specific national realities (which is characteristic for the "pure" linguistic country studies that refers to a respectable literary tradition of the last three decades) [20, 24, 51], but furthermore the interaction of language (mainly its semantic, content side) with mental concepts, cultural stereotypes, the world view of the people-bearers as a whole. German language on the territory of Germany, Austria, Switzerland and other German-speaking countries is not only just "not identical to itself" in a purely diatopic, dialectal-variant sense, but also reflects the different realities, that is an expression of different mentalities and ideologies, and also reveals significant differences in the pragmatic use. To consider variants of German language outside Germany as dialect deviations from the supposedly existing natural common German standard norm, that should also be eliminated, is an entirely false, though quite commonly spread approach by now [27]. More scientifically proved is a concept of pluricentrism and national cultural non-homogeneousness of German and several other European languages, offered

by our linguistics in the 70's [12, 44] and established later in the West [1, 2, 9, 25, 26, 53]. However, this fact has not found the appropriate feedback in the publications of Germanic linguists especially in the field of lexical semantics and phraseology. National variants of the German language have been studied over the past half a century from the almost entirely inventory-distributive, structural and semantic point or even from the usual divergent approach, limited to fixing the differences and their stating description. This state of research can not meet modern requirements of an anthropocentric, culture-bearer, cognitive approach to linguistic problems. So far, the structural differences between the variants of the German language in phonetics, orthography, morphology, syntax, word-building, lexical stock are relatively satisfactorily described. However, the lack of answers to the question - how, why, to what extent and when, with what kind of illocutionary intentions the native variant speakers should make use of the national language variant, i.e. of this particularly different linguistic stock and when they choose standard German correlates, what cultural realities, artifacts, stereotypes, connotations and presupposition are activated then and how it affects the communicative process opens a new perspective of the further research.

Except fundamental, however fragmentary works of Western scholars U. Ammon, M. Clyne, P. Wiesinger, J. Ebner, R. Muhr, H. Burger, Ch. Foldes [4-8, 13-19] and the national school of A.I. Domashnev [12], nowadays there is no comprehensive fundamental research of the phraseology of German outside Germany, its national and cultural specificity, and most importantly - communicative and pragmatic relevance. In Soviet linguistic tradition the theses of V.T. Malygin, V.T. Sulym and O. Ostapovych, individual items of L.I. Kokanina and G.I. Turkovskaya [21-23, 28-43, 46-49] were devoted to this issue. However, they are made in the inventory-distributive, structural and semantic sense and their empirical results still need, according to our data, a significant refinement. In addition, none of the works is devoted to the phraseology of all non-dominant variants of German. The principal theoretical novelty of proposed combination of linguistic and cultural analysis of the semantics of idioms with the theory of national linguistic variation is, in our opinion, the following.

We try to verify not only the author's hypothesis of double linguistic additivity in relations between language variant and culture, worldview and thinking of its bearers as the development of hypotheses of G.A. Brutyan [3], but to claim for its identity with the "soft" version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, recognized in the West [45, 52].

We offer a sociolinguistic concept of not a national but national-state variant of the standard language for its separation from the regional linguistic variations – both, dialects and language variants without any regulatory or codified legal and official status. In order to describe variations of German outside Germany we introduced a pluricentrically correct concept of "non-dominant national-state variant of the standard language."

In determining the role and status of phraseology in non-dominant nation-state variants of the modern German language, from the standpoint of the theory of information field we qualify idioms as belonging to the lexical level and the lexical system, and variant phraseology - to lexical micro systems. We do not share an idea of a pluricentric language as a "system of systems" and "correlation hierarchy" [12], which is quite common in the scientific literature.

Linguistic facts, introduced into scientific circulation, we checked not only by lexicographic sample analysis of fragmentary textual sources and representative statistical surveys of informants, but also by the computer corpora search and quantitative analysis of the results. This allows to claim for the scientific validity of the results.

The lexicographical corpus, formed in that way, will have not only theoretical but entirely practical, applied value in learning foreign languages.

Taking into consideration linguistic situations, language world view and national identity of German-speaking nations we can state that, in today's globalized world the Herder's, positivist formula of "one language - one nation" practically does not work. Today, scientists have almost no doubt of a non-homogeneousness of the national German language, its national-state variation in Germany, Austria and German-speaking Switzerland, Luxemburg, Liechtenstein, Eastern Belgium, South Tyrol at all levels of the language system. According to our premise, we support the pluricentric concept of

standard German language and introduced the category of the non-dominant national-state variant. We understand the Austrian, Swiss German, German in Luxembourg and Liechtenstein German as the codified standard national norm, within the equally-righted system of "full centers" of normalization (Vollzentren, in the terminology of U. Ammon [2]), in contrast to both: the areal-diatopic regional-dialectal variant stratification (which lies outside the object of our study) and regional "half-centers" (Halbzentren) in Eastern Belgium and South Tyrol as well.

Equal pluricentric language standards do not provide any "correlation hierarchy" or "system of systems", as often claimed. German standard literary language outside of Germany are not some regional, deviant, non-normative inclusions and not purely national, but non-dominant national and state variants. The main criterion of their status is not the normative codification (the concept of norm and standard in these variants becomes elastic), not cumulative, but cognitive-reference one - the factor of social prestige.

Linguistic situations in German-speaking countries except Germany are endogenous and exogenous, mono- and polylingual, with differences quantitatively most important in Switzerland and marginalized in the former East Germany (where there was no formation of a separate language variant [33, 35]). Incomplete functional paradigm of standard German in Switzerland confirms a non-dominant nature of the language variant.

All these facts clearly illustrate the axiomatic obvious fact - linguistic boundaries almost never coincide with the state ones. They are manifestations of not only national-state but also a territorial, regional-dialectal variation of language and speech. The factors of the creation and preservation of national identity are precisely those linguistic features which are nationally valid, codified national norms, perceived as alien and even incomprehensible beyond the borders of the country [36].

Double linguistic additivity in the national language world pictures of variants of German correlates with the "soft" version of the linguistic relativism Sapir-Whorf-hypothesis. National and state variations confirm the "double refraction" of reality through the prism of common German language and its variant as well, fractal semiotics and trilateral nature of linguistic signs - "denoting - denoted - sign-maker".

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

2.1. THE CULTURAL SPECIFICITY OF GERMAN PHRASEOLOGY OUTSIDE GERMANY

The priority of a pre-scientific, naive, peculiarly linguistic picture of the world in the psychic reality of speakers - bearers of the language variants, which means the "soft" relativism is confirmed by national characteristics of idiomaticity as a linguocognitive universal - structural irregularity, pragmatic restrictions, folk etymological semantic shifts and derivatives, nationally specific unique components - archisemantica, including dialectisms, borrowings, onymic realia, occasionalisms, not just archaisms, "quotational memory" and eponymic, paremiological minima, interviant "false friends of the interpreter" ethno-cultural stereotypes in the semantic structure of idioms, word-play linguistic mechanisms, above all, literal reading of idioms.

According to our hypothesis, idiomaticity is interpreted as a cognitive universal, based on the mental mechanisms for the creation of linguistic units, reception and interpretation of extra-linguistic knowledge, linguistic categorization of a naive, pre-conceptual world view.

The four-components structure of idiomaticity, according to our hypothesis, has no character of a vertical hierarchy or horizontal level taxonometry. Numerous zones of intersection of its components cause rather a radial cluster structure as the cognitive reality of the thesaurus [37].

Idiomaticity is not related to linguistic and conceptual invariant zone, it is a part of the "naive" world view, a partial manifestation of irregularities in the language system and the complexity of the link to the denotate (even by more simple syntactical structure, contrary to the "principle of iconicity"), in contrast to the traditional point of view, it is a hyperonym related to other components - re-

interpretation, opacity, and pragmatic restrictions with the absence of clear boundaries between the components of the idiomaticity and the presence of between-zones of intersection.

According to our vision of national-cultural specificity of semantics in variant idioms, it has a field, radial prototypical structure. Its "nuclear cluster", a kind of "good samples" are idioms with direct denotative-significative correlation with specific realities - non-equivalent or onymic mono-lexeme and true-situational, framing ones as well. It means, this is the national cultural component of semantics at all three hierarchical levels of the "linguistic country studies-based triad" of E.M. Vereshchagin, V.G. Kostomarov, V.I. Mokienko and D.G. Maltseva [20] (lexeme component marker - a literal reading of the genetic prototype - total idiomatic significate). Peripheral "bad samples", which, however, substantially prevail in number, are idioms with complex background cultural connotation. The set of world-viewing mental structures they are correlated with, may, by a thorough and quantitatively valid check of the contemporary usage of idioms, identify certain culturally specific features.

However, it is clear that this specificity is more implicit, and most importantly - quantitatively less relevant as the common human invariant linguistic and world-viewing features, at least for linguoculturally related areas of Jewish-Christian origin. By this idiomatic fund we also refer to the winged expressions with an unshadowed association with the source of origin, idioms with monocultural lexeme components - symbols par excellence (color, animal, digital etc). Their specificity is identifying, that is, from the viewpoint of native speakers these phraseologisms are unimaginable in language usage of foreigners, even of those who have a strong command of a foreign language and even of Non-Austrians and Non-Swiss [40].

The foreign lexical components (mainly Slavic, Hungarian and Roman) and integral non-assimilated idiomatic borrowings (Latin and French) is an integral feature of the German variant phraseology. Above their cumulative function (fixation of unique linguistic and cultural contacts) the signal identifying one by zero usage outside the area clearly dominates.

2.2. CRITERIA OF CHOICE AND STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EMPIRICAL CORPUS

The subject of our investigation was the typological structure of the corpus of empirical linguistic material – the Austrian and Swiss idiomatic fund.

Our research methodology included the consistent implementation of several stages [30, 43].

1. Primary lexicographic selection.
2. Primary structural and typological classification of the obtained "macrocorpus."
3. Primary corpus analysis of printed texts.
4. Primary diatopic classification.
5. The experimental phase was divided into two components
 - 5.1. "Screening" of questionable occasional-archaic "one-day butterflies".
 - 5.2. Diatopic-areal attribution.

In the course of our study we found out the idioms that have not passed the verification of their status: occasionalisms, "pure" dialectisms, archaisms, individual authors' new creations.

Half of these phrases are on the "status crossroads", i.e. the selected taxa are combined into clusters "occasionalism-dialectism", "occasionalism-archaism", "archaism-dialectism", "occasionalism-dialectism archaism". They are a kind of "bad samples" for their categories. Individual authors' new creations have the clear character of "one-day butterflies" par excellence, are more literary or idiolect images, rather than elements of the language. Only two word combinations of them are occasionally used archaisms. Occasional phrases, despite to lexicographic information are used in the common German sense, which is confirmed by informants and the results of the corpus search. Dialect and occasional expressions, according to informants and corpora, are occasionally used in parallel to their common German counterparts, with the obvious quantitative preferences in favor of the latter. So, they obviously can not stand the communicative competition and can not claim the language system status of Austriacisms or Helvetisms, which is evidenced by their absence in the dictionary of U. Ammon.

Drawing a clear boundary between dialectal and common German proverbs in Switzerland in general terms seems almost impossible due to the wide Allemanic dialectal diversity. The study of

Swiss paremiological fund by means of sociolinguistic experimentation is characterized by specific difficulties, which are fundamentally different from similar studies on the language of Germany and Austria.

Our hypothesis that the Swiss proverbs are known by the vast majority of informants exactly in dialectal, not standard-literary form, was fully confirmed by the results of the survey. Furthermore, a significant percentage of archaisms among analyzed proverbs was predicted, especially those containing a single-component divergent lexeme-Helvetism. They do not maintain the communicative competition with the common German proverbs, especially with those of the paremiological minimum (but only in the literary version (!), dialect forms retain an absolutely Allemanic version). Sayings that passed the "primary verification of status", are fixed in corpora in the standard-literary and in lexicographical sources - in the literary and dialectal versions [32].

With respect to system characteristics of the variant phraseology, especially communicatively relevant are the inter-variant "false friends of the interpreter," and the least studied aspects of enantiosemaic phraseology is the inter-variant, intralingual homonymy. A number of phraseologisms implement different meanings in different national and state variants of German. However, their purely lexicographical semantization, according to available sources required verification by interviewing informants and analysis of the wide text corpora. The results of this empirical verification show that phraseological units found in Switzerland are increasingly used in common German sense or are poly-semantic, reveal all meanings listed in dictionaries in different contexts, with a predominance of those that are qualified in dictionaries as Austrian ones. These semantic divergents within one language, according to our hypothesis, with non-equivalent Austriacisms and Helvetisms, "national variant archisemantica", make up in the mental lexicon of Austrians and Swiss a "nuclear cluster" as a kind of "prototype good samples", are the key signal components of national cultural linguistic self-identification [31].

Generally confirmed is the initial hypothesis of structural and typological non-specificity of variant phraseology in relation to the standard literary language of Germany, but with some reservations. However, empirically disproved is the hypothesis of G. Turkovskaya about the quantitative dominance of the structural model Adj + Sub in the Austrian variant, allegedly under the influence of the Slavic languages [50]. Prevalence in Austrian and Swiss phraseological fund of phraseological combinations sensu I.I. Chernysheva or referential (not propositional or structural) phraseology according to H. Burger is, in our opinion, caused on the one hand, by specific thematic areas of variant phraseology (political life, official paperwork, national holidays, national cuisine), and on the other – by its decompositional component specificity (variant idiomatic doublets with divergent lexemes).

2.3. COGNITIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF GERMAN VARIANT PHRASEOLOGY

From the cognitive point of view, the Austrian and Swiss phraseology supports even more than common German the conclusion that in the mental lexicon idioms have no thematic-ideographic, also not hierarchical-gradual, but concentric, radial, "taxa-cluster" structure. Thus on the "basic conceptual level" (the term of D.O. Dobrovolsky [10, 11]), which is confirmed by informants, variant Helvetisms / Austriacisms are closely interrelated and compete with common German and own dialect phraseology without clear boundaries and preferences. No direct correlations: Austriacisms or Helvetisms / Teutonism or dialectism – "good / bad sample" were found. Thus, idioms-Austriacisms / Helvetisms – "good samples" can be considered as those phraseological units which reveal a set of categorical attributes - lexicographical, functional, pragmatic, textual, areal, intersubjective, temporal ones, while the "bad samples" may have a peripheral position and become potential candidates for the Austrian and Swiss common German idiomatic fund.

After analyzing a variety of combinations of areal clusters and the frequency of their use, we came to the conclusion that two groups of phraseology are the most commonly used. The first group consists of the phraseological units, used in Germany and Austria, and the second – of those used in Germany and Switzerland. In general, the part of each group is approximately 20%. Cluster organization of the idiomatic thesaurus is a rather new, but established heuristic of cognitive linguistics. In a nationally

varying phraseology cross-clusters illustrate the axiomatic fact that national borders can not coincide with the linguistic area per definitionem. Areal, diatopic differentiation of language is the more complex matrix compared to the linguistic and political, national and state ones. That quantitatively proved fact that "pure" Austriacisms / Helvetisms "par excellence" are although five times more numerous than the analog-synonymous doublets, but almost as large in number as the cross-cluster ones, caused a serious doubt on traditional notions of center and periphery. The "Swiss-German" and "Austrian-German" clusters actually dominate, but unexpectedly in the "pure" form (sic!), without any regional "fixation" for use in the South-East or South-West of Germany. The factor of national and state variation, national communicative space and pluricentric normative codification in the modern information age is stronger than the classic "Bavarian-Austrian" or "Baden-Schwabian" and Allemanic dialect area. Lexicographical data confirmed a weak correlation of Austrian and Swiss variant phraseology with the Central and East German, Austrian - with the North German and West Austrian - with the West German, for the obvious geographical reasons. The lack of discrete boundaries in areal distributing of German idioms, despite the obvious presence of "pure" Austriacisms and Helvetisms "par excellence", which make up 27% of our empirical corpus, is a proved objective fact. Diffusivity of dialect boundaries and their obvious difference from the state borders quite logically leads to the clusters, in the so-called "contact zones". However, they are not always geographically obvious, at least areal factors are not accounted for the "interstate" clusters and also - for the correlation between the Austrian and Swiss phraseology of the North [39].

Almost every eighth idiom of our lexicographic sample is a terminological word-combination, indicating that the German phraseology in its variants is of partly terminological nature. These quasi-terms contain in their meaning informations of national cultural and historical character. They are a kind of phraseorealia - the single linguistic nomination of certain specific items and life events of nations-bearers of German language and its variants. Most phraseologisms of our lexicographic sample verbalize the concept of human, which consists of subconcepts: food, appearance and character of a person, the emotional and physical well-being, insanity, alcoholic intoxication, fight. Some less phraseologisms are related to concepts WORLD (with subconcepts WORK, Celebration) and the Relationship between the world and human (with subconcepts LOVE, time, money). Figuratively semantic features of the variant phraseology cover all important for human life topical subconcepts, consisting of the triad of Human-WORLD-Relations between them. System of concepts verbalized by elements of the latter group of phraseology is an accumulation of the world-view, related, as exemplified by variant phraseology, to material, social or spiritual culture of nations-bearers of these variants, so they may indicate its cultural and national experience and traditions. These examples are a vivid illustration of national identity, of cultural and historical development of expressive potential of language as a means of reflection of emotional state and of certain concepts in their linguistic picture of the world. The above mentioned phraseological units are the clear accumulation of background knowledge of native German speakers of national language variants in the appropriate cultural area. On the other hand, the group of such phraseologisms is quantitatively marginal and global conclusions on the reflection of linguoculture by nations-bearers of German national language variants in their phraseology from our sample, according to their component composition, does not seem to us as possible [43].

Thus we have not identified any specific (other than common German - typically Austrian or Swiss) animalistic, chromatonymic or digital lexeme symbols. Also non-specific are conceptual metaphors. This proves the hypothesis that the figurative and metaphorical divergency is inherent rather for territorial dialects that preserve a rustic lifestyle and patriarchal worldview. The archaization of dialect vocabulary as components of idiomatics and of variant idioms of dialect origin as a whole, that was stated in our study, eliminates the differences in figurative bases that were inherent in the language of German-speaking countries in previous years of the formation of national state variants.

Some specific features reveal only a few folk etymologically re-motivated phraseologisms and ethno-cultural stereotypes in their semantic structure. The main argument in favor of the folk etymology is the fact that it was not the correct diachronic interpretation that stands for derivational

base and formed the basis for borrowings we have identified [34]. Ethnic and cultural stereotypes in phraseology is a marginal phenomenon, relatively unproductive and potentially peripheral in contextual functioning, especially in the age of "political correctness". The Austrian variant of the German language denotes the specifics of language and cultural contacts of the Habsburg Empire and as a result - a significant amount of actual "Austrian" lexical and phraseological borrowings from the language, whose representatives are negatively stereotyped by linguistic consciousness - Italian, Czech, Serbian, Croatian. An exception are the Hungarians (despite numerous Hungarian borrowings, their pejorative ethnic stereotypes in the Austrian phraseology, according to our data, are absent). The reason is, in our opinion, the actual equality of Hungarian part of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The similar antinomy we observe in German-speaking Switzerland phraseology - despite the significant number of borrowings from French, a negative image of the Frenchman is also missing - it is rather a result of many years of traditional tolerant multiethnic coexistence of Swiss society. Another paradox of language consciousness by Austrians and German Swiss, that, however, can be explained, is a negative stereotypization of Germans despite the linguistic community [41].

The experimental results allow us to hypothesize about the need to clarify the regional marking of analog-synonymous and clustered Austrian and Swiss idioms (which most respondents - Germans stubbornly classify as well known and used beyond the hypothetical cluster). The convinced rejection of the other idioms by informants - often with comments - "this is wrong", "it is a mistake" and even their own additions such as "it should be..." (as such additions almost always appear idiomatic Teutonisms) are caused not only by the widespread German-centric attitude to language in Austria and Switzerland as to the deviational phenomenon - deviations from the supposedly existing natural common German literary standard. In our view, this represents an additional argument in favor of our hypothesis of holistic perception of the semantics of idioms by the Germans, and vice versa - their decompositional reception by bearers of non-dominant variants - Austrians and Swiss, for which - sic! - even a small component divergency of a phraseologism is a signal indicator of national and cultural identity. This makes us to review our initial intuitive hypothesis to some extent. Morphosyntactical differences in phraseology really are not the facts of national culture - but, as evidenced by the results of our surveys, even the differences in the rection of verbs or prepositions used in component composition of idioms from the cognitive viewpoint perform a signal recognition function in coordinates "native or foreign" even within the same standard language [43].

2.4. PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GERMAN VARIANT PHRASEOLOGY

From the pragmatic and functional point of view idiomatic variant fund is characterized by situational connectedness with official, traditional and domestic contexts, above all, the culinary and ritual ones, by the absence, unlike the German, of a taboo for the use of dialect forms in the semi-official discourse, framing pragmatic restriction of use, the lack outside of these areas of preferential correlations by communicative competition with Bundes-Deutsch, priority of signal identifying functions compared to the nomination of realia [28].

In the text functioning any direct correlation "analog synonym - parallel equal functioning with Teutonisms based on communicative competition" is not found (identified are cases of displacement and occasionalization of an Austriacism or Helvetism as well, and vice versa - a distinct preference of an Austrian or Swiss synonym) [38].

Partially confirmed is another hypothesis of correlation "analog version - communicative preference of an Austriacism or Helvetism".

Idiomatic non-equivalent Austriacisms or Helvetisms can either become completely archaic (as factors of this process, we consider first of all the archaism and regional limitations of the lexeme component composition) or acquire the normative status (on the contrary, due to actuality and absolute preference of lexeme components).

After all, there is no doubt of a special attraction in phraseology of national language variants to the subject-ideographic field "official political life" and the use of idioms - Austriacisms or Helvetisms in respective contexts even with everyday-life and pejorative semantics.

To our knowledge, the national German language variants are marked by a distinct ludic functioning of phraseology. According to our initial hypothesis, homonymy and literally or double actualization is only a part of the playing idiomatic language field, and not the largest one. Among its other components, in our opinion, are the intertextual allusional precedency; occasional individual-author new creations; holistic and semantic parody - Wellerization (as one of its subtypes); political and politically correct euphemy; cliché-based reactualizational modeling. Euphemy of "political correctness," especially in its ironic version, is well illustrated by the phraseology of German in the ex-GDR. On the one hand, these are linguistic monuments of the former age, and secondly – monuments of the "Aesopus language" of the population of the GDR, which ironically treated the officious discourse, modifying it to more adequately reflect the "socialist reality" [35]. Cliché-based modeling according to structural patterns of known idioms is, in our view, a particular manifestation of the language game that combines allusions and reactualization. So most famous Swiss literary quotations, according to our information from electronic corpora, function in numerous German journalistic texts in transformed versions, and their meanings contradict to semantizations listed in the Duden dictionary 12 [29]. As a result of our research, for the Austrian winged expressions is characteristic the "continued" quotational life, especially not by winged expressions from literary classics, but due to the popularity of text "fragments" of a regional entertainment and a daily-trivial literature, including those specifically Austrian genre as operetta libretto [42]. Secondly, if the winged phrase is widely used and became an integral part of the eponymic minimum (which can also be most likely to be defined empirically), then it gets in synchronic current mentality of speakers the integrated connotations with its own national culture as a whole. Finally, such an association with its own source of origin, especially by expressions - internationalism, may be wrong, folk etymological, but still remain an important fact of everyday language consciousness of the people.

The idiom is a radial and prototype category, according to modern concepts, it is a minimized cognitive structure, that in many ways (including in the gaming sense) is developed in the speech use depending of the communicative intentions of the speaker and its socio-cultural background. The modification play as a part of semantics in such phrases, opposed to a free syntagm, is present per definitionem [42].

Quantitative correlations of the text functioning show on the one side - the absolute quantitative marginality of variant phraseology compared to common German, statistically insignificant specific features in phraseology of the "half-centers" but at the same time – the wide regional variation within across the whole centers and already mentioned above the impossibility of areal matches of linguistic and national borders.

Quantitative and functional characteristics of the analyzed linguistic and speech material justify the hypothesis of conversational, informal, occasional status of a statistically significant number of variant phraseologisms, dynamic processes of unification and archaization of variant phraseology in nonfiction texts and the need for correction of lexicographical information.

3. CONCLUSIONS

The research of idioms in national languages occupy a significant niche in different linguistic paradigms. Objective difficulties with the formulation of a common definition of phraseological units and constructing of classification schemes with clear boundaries that representatives of a systemic-structural approach are exposed to, caused, in particular, the attempts to put under this notion the sustainably diverse units within the so-called narrow and broad understanding of phraseology, which are largely successfully overcome by the representatives of the communicative and pragmatic approach and especially – of cognitive linguistics, taking into account the inter-subjective and individual extralinguistic factors relevant to the functioning of various types of phraseological units as well.

The hypothesis of our research was that the phraseology as a result of nation-varying of standard pluricentric German does not create any integrated system, but is characterized by several specific superficial, surface, - explicit, and structural, semantic and image-semantic, cognitive, functional -

implicit features. Besides, these features are fundamentally different from the characteristics of the dialect phraseology.

The national communicative space of the German-speaking peoples outside of Germany provides in the field of phraseology no basis for the formulation of "idiomatic picture of the world" and "phraseological concepts" - through the quantitative marginality and functionally incomplete information "field" coverage. Also as non-existent categories should be regarded on the material of variant phraseology the "phraseological level" ("intermediate" or "vertical hierarchical") - because of the impossibility of re-encoding into units of higher level and the "phraseological system" - despite the existence of fragmental internal and intervariant system relations - synonymy, polysemy, homonymy, antonymy. Thus, the concept of "Austrian / Swiss national phraseological microsystem" used in the literature should be considered as a purely operational simplification. It makes sense to talk about the phraseological component of the Austrian / Swiss national language picture of the world, verbalization of basic concepts by the native phraseology, and – about phraseological units in the lexical subsystems of non-dominant national-state standard language variants.

The central quantitatively dominant constituent of the idiomatic fund of German-speaking countries outside of Germany is the common German phraseology with the nuclear invariant - the experimentally determined idiomatic universals (only in Switzerland, unlike in Austria - in dialect language version). The quantitative but not communicative periphery (as confirmed empirically) is made up by the purely Austrian / Swiss national phraseology.

The national phraseology of Austria and Switzerland confirms the status of not a taxa-hierarchical but radial cluster category with prototypical good samples and peripheral bad samples.

From the contrastive point of view, related to the system of Hochdeutsch (Standarddeutsch, Binnendeutsch, we prefer and consider as optimal the term Bundesdeutsch), this phraseological fund is clearly structured into "pure" Austriacisms / Helvetisms par excellence – core; translated dialectisms – next to core zone and analogue idioms with integral (synonyms) and component (variants, regional structural doublets) divergency - peripherals.

According to the introspective criterion (experimentally determined by interviewing informants – bearers of the language variants and by the corpus textual analysis on a massive sample) the actual Austriacisms / Helvetisms and peripheral occasional archaisms are defined.

In areal-diatopic terms by textual checking of lexicographical information with territorial markings the "pure" Austriacisms / Helvetisms (core), analogs-doublets with territorial reference (next to core zone) and clusters (peripherals), used at the intersection of language areas, partly unexplainable by geographic factors, are found.

The basic primary heuristic for us is the premise that from a cognitive point of view an intersubjectively unused idiom is in the strict sense not an idiom at all [10, 11].

The variant idiomatic thesaurus composed in that way allows to claim the psychic reality in the mental lexicon of speakers and to make significant corrections, and partly a negation of certain previous lexicographical data.

The peripheralism of the image-semantic specificity of the variant German phraseology is also evident in the non-specific character, unlike the dialects, of conceptual metaphors and metaphorical-metonymical models. However ideographic specific features of official, legal, food, everyday-life, and traditional and ritual character provide a cumulative function such as nomination of realia, they are quantitatively marginal (12% of the corpus), but the inadmissibility of their use by German-speaking foreigners makes them to identifiable signal markers. They are represented by the terminological-referential word combinations. It logically leads to the lower grade of traditional idiomaticity and higher degree of propositionality and referentiality of the variant phraseology. Similarly, the non-specific digital, animalistic, vegetable symbols, with partial specificity of extralinguistic colour symbolism is caused by the denotative-referential and cumulative characteristics of the studied corpus. Strongly specific are only some geographically onymic, cooking verbal symbols and ethnic stereotypes (sic!).

The concept of national cultural component of the semantics of German variant phraseology requires also the radical correction.

Ambiguous experimental results show that not only Austrians and Swiss Germans use Standard German and partly common German idiomatic correlates equally and in parallel with the national variant phraseology and find them "native", but also Germans just add to their idiomatic fund variants, doublet Austriacisms and Helvetisms without any unambiguous direct correlations of preferences in favor of one or the other. The proverbs are the least used, but most parodied and modified, at the same time the most "intimate" national sphere, so if they are known and used, then in dialectal form. However the paremiological minimum is built according to common German structural models. In contrast, the eponyms of the known origin from outside Germany are used outside the area of origin in the literary German version and often with modified meanings. "False friends of the interpreter" do not always confirm their status, used by the Austrians and Swiss in common German sense as well.

The error corrections of idiomatic Austriacisms / Helvetisms by informants - Germans are determined not only by a sense of foreignness of an expression, but by its holistic and partly literal perception, strongly associated in the structural pattern with the idioms known and used by Germans.

Generally, the Austrian and Swiss idiomatic thesaurus is a diffuse, radial prototypical structure with the clusters of heterogeneous taxa (of contrastive, introspective and areal-diatopic character) without any vertical hyper-hyponymic hierarchy, discrete boundaries, but with well-defined intersections, mutual transitions, sort of "hyperlinks". It is realized through the decompositional reception by bearers of the native language variant and holistic, literal, often inadequate perception by foreigners, even the Germans. Abstract mental, conceptual modeling image-semantic features are rather not typical for variant but dialect phraseology due to the non-emancipation of variants to the status of a separate language.

The sources of replenishment of this idiomatic fund in a diachronic aspect were regional dialects, foreign borrowings and extralinguistic factors - in the modern era more significant become global language contacts, not these of a "contact" dimension, including interaction of variants with Bundesdeutsch, but also the reverse effects (sic!): nomination of new specific realities by the standard German vocabulary means.

All this makes up a zero probability of a complete elimination of variant idiomatic features as well as their complete gaining of the independent status of a separate standard literary language, and thus requires a further investigation by specialists on Germanic linguistics.

As prospects for further research of this problem we consider the further analysis of the functioning of variant phraseology in the texts of various genres, their communicative competition with common German correlates, including these outside of the previously defined area of spread.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ammon U. *German Language in Germany, Austria and Switzerland*. Walter de Gruyter, New York, Berlin, 1995. (In German)
- [2] Ammon U., Bickel H., Ebner J. et. al. *Variants Dictionary of German*. Walter de Gruyter, New York, 2005. (In German)
- [3] Brutyan H. A. *Hypothesis of Sapir-Whorf*. Luys, Erevan, 1968. (In Russian)
- [4] Burger H. Helvetisms in Phraseology. In: Löffler H. (Ed.) *Alemannische Dialektforschung. Bilanz und Perspektiven. Beiträge zur 11. Arbeitstagung allemanischer Dialektologen*. Francke Verlag, Tübingen und Basel, 1995, 13-25. (In German)
- [5] Burger H. *On Phraseology of Swiss Standard German*. In: Korhonen J. (Ed.) *Studien zur Phraseologie des Deutschen und des Finnischen*, 2. Bochum, Brockmeyer, 1996, 461-488. (In German)

- [6] Burger H. Helvetisms in Phraseology. – Appearance and Stylistic Functions. In: Hatrmann D. (Ed.) „Das geht auf keine Kuhhaut“. Arbeitsfelder der Phraseologie. Akten des Westfällischen Arbeitskreises „Phraseologie / Parömiologie“. Bochum, 1996, Brockmeyer, Bochum, 1998, 49-80. (In German)
- [7] Burger H. *Concepts of "Variation" in Phraseology*. In: Häcki Buhofer A. (Ed.) Vom Umgang mit sprachlicher Variation. Soziolinguistik, Dialektologie, Methoden und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Heinrich Löffler zum 60. Geburtstag, Francke Verlag, Tübingen/Basel, 2000, 35-51. (In German)
- [8] Burger H. *Dialectal Phraseology – on the Example of Swiss German*. In: Piirainen E., Piirainen I.T. (Eds.) Phraseologie im Raum und Zeit. Akten der 10. Tagung des Westfällischen Arbeitskreises „Phraseologie/Parömiologie“, Münster, 2001, Phraseologie und Parömiologie, Band 10, Schneider Verlag Hohengehren, Baltmannsweiler, 2002, 11-29. (In German)
- [9] Clyne M. G. Pluricentric Language/Plurizentrische Sprachen. In: Ammon U. et al. (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics / Soziolinguistik. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society / Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft*, 2. vollständig neu bearbeitet und erweiterte Auflage. (1. Teilband), 2005, 296-300. (In German)
- [10] Dobrovolskij D. *Studies on the Thesaurus of German Idioms. Cognitive Aspects of Idiom-Semantics*. Narr, Tübingen, 1995. (In German)
- [11] Dobrovolskij D. *Aims and Methods of Cognitive-Based Research of Phraseology. Idioms in the Mental Lexicon*. Trier, 1997. (In German)
- [12] Domashnev A.Y. *Papers on Germanic Linguistics and Sociolinguistics*. Nauka, SPb, 2005. (In Russian)
- [13] Ebner J. *Dictionary of Austrian Peculiarities. Duden-Pocket Books. How do they say in Austria?* Dudenverlag Bibliographisches Institut, Mannheim / Wien / Zürich, 1980. (In German)
- [14] Ebner J. *Words and Expressions in Austrian German*. In: Wiesinger P. (Ed.) Austrian German, Böhlau Verlag. Wien / Köln / Graz, 1988, 99-189. (In German)
- [15] Eismann W. The Issue of Lexicographic Fixation of the non-standard German Phraseologisms in German-Slavic Phraseological Dictionaries. In: Palm C. (Ed.) "Europhras 90". Akten der internationalen Tagung zur germanistischen Phraseologieforschung, Aske, Schweden, June 12–15, 1990, Uupsala, 1991, 43-61. (In German)
- [16] Földes Cs. *On the Austrian Peculiarities of German Phraseology*. In: Földes Cs. (Ed.) German Phraseology in Language System and Language Use, Edition Praesens, Wien, 1992, 9-24. (In German)
- [17] Földes Cs. *German Phraseology Contrastive. Intra-and Interlinguistic Approaches*. In: Deutsch im Kontrast, Band 15, Julius Gross Verlag, Heidelberg, 1996. (In German)
- [18] Földes Cs. *Verbal Idioms in Austrian German*. In: Korhonen J. (Ed.) Studies on Phraseology of German and Finnish, Brockmeyer, Bochum, 1996, 441-459. (In German)
- [19] Földes Cs. *Is there any Austrian phraseology ?* In: Hatrmann D. (Ed.) „Das geht auf keine Kuhhaut“. Arbeitsfelder der Phraseologie. Akten des Westfällischen Arbeitskreises Phraseologie / Parömiologie. Bochum, 1996, Brockmeyer, Bochum, 1998, 109-125. (In German)
- [20] Mal'tseva D.G. *Linguistic Country Studies through Phraseologisms in Study of German Language*. Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 1991. (In Russian)
- [21] Malygin V.T. *Austrian Word Combinations and Proverbial Sayings*. Österreichischer Bundeseverlag. Pädagogischer Verlag, Wien, 1996. (In German)
- [22] Malygin V.T. *Austrian Phraseology in Social Cultural Aspect: Monograph*. Obrazovanie, Ros. hos. ped. un-t im. A.Y. Hertsen, S.-Peterburg, 1999. (In Russian)
- [23] Malygin V.T., Kokanina L.B. *National Specificity of Austrian and Swiss Phraseology Compared Especially with German*. In: Dobrovolskiy D.O., Malygin V.T., Kokanina L.B. (Eds.) Comparative Phraseology (on the Material of Germanic Languages). Izdatel'stvo Vladimirskogo universiteta, Vladimir, 1990, 49-79. (In Russian)
- [24] Mokienko V.M. Cognition and Culture Reflected by Cognitive and Historical Phraseology. In: Proceedings of the 2 International Scientific Conference "Phraseology, Cognition and Culture", Volume 1, Phraseology and Cognition Belgorod, Russia, September 7-9, 2010, Izd-vo BelGU, Belgorod, 2010, 8-20. (In Russian)

- [25] Muhr R. (Ed.) *International Papers on Austrian German and its Neighbour Linguistic Relations*. Verlag Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, Wien, 1993. (In German)
- [26] Muhr R., Schrodt R., Wiesinger P. (Eds.) *Austrian German. Linguistic, Social-Psychological and Linguistic-Political Aspects of a National Variant of German*. Hölder, Wien, 1995. (In German)
- [27] Munsa F. German Standard Language and Austrian Dialect. *Muttersprache: Zeitschrift zur Pflege und Erforschung der Deutschen Sprache*, **85** (1975), 334-341. (In German)
- [28] Ostapovych O.Ya. Peculiarities of Functional Characteristics of the Nationally Marked Nominative Phraseology in the Austrian Variant of German. *Visnyk Prykarpat's'koho universytetu. Filolohiya*, **VII** (2003), 49-62. (In Ukrainian)
- [29] Ostapovych O. Winged Words of Swiss German Origin. Status and Usage. In: Die XIV. UDGW-Tagung „Deutsche Sprache und Literatur im europäischen Kontext“, Donezk, 2007, 175-179. (In German)
- [30] Ostapovych O.Ya. Cognitive and Corpus-based Status Definition Criteria of Phraseological Helvetisms. *Naukovyy visnyk Volyns'koho derzhavnoho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrayinky*, **4** (2007), 380-385. (In Ukrainian)
- [31] Ostapovych O.Ya. Phraseologisms—“False Friends of the Interpreter”. Implicite and Intralinguistic Aspects. *Filolohichni studiyi*, **1-2** (39-40), (2007), 194-198. (In Ukrainian)
- [32] Ostapovych O.Ya. On the Issue of Definition of a National Corpus of Swiss Proverbs. *Aktual'ni problemy hermans'koyi filolohiyi*, (2008), 207-211. (In Ukrainian)
- [33] Ostapovych O.Ya. Linguistic Situations and Language Politics in the German-Speaking Countries in the Age of Globalization. *Nova filolohiya*, **32** (2008), 205-213. (In Ukrainian)
- [34] Ostapovych O.Ya. Folk Etymology in Semantics of Phraseological Units from the Gognitive Viewpoint. In: *Suchasni problemy hermanistyky v Ukrayini. Materialy Mizhnarodnoyi naukovoyi konferentsiyi, Surma, Drohobych*, 2008, 167-170. (In Ukrainian)
- [35] Ostapovych O.Ya. Phraseology of German in the former GDR. Archaic or Empirical Newland? In: *Proceedings of the International Conference “World. Language. Human”*, Vladimir, 2008, 111-116. (In Russian)
- [36] Ostapovych O.Ya. Idea of the National Identity in the Language Consciousness of Austrians. Lexicographical Aspect. Actual Problems of Germanic Philology. *Scientific Journal of the Ivan Ohiyenko Kamyanets'-Podil's'ky National University (Philological Sciences)*, **2** (22) (2010), 64-68. (In Ukrainian)
- [37] Ostapovych O.Ya. Idiomaticity of Language and Speech as a Linguocognitive Universal. *Mova i kul'tura*, **2** (13) (138) (2010), 146-157. (In Ukrainian)
- [38] Ostapovych O.Ya. Functional Characteristics of the Mostly Used Idioms-Helvetisms. *Studia Germanica Et Romanica (Foreign Languages. World Literature. Teaching Methods)*, **7** (3) (21) (2010), 57-64. (In Ukrainian)
- [39] Ostapovych O.Ya. Cluster Organization of the German Idiomatic Thesaurus Abroad Germany. *Mova i kul'tura*, **158** (2012), 65-74. (In Ukrainian)
- [40] Ostapovych O.Ya. Cultural Specificity of German Phraseology. Empirical Reality or Publicity Fiction? *Typology of Language Meanings in Diachronic and Comparative Aspects*, **25** (2012), 123-138. (In Ukrainian)
- [41] Ostapovych O.Ya. Pejoratives and Majoratives in Ethnocultural Stereotypes of Idiomatics Eastern Slavic Philology. *Linguistics, Scientific Journal of Horlivka State Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages*, **22** (2012), 152-160. (In Ukrainian)
- [42] Ostapovych O.Ya. “Homo ludens” in Phraseology: from Anti-Proverbs and Wellerisms to the Gender Restrictions. *Scientific Journal of the V.I. Vernads'ky Tauris National University (series “Philology. Social Communications”)*, **25** (64) (3) (2) (2012), 60-68. (In Ukrainian)
- [43] Ostapovych O.Ya., Varenysya E.Ya. Cognitive Preferences of Speakers-Bearers of the National-State Variants of the Modern German Language in the Sphere of Phraseology. Experimental Approaches. *Scientific Journal of the National University “Ostroh Academy» (series “Philology”)*, **37** (2013), 329-335. (In Ukrainian)
- [44] Riesel E. *Style of the German Everyday Speech*. Vyssaja skola, Moscow, 1964. (In German)
- [45] Sapir E. *Language*. Max Hueber Verlag, München, 1961. (In German)
- [46] Sulym V.T. Lexical Borrowings in Phraseologisms of the National Variants of German. In: *Proceedings in honor of professor B.V. Maksymchuk, Ivan Franko LNU Publishing House, L'viv*, 2011, 242-247. (In Ukrainian)

- [47] Turkovskaya G.V. Some Peculiarities of the Micro-System of the Austrian Variant of German on the Phraseological Level. *Phraseology*, 1 (1973), 215-218. (In Russian)
- [48] Turkovskaya G.V. *Notes on the Phraseology of the Vienna's Dialect*. In: *Phraseological System of Language*. Chelyabinsk Ped. Inst. Publishing House, Chelyabinsk, 1976, 157-164. (In Russian)
- [49] Turkovskaya G.V. *Variants and Synonyms on the Phraseological Level in the Austrian National Usus*. In: *Issues of Romanic and Germanic Linguistics*. Chelyabinsk Ped. Inst. Publishing House, Chelyabinsk, 1977, 121-126. (In Russian)
- [50] Varenysya E.Ya. Structural and Typological Peculiarities of the German Variant Phraseology. *Scientific Journal of the Ivan Ohyenko Kamyanets'-Podil's'ky National University (Philological Sciences)*, 32 (2013), 82-86. (In Ukrainian)
- [51] Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.H. *National and Cultural Semantics of Russian Phraseologisms*. In: *Dictionaries and Linguistic Country Studies*. Moscow, 1982, 89-98. (In Russian)
- [52] Whorf B. L. *Language – Thought – Reality. Contributions to the Metalinguistics and Philosophy of Language*. Rowolt, Reinbeck bei Hamburg, 1997. (In German)
- [53] Wiesinger P. *German Language in Austria*. In: Wiesinger P. (Ed.) *Austrian German*. Böhlau Verlag, Wien / Köln / Graz, 1988, 9- 31. (In German)

Address: O.Ya. Ostapovych, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57, Shevchenko Str., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76000, Ukraine.

E-mail: olegost@hotmail.com.

Received: 12.01.2015; **revised:** 04.05.2015.

Остапович О.Я. Національно-державне варіювання німецької фразеології. Антропоцентричні, когнітивні та корпусні підходи. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, 2 (2-3) (2015), 9-21.

Статтю присвячено розробці новітньої теоретичної концепції дослідження варіювання німецької фразеології поза межами ФРН. В її основу покладено синтез теорії рівноправного плюрицентризму та гіпотези подвійної лінгвальної доповняльності із сучасними набутками когнітивної лінгвістики. В результаті запроваджено поняття «недомінуючого національно-державного мовного варіанту» на відміну від регіонального нормативно некодифікованого і діалектного варіювання, кластерного варіантного ідіоматичного тезаурусу, національного комунікативного простору у царині фразеології. Спростовано емпіричну реальність категорій «національна фразеологічна система/мікросистема», «плюрицентрична архісистема», «кореляційна ієрархія», «фразеологічна картина світу», «фразеологічний концепт».

Ключові слова: мовний плюрицентризм, подвійна лінгвальна доповняльність, когнітивна лінгвістика, недомінуючий національно-державний мовний варіант, кластерний варіантний ідіоматичний тезаурус, національний комунікативний простір, фразеологічна система, плюрицентрична архісистема, кореляційна ієрархія, фразеологічна картина світу, фразеологічний концепт.