



Ph.D. Dissertation Theses

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF RUSSIAN AND
HUNGARIAN SOMATIC PHRASEOLOGISMS**

Written by Dr. Zoltán Györke

DEBRECEN – 2002

I Introduction

1. Dissertation Subject and its Place in Linguistic Science

Phraseology represents a complex branch within the linguistic sciences as it deals with phraseological units the study of which spans the scope of several linguistic disciplines. The subject of the present paper is the **comparative** (contrastive, confrontative) analysis of the lexico-semantic group of somatic phraseologisms (phraseological units that include organ names) found in the Russian and Hungarian languages. This analysis requires a complex research approach based on descriptive linguistics, lexicology, semantics, syntax and various branches of applied linguistics, such as lexicography, stylistics, translation and translation theory.

Despite the relatively short, fifty-year history of Hungarian and Russian linguistic research in the field of phraseology, this period has seen phraseology develop alongside other branches of the linguistic sciences as an independent linguistic discipline. The discoveries made possible by modern linguistic disciplines and the various trends in linguistics have had a significant impact on phraseological research, too. The extensive work of Gábor O. Nagy in the field of linguistics and lexicography, coupled with the phraseological research carried out by the following generation of linguists have resulted in the linguistic description of modern Hungarian's phraseological system (**O. Nagy 1954, 1966, 1977; Károly 1970; Juhász 1980, 1980/a, 1980/b, 1982; Rozgonyiné 1980, 1981, 1984; Hadrovics 1995**).

Achievements in the field of descriptive linguistics with regard to phraseological research have allowed for the comparative study of the phraseological subsystems of Hungarian and other languages, and in recent years this type of study has led to an intensive development in contrastive phraseological research. The comprehensive description of the phraseological systems of various foreign languages and the comparative study of the phraseological subsystems of Hungarian and other languages have been the subject of several dissertations, textbooks and monographies in the past few decades (**Hajzer 1969; Tatár 1975a, 1984a, 1985, 1992; Csige 1982; Hessky, R. 1982a, 1985; Földes 1983, 1987, 1987b; Somhegyi 1984; Bárdosi 1986, 1990; Kocsány 1986; Fábrián 1987; Szalai 1989; Holló 1990; Forgácsné 1995; Kárpáti 2000; Nagy 2000**).

As the science of linguistics develops, linguists increasingly focus on human factors, i.e., on the investigation of the role of the individual in speech activity. Language fulfils its most important role only if it allows one to communicate all the knowledge and experience acquired through the daily activities that facilitate the formation of knowledge.

The study of languages as tools of communication facilitates a better understanding of the essential characteristics of language as a unique human phenomenon.

Every element of the linguistic system, including the phraseological subsystem, is subordinate to the communicative function of the language, i.e., the formation and expression of the cognitive and emotive content.

In recent years, the results achieved in the various fields of linguistics have allowed us to study the phraseological subsystem of a given language from a new perspective, that of communication. The functional description of the phraseological subsystem of language is the subject of a complex linguistic discipline, namely **communicative linguistics**. Communicative linguistics integrates the research results accomplished in the field of various linguistic disciplines. One of the first Hungarian representatives of this new linguistic discipline is Janus Bańcerowski (**Bańcerowski 1979, 1996, 1998, 1999, 1999a**). Communicative grammar relies on the results of the following linguistic disciplines: **functional grammar** (Золотова 1982; Бондарко 1984; Крекич 1989), **textual linguistics** and **textology** (Николаева 1978; Гальперин 1981; Petőfi – Békési – Vass 1990-1997; Szikszainé ...; Békési 2001), **logical syntax**, **reference theory** (Арутюнова 1976, 1982), **semiological grammar** (Степанов 1977, 1980, 1981a, 1983b), **nomination theory** and **onomasiology** (Кубрякова 1978), **speech act theory**, **linguistic pragmatics** (Ахманова-Магидова 1978; Степанов 1981b; Бульгина 1981; Арутюнова 1981; Крекич 1993), **psycholinguistics** and **speech activity theory** (Лурья 1975, 1979; Pléh 1996; Gósy 1999; Lengyel 1994).

Describing a level of the linguistic system from a communicative aspect is also a pragmatic description of that particular level of the language. The speaker, the person shaping the text, communicates to the listener his/her personal worldview in connection with the objects and phenomena that surround him/her, and also provides information about the relationship between those objects and phenomena and about their features in order to attain a desired pragmatic effect.

Several scientific results have been achieved in describing the phraseological subsystem of the Russian language from a communicative aspect (Cf.: Яранцев 1981; Телия 1995; Эмирова 1971, 1972, 1977a, 1977b, 1978a, 1978b, 1983b, 1984a, 1987; Торопцев 1970, 1974). In the Hungarian literature on phraseology, Vilmos Bárdosi was the first person to describe phraseological units from a communicative aspect, presenting his description in a dissertation (**Bárdosi 1990**). In his dissertation, the comparative symbolist author describes the phraseological similes found in French from an onomasiological aspect,

based on field theory. To date there have been no publications in Hungarian linguistic literature on conducting a comparative analysis of the phraseological system of Hungarian and other languages from a communicative aspect.

For the first time in the Hungarian literature on phraseology, in the present paper I conduct a comparative, language- and speech-level analysis of Russian and Hungarian somatic ('sōma' = 'body', Greek) phraseological units from a communicative aspect.

Somatic phraseologisms are linguistic universals that are present in every language, amounting to approximately one-third of the total number of phraseological units found in a given language. The lexico-semantic group of somatic phraseologisms is regarded as an independent subsystem within the phraseological system of a language, and it is comprised of phraseological units whose key constituent parts include human or animal organ names.

The objectivity of the study's results is ensured by the fact that the number of somatic phraseologisms is high and that somatic phraseologisms are diverse in their structure and semantic features. In addition, the random sample that comprises the paper's corpus also guarantees objectivity. The relationship between the group of somatic phraseological units and the phraseological system of a language is a dialectic relationship between the **part** and the **whole**, the **general** and the **specific**. In accordance with the two fundamental laws of dialectics, still valid today, the group of somatic phraseologisms is representative of the characteristics of the entire phraseological system, as the **part** is representative of the **whole**. The same general criteria and rules apply to the part as apply to the whole. What is **specific** in the **part** is the somatic component, on the basis of which we separate it from the whole.

The results of the comparative study of somatic phraseologisms found in Russian and Hungarian allow for drawing scientific conclusions that apply to the phraseological systems of the two languages.

2. Dissertation Objective, Research Tasks

In the present dissertation I set out to complete the following scientific tasks:

1. The collection and classification of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseological units that comprise the corpus of the present dissertation. The source for the collection of phraseological units was provided by monolingual and bilingual phraseological and explanatory dictionaries (**Молотков 1987; Фёдоров 1995; Влахов 1986; Keszthelyi 1961; Лавер-Зикань 1985; Dubrovin-Klaudy 1990; Шанский-Богетрова-Вереш 1983; O. Nagy 1966; Békés 1977; Ожегов-Шведова 1977; СРЯ тт. I-IV.; Értelmező kéziszótár (Concise Hungarian**

Explanatory Dictionary); **Értelmező szótár** (Hungarian Explanatory Dictionary) **I-VII.**; **Максимов 1955; Яранцев 1977).**

Russian-Hungarian and Hungarian-Russian dictionaries (**Hadrovics-Gáldi 1974, 1977; Gáldi-Uzonyi 2000**), Russian and Hungarian literary works and daily newspapers also served as a source.

The somatic phraseologisms collected according to set criteria for the purposes of the present paper number **1376 Russian** and **1177 Hungarian** phraseological units.

2. In accordance with the latest results of phraseological lexicography, a detailed analysis of the somatic phraseological units found in Russian and Hungarian dictionaries. Laying the foundations for a Russian-Hungarian phraseological dictionary for educational purposes.
3. Exploring the Hungarian lexical (linguistic) equivalents of Russian somatic phraseological units, and vice versa. Eliminating mistranslations in dictionaries.
4. Providing an overview of the various trends and results in Hungarian phraseological research, with special emphasis on the current state and future tasks of descriptive and comparative phraseological research, compared to the wide-ranging intensive phraseological research conducted in other countries.
5. Contributing to the development and standardisation of Hungarian phraseological linguistic terminology.
6. The improvement of the general theory and practical results in Russian and Hungarian phraseology.
7. The development of complex methods applied in the systematic analysis of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms. The presentation of the systemic quality evident in the lexico-grammatic structure and semantics of the phraseological units in the two languages.
8. The presentation of the similarities and dissimilarities between the morphological, derivational and syntactic systems of the two languages, and the exploration of the reasons behind these similarities and dissimilarities through the comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseological units.
9. The linguistic analysis of intra-lingual and inter-lingual phraseological **polysemy**, **homonymy**, **synonymy** and **antonymy**. The linguistic analysis of **enantiosemy** and **semantic opposition** and the presentation of the inter-lingual phraseological **paronymy** phenomenon. In the past there has been little scientific interest in the

analysis of these semantic and structural groups of phraseological units with regard to the Hungarian language, while certain phenomena (i.e., phraseological homonymy, antonymy, enantiosemy and paronymy) were ignored by linguists altogether.

3. Research Methods

The set linguistic phrases (phraseologisms) which are examined in the present dissertation are characterised by an intricate semantic structure, consequently their comparative analysis requires the utilisation of complex research methods. One of the primary objectives of the dissertation is to provide a **systemic description** of the structural semantic characteristics and the equivalence-types of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms through the application of the **descriptive-comparative method**.

1. In describing the general theory of phraseology along with the criteria for a phraseological unit, its place within the system of linguistic signs, its nominative and expressive function, and finally, its structural semantic characteristics, I applied the method of **synchronic linguistic analysis**.
2. I applied the **comparative (contrastive, confrontative) method** in the structural semantic comparative analysis of the somatic phraseologisms which make up the corpus of the paper – exploring the similarities and dissimilarities (specific characteristics) between the structure and semantics of the phraseological units found in the two languages. Russian served as the base-language for every comparative analysis in the paper, and the similarities between the structure and semantic features of the phraseological units of the two languages took precedence over the dissimilarities. The description of the theoretical results of the **comparative typological analysis** presented in the paper is based on Russian and Hungarian linguistic theory (and that of other languages – primarily English), and in particular on the concepts of phraseological theory and phraseological terminology.
3. I applied the **distributional method** in the speech-level comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian phraseological units – analysing the distributional properties of phraseological units, their textual application, the possibility of transformation (modification) and the phraseological equivalence-types of the two languages.
4. I applied a version of the method of **componential semantic analysis** – semantic syntagmatics, developed by V. G. Gak – primarily in the comparative analysis of the semantic features of phraseologisms. This method relies on the conception that the semantic structure of a lexical unit is essentially revealed through the objective analysis of

the features of the relevant signified object and its paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationship with other lexical units (Gak). This method proved to be an efficient tool in the comparative analysis of **inter-lingual phraseological monosemy, polysemy, homonymy and enantiosemy** as well as **phraseological synonymy and antonymy** and the **inter-lingual phraseological paronymy** phenomenon.

5. In conducting a comparative structural analysis of the phraseological units found in the Russian and Hungarian languages I opted for the **method of formal linguistic description**, applying international symbols. The symbols used in formal linguistic description facilitate the clear exploration of the structural similarities and dissimilarities between the phraseological units of the two languages.
6. Finally, the **statistical method** allowed for a numerical representation of the distribution of the data pertaining to the size of the corpus and to the similarities and dissimilarities between the two languages (examined through comparative structural semantic analysis), and it also served to support the tendencies explored in the paper.

4. Background to the Research Subject

The study of somatic phraseologisms (including comparative analysis) is not without any antecedents in Hungarian and foreign (mainly Russian) linguistic literature. Linguists began to show interest in this particular lexico-semantic group by as early as the 1960s primarily due to the large number and special features of the phraseological units that belong to the group.

In the early days of research into somatic phraseologisms the collection, classification and description of the somatic phraseological units found in a language served as the research subject of two dissertations. Research in this field either involves the analysis of the phraseological system of a given language, or a comparative analysis of the somatic phraseologisms found in two or more different languages. Applying methods that reflect the state of the science of phraseology in the sixties, the Estonian linguist, F. Vakk was the first person to collect and analyse the structural, semantic and stylistic groups of somatic phraseological units found in the Estonian language – also studying the role of Estonian somatisms in the formation of phraseologisms (**Ф. Вакк 1964**).

Later, E. S. Jakimova conducted a comprehensive analysis of the symbolism inherent in the somatic phraseologisms of another Finno-Ugric language, Mari (**Якимова 1975**).

There have been several linguists who have carried out comparative studies in connection with somatic phraseologisms found in Russian and other languages. Studies by O. Nazarov, Ju. A. Dolgoplov, N. V. Dzsanelidze, M. N. Azimova, P. G. Nandan, N. N.

Kirillova deserve special mention here (**Назаров 1973; Долгополов 1973; Джанелидзе 1981; Кириллова 1975; Азимова 1980; Нандан 1978**).

Papers published in Russian-speaking countries either deal with the classification of somatic phraseological units according to defined conceptual categories (**Мордкович 1976**), or the structural semantic description of the somatic phraseologisms found in certain Turkish languages (**Раджабов 1976; Исаев 1976**).

Hungarian linguists have also found an interest in the comparative analysis of somatic phraseologisms, and, to date, two dissertations and studies have dealt with the subject. In his dissertation, Gyula Somhegyi conducted a comparative analysis of Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian phraseological units based on the somatic phraseologisms found in the two languages (**Somhegyi 1984**). In his Ph.D. thesis, László Nagy carried out a comparative analysis of approximately 1000 Russian and 1000 German somatic phraseologisms, limiting his research to 30 organ names (**Nagy 2000**).

Together the above studies provide a comparative analysis of Russian-German-Hungarian and Russian and German somatic phraseological units, offering equivalents for the somatic phraseologisms in the various languages and describing equivalence-types (**Földes 1985; Надь 1997**).

In the Hungarian specialist literature on phraseology there have been valuable contributions to the study of the etymology and grammatical features of lexical somatisms and to their role in the formation of phraseologisms (**Pete 1989:28, 108; Papp 1979: ...**). A particularly detailed analysis of somatisms can be found in **Magyar phraseology – Történeti áttekintés** (Hungarian Phraseology – An historical overview) by **László Hadrovics**. In addition to presenting an extensive collection of Hungarian somatic phraseologisms, the work also contains several valuable scientific analyses with respect to the role of somatisms in the formation of phraseologisms and in the development of the semantic features and symbol-fields of phraseological units.

In the Hungarian literature on phraseology to date there have been no dissertations dealing specifically with the comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms. In the present paper, I conduct a language- and speech-level comparative analysis of one of the largest phraseological subsystems of the two languages, offering valuable information with regard to the Russian and Hungarian phraseological systems as a whole – a first in the Hungarian literature on comparative phraseology (**Hadrovics 1995**).

5. Scientific Novelty of the Dissertation and its Range of Applications

1. The subject of the present paper represents a field of research not yet covered by Russian-Hungarian linguistic research in contrastive phraseology. In the Hungarian specialist literature on phraseology the present dissertation is the first scientific paper to offer a comprehensive (structural, grammatical, semantic and equivalence-type-based) language- and speech-level contrastive analysis of the somatic phraseologisms which amount to one-third of the phraseological units in the respective phraseological subsystems of the Russian and Hungarian languages. A comprehensive scientific comparative analysis of the phraseological subsystems of the two languages is only possible if the partial results of the comparative analysis of the phraseological units and that of the structural, semantic, thematic and other groups (microsystems) of phraseologisms are taken into account and generalised. Consequently, the analysis of the **parts** (subsystems) must precede the analysis of the **whole** (system).

As with every language pair, the analysis of the part has to be conducted in the case of Russian and Hungarian, too. The comparative analysis of the phraseological systems of Russian and Hungarian (and especially that of German, Russian and Hungarian) has a considerable history, which significantly contributes to the comparative analysis of the various phraseological groups of the two languages and also to the comparison of the entire phraseological systems of the two languages with that of other languages. With regard to the results achieved in the field of comparative phraseological research in Hungary, it is primarily the respective linguistic works of Regina Hessky, Csaba Földes, József Juhász and Béla Tatár that have to be mentioned (**Hessky 1980, 1982, 1985; Földes 1987, 1987a, 1987b, 1993; Юхас 1996; Tatár 1987, 1988a, 1995, 1997a**). Comparative phraseological research used to be focused on the level of individual phraseologisms, or it concerned a corpus of Russian-Hungarian (or primarily German and Russian) structural, semantic, lexico-semantic and other groups of phraseological units. We summarised the results achieved in this field of research in three studies with an appended selected bibliography (**Дьёрке-Фельдеш 1986, 1989; Földes-Györke 1987**).

2. In the phraseological system of a particular language the uniformity and specific features characteristic of the various (primarily **derivational, morphological, syntactic and semantic**) levels of the language appear in a concentrated form.

3. The results of the comparative analyses conducted as part of the dissertation facilitate a better understanding of the **morphological, derivational, syntactic, semantic** and

word class systems of the two languages, and they also allow for a detailed exploration of the similarities and dissimilarities between these systems.

In addition to expanding on the general theoretical results attained in the field of Russian and Hungarian phraseology, the findings introduced in the present paper offer a considerable contribution to the results of the comprehensive phraseological analyses conducted during the seventies and eighties, especially with regard to the results achieved in the description and comparative analysis of the structural-semantic types of Russian and Hungarian phraseological units. The partial results of the comparative analysis of the phraseological units found in the two languages are widely applicable at every level of language teaching, and in particular – at the level of higher-education – in approaching teaching about the derivational, morphological and syntactic properties of Russian from a comparative aspect, as well as in developing phraseological content for use in textbooks and reference books.

4. The present dissertation may serve as the basis for updating and expanding the syllabus and curriculum of the seminar on comparative phraseology, taught by the author for the past few decades.

5. The paper significantly contributes to the formation and standardisation of Hungarian phraseological terminology related to linguistics, semantics, lexicography as well as the theory and practice of translation.

6. The scope and quality of the phraseological corpus in the lexical section appended to the dissertation, and the parameters and techniques applied in the lexicographical processing of the phraseological units found in the section could be instrumental in the compilation of either a concise dictionary for educational purposes or a comprehensive academic dictionary of Russian and Hungarian phraseologisms – as the lexicographical process involved the formation of the lexical representation of the phraseological units' ground form, variations and semantic features (polysemy, homonymy and enantiosemy) as well as the exploration of the system of references pertaining to the stylistic and distributional properties, emotive and expressive meaning, range of applications and equivalence-types of the phraseological units.

7. Exploring the lexical and speech-level equivalence-types of Russian phraseological units, i.e., the presentation of the difficulties of translating phraseologisms (examined in the context of translations of works by Hungarian and Russian writers) serves as a valuable tool that can be utilised not only in lexicography but also in the practice of literary translation and interpreting.

8. As a source for future phraseological research, the special bibliography (reflecting the theoretical foundations of the dissertation subject and representing the various trends and results in Hungarian and international phraseological research in the past 30-40 years) should significantly facilitate the scientific research to be conducted by the following generations of linguists interested in phraseology.

6. Dissertation Structure

The dissertation is comprised of **five chapters**, a **lexical section** in the form of an **appendix**, a **bibliography of specialist literature** and a **summary** in Hungarian and English.

In the **Introduction** I delineate the dissertation subject and its place in linguistic science, I define the objective of the dissertation and the research tasks and I also provide a description of the research methods applied.

Chapter II of the paper describes the theoretical foundations of the dissertation subject, and is comprised of the following four subchapters:

2.1 The subject of phraseology as an independent linguistic discipline

2.2 A narrow and broad interpretation of phraseology. The lower and upper limit of a phraseologism in Russian and Hungarian

2.3 Views on the domain of phraseology in Hungarian linguistics

2.4 The concept and criteria of a phraseological unit

In **Chapter III** of the paper I discuss the background of the research subject. The chapter is comprised of the following three subchapters:

3.1 The background and main trends of phraseological research in Hungary

3.2 Hungarian phraseological research on foreign languages

3.2.1 Foreign-language phraseological research and bilingual phraseological lexicography

3.2.2 General and contrastive phraseological research in Hungary

3.3 The place of the lexico-semantic group of somatic phraseologisms in the phraseological subsystem of language

3.3.1 Background to the research of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms

3.3.2 Extra-linguistic factors in the development of somatic phraseologisms

3.3.3 Linguistic and stylistic factors in the development of somatic phraseologisms

3.3.4 Criteria for the comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms

Chapter IV of the paper offers a comparative analysis of the structure of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms, and is comprised of the following two subchapters:

- 4.1 A comparative analysis of the structure of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms
 - 4.1.1 The structural properties of Russian and Hungarian phraseological units equivalent to collocations
 - A. The comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian phraseological units that form subordinative constructions
 - B. The comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian phraseological units that form co-ordinative constructions
 - 4.1.2 A comparative analysis of the structure of Russian and Hungarian phraseological units equivalent to sentences
 - A. The structural model of the simple sentence with two primary constituent parts
 - B. The structural model of the complex sentence with two primary constituent parts
- 4.2 The semantic properties of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms
 - 4.2.1 The systemic properties of phraseologisms and their reflection in bilingual lexicography
 - 4.2.2 Problems of inter-lingual phraseological polysemy
 - 4.2.3 Problems of inter-lingual phraseological homonymy
 - 4.2.4 Problems of inter-lingual phraseological synonymy
 - 4.2.5 The phenomenon of inter-lingual phraseological antonymy
 - 4.2.6 The phenomenon of inter-lingual phraseological paronymy
 - 4.2.7 The phenomenon of enantiosemy in the case of Russian and Hungarian phraseologisms

Chapter V of the paper deals with the speech-level comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms, and is comprised of the following subchapters and points:

- 5.1 The definition of language and speech. Phraseologisms at the level language and speech
- 5.2 Problems related to inter-lingual phraseological equivalence
 - 5.2.1 Russian phraseologism corresponding to a Hungarian phraseologism
 - 5.2.1.1 Russian phraseological unit having a complete phraseological equivalent in Hungarian
 - 5.2.1.2 Russian phraseological unit having a partial phraseological equivalent in Hungarian
 - 5.2.1.3 Russian phraseological unit having an analogue phraseological equivalent in Hungarian
 - 5.2.1.4 Establishing correspondence between a Hungarian phraseologism and a Russian phraseologism through metaphrasing

5.2.2 Russian phraseologism corresponding to a unit other than a Hungarian phraseologism

5.2.2.1 Russian phraseologism corresponding to a free collocation in Hungarian

5.2.2.2 Russian phraseologism corresponding to a lexeme in Hungarian

5.2.3 Other cases of establishing the equivalent of a Russian phraseologism in Hungarian

5.2.3.1 Complete omission of Russian phraseological units in oral and written translation

5.2.3.2 Compensating for Russian phraseological units in the target language

5.2.3.3 Cases of mistranslating Russian phraseological units, and the reasons for mistranslation

Chapter VI of the dissertation is comprised of a bibliography of the specialist literature quoted and utilised in the paper, data on the mono- and bilingual dictionaries and literary works serving as the source for the collection of phraseologisms, and finally, a list of the abbreviations and conventional symbols used in the paper.

The dissertation is concluded by a **Summary** in Hungarian and English.

The **Appendix** of the dissertation, presented in a separate volume, contains a lexical representation of the 1376 Russian somatic phraseological units and their Hungarian equivalents (i.e., the corpus examined in the dissertation).

II DISSERTATION THEMES, A DESCRIPTION OF CONDUCTED ANALYSES

Regarding its basic function, language is essentially the most important **tool of communication**, the tool used for encoding, storing, transmitting and decoding the information necessary for the functioning of society and the existence of the individual.

Owing to the work of Saussure it is of common knowledge that language is a hierarchical structure constructed of so-called linguistic plains (or subsystems). In the hierarchy of linguistic plains, higher-level linguistic units are made up of lower-level units. Phraseologisms are complex units comprised of several lexemes, and they may contain every type of unit on the linguistic level of **phonetics-phonology**, **morphology**, **lexico-phraseology**, **syntax** and **semantics** (i.e., phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, syntagms, sememes). Phraseological units are secondary linguistic formations, viz., linguistic signs produced through secondary nomination.

The cause of the origin of phraseologisms as linguistic signs lies with the peculiarities of human thinking and the infinite nature of social practice on the one hand, and the limited number of the linguistic signs available, on the other.

Of all linguistic signs, it is primarily lexemes, phraseological units (phrasemes) and free syntagms that play a role in the process of nomination.

The function of lexemes in linguistic nomination is different from the function fulfilled by phraseological units in the same process: in contrast to lexemes, phraseological units **not only denote (designate) the fragments (objects, phenomena, processes, events etc.) of the reality that we experience, but they also evaluate them.** The **nominative – evaluative – denotive** function of phraseological units **serve the emotive aspect of language.**

According to Ch. Bally, the founder of the science of phraseology, it is the penchant people have for exaggeration, over-emphasis and blowing out of proportion that gives rise to idiomatic expressions in everyday language: “... *modern languages express the concept of intensity through specific phraseological units*” (Балли 1961:80).

Phraseological units may belong to any of the word classes of a language, and they have numerous features that distinguish them from words and free collocations. The general features of a phraseological unit are: ‘setness’, **reproducibility, separateness, idiomacy and semantic amalgamation.**

With regard to the form and content of phraseological units, the phraseological subsystem of language is characterised by the same systemic features that are characteristic of the lexis.

With regard to the phraseological subsystem itself, the laws of the linguistic system manifest themselves in the following three relationships:

1. Regular (systemic) relationship within a phraseologism, affecting both the form and content of the given phraseological unit (e.g., the syntactic relationship between the constituent parts of the phraseologism; the grammatical forms of the phraseological unit, and the relationship between these forms; the variants of phraseological units, and the relationship between these variants). With regard to content, the meaning of a phraseological unit is also systemic: polysemy and monosemy are both characteristic features of phraseological units.

2. Regular (systemic) relationship between phraseological units (within the phraseological system), involving the structural, morphological and derivational features of phraseological units and the systemic relationships between the constituent parts of phraseological units.

Semantic regularities within the phraseological system manifest themselves in the systemic organisation of the phraseological system in the **semantic fields** and in the

monosemic, polysemic, synonymic, antonymic, homonymic and enantiosemic relationship between phraseological units.

3. The regularities of the linguistic system also manifest themselves in the systemic relationship between phraseology and other subsystems of language. Phraseologisms are secondary formations of the linguistic system, comprised of linguistic units that belong to the other subsystems of language, and their structural organisation mirrors the syntactic structural models of language. The paradigmatic and syntagmatic relationships between phraseologisms and words also reflect the regularities of language.

In the present paper I devote a separate chapter to the detailed analysis of the structural properties of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms, i.e., the characteristic morphological, derivational, lexical and word-order-related features (similarities and dissimilarities) of the phraseological units found in the two languages.

In defining structural types, I relied primarily on the works of Ю. А. Долгополов, Райхштейн, Regina Hessky and Csaba Földes, while in the case of Hungarian phraseological units I made use of the structural classification described in detail in the dissertation of József Juhász (Долгополов 1973:6-9; Райхштейн 1980:23-31; Hessky 1985:19:4-5; Földes 1985:30-32, 1987:35-36; Juhász 1982:142-157). The structural features generally characteristic of the somatic phraseologisms in Russian and Hungarian provide data with respect to the phraseological subsystems of the two languages.

Based on the analysis of the corpus, among Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms one may differentiate between the following structural types:

1. Phraseological units equivalent to subordinative or co-ordinative constructions.

Subordinative constructions can be classified into 7 primary structural types and several subtypes.

Structural Type 1:

Subgroup 1: $\boxed{V + N_{som}}$ *начкать (марать) руки об кого-л., обо что-л. = $\boxed{V + (d) + N_{som}}$ beszennyezi (bepiszkítja) a kezét vkivel, vmivel*

Subgroup 2: $\boxed{V + N_{som}}$ *натянуть нос кому-л. = $\boxed{N_{som} + V}$ lóvá tesz vkit; bolondját járítja vkivel*

Structural Type 2:

Subgroup 1: $\boxed{V + Prep. + N_{som}}$ *брать/взять за душу (за сердце) = $\boxed{N_{som} + V}$ szívébe (lelkébe) markol vkinek vmi; felkavarja a lelkét/a szívét vkinek vki, vmi; lelkéig hatol vkinek vmi*

Subgroup 2: $\boxed{V + Prep. + N_{som}}$ *стоять на (своих) ногах = $\boxed{(d) + Adj. + N_{som} + V}$ saját lábára áll vki*

Structural Type 3: $\boxed{V + Adj. + N_{som}}$ *делать/сделать большие (круглые) глаза*
 = $\boxed{Adj. + N_{som} + V}$ *nagy szemeket mereszt (cf.: nagyokat néz)*

Structural Type 4: $\boxed{V + N^1 + Prep. + N_{som}^2}$ *выбивать (выкалачивать) дурь из головы* = $\boxed{V + d^1 + N^1 + d^2 + N_{som}^2 (+ postposition)}$ *kiveri (kiveti) a bolondságot vkinek a fejéből*

Structural Type 5:

Subgroup 1: $\boxed{Prep. + Adj. + N_{som}}$ *на свежую голову* = $\boxed{Adj. + (d +) N_{som}}$ *friss (kipihent) fejjel*

Subgroup 2: $\boxed{Prep. + Adj. + N_{som}}$ *из первых рук* = $\boxed{Adj. + N_{som}}$ *első kézből*

Structural Type 6: $\boxed{Adj. + N_{som}}$

Subgroup 1: $\boxed{Adj.^n + N_{som}^n}$ *пустая голова* = $\boxed{Adj.^n + N_{som}^n}$ *üres fejű*

Subgroup 2: $\boxed{Adj.^{gen} + N_{som}^{gen}}$ *дубовая голова* ≠ $\boxed{\text{compound}}$ *fafejű*

Subgroup 3: $\boxed{Adj.^i + N_{som}^i}$ *твёрдой рукой* = $\boxed{Adj.^i + N_{som}^i}$ *kemény (erős) kézzel*

Structural Type 7: $\boxed{Prep. + N_{som}}$ = $\boxed{(d) + N_{som} + (Postp.)}$

Subgroup 1: $\boxed{Prep. + N_{som}}$ *за плечами чьими-л.* = $\boxed{(d) + N_{som} + (Postp.)}$ *vkinek a háta mögött*

Subgroup 2: $\boxed{Prep. + N_{som}}$ *на носу что-л.* = $\boxed{(d) + N_{som} (+ V)}$ *a nyakunkon van vmi; küszöbön van vmi*

Subgroup 3: $\boxed{Prep. + N_{som}}$ *по душе кому-л.* = $\boxed{N_{som} + (d) + (Postp.) + V}$ *vkinek a szíve szerint való (van); vkinek a szája íze szerint való (van); vkinek a kedvére való (van)*

Subgroup 4: $\boxed{Prep. + N_{som}}$ *на руку кому-л.* ≠ $\boxed{N + V}$ **Hungarian phraseological units of another structure:** *kapóra jön vkinek*

Co-ordinative constructions can be classified into one primary structural type and four subtypes:

Structural Type 1:

Subgroup 1: $\boxed{Prep. + N + Prep. + N_{som}}$ *с пеной у рта* = $\boxed{Adj. + N_{som}}$ **or:** $\boxed{V + N_{som}}$ *habzó szájjal; dühösen*

Subgroup 2: $\boxed{Prep. + N_{som}^1 + Prep. + N_{som}^2}$ *с (от) головы до ног* = $\boxed{N_{som}^1 + N_{som}^2}$ *tetőtől talpig*

Subgroup 3: $\boxed{Prep. + N_{som} + Prep. + N_{som}}$ *из рук в руки* = $\boxed{N_{som} + (d) + N_{som}}$ *kézről kézre (ad)*

Subgroup 4: $\boxed{N^1 + Prep. + N_{som}^2}$ *солома в голове у кого-л.* = $\boxed{N^1 + V + (d)N_{som}^2}$ *korpa (káposztalé) van vkinek a fejében*

2. Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms equivalent to a sentence can be classified into six structural types:

Structural Type 1: $\boxed{N_{som} + V}$ *глаза бегают у кого-л.* = $\boxed{V + (d) + N_{som}}$ *jár (ugrál, futkos) a szeme vkinek; azt sem tudja, hová nézzen*

Structural Type 2: $\boxed{N_{\text{som}} + \text{ne} + V}$ *рука не поднимается у кого-л. на что-л. =*
 $\boxed{\text{nem} + V + \text{Postp.} + N_{\text{som}}}$ *nem viszi rá a lélek; nem tudja rászánni magát vmire*

Structural Type 3: $\boxed{N_{\text{som}} + V + N}$ *волосы становятся дыбом у кого-л. =*
 $\boxed{(N) + V + d + N_{\text{som}}}$ *égnek áll a haja vkinek*

Structural Type 4: $\boxed{N_{\text{som}}^1 + V + \text{Prep} + N_{\text{som}}^2}$ = $\boxed{V + d + N_{\text{som}}}$ *eljár a szája vkinek*

Structural Type 5: $\boxed{N_{\text{som}}^1 + \text{Prep} + N_{\text{som}}^2 + V}$ *зуб на зуб не попадает =*
 $\boxed{V + d + N_{\text{som}}}$ *vacognak a fogai vkinek (a hidegtől v. félelmében); összeverődik a foga vkinek*

Structural Type 6: $\boxed{\text{Adj} + \text{Prep} + N_{\text{som}}}$ *остёр на язык =* $\boxed{\text{Adj} + V + (d) + N_{\text{som}}}$
jól felvágták vkinek a nyelvét; csípős (éles, hegyes) nyelve van; csípős (éles, hegyes) a nyelve vkinek

In the second section of Chapter IV (4.2) I investigate the semantic features of Russian and Hungarian somatic phraseologisms.

The semantic regularities within the phraseological system manifest themselves in the systemic organisation of the phraseological system in the semantic fields and also in the **monosemic**, **polysemic**, **synonymic**, **antonymic**, **homonymic** and **enantiosemic** relationships between phraseological units.

In the case of **monosemy**, the principle of **one notion – one name (signifier)** applies. In the case of **polysemy** and **homonymy one name is connected to several notions**, while in the case of **synonymy several names refer to one notion or a group of related notions**. In analysing the relationship between these three determinant phenomena, we find that **polysemes** and **homonymes** act in an identical manner with regard to the distribution of linguistic signs (phonetic representations), whereas **synonyms** act differently.

Polysemy and **synonymy** are inter-related phenomena. There is an integral connection between the two, a relation that plays a part in controlling the functioning of the linguistic system. **Polysemy** – a series of metaphoric and metonymic nominal transpositions – **limits the range of words (phraseological units) to a finite number**. The origin of polysemic words and phraseological units lies in the endeavour to promote **linguistic richness** and **usefulness**.

The linguistic phenomenon of **synonymy** ensures that there are a finite number of meanings, as the metaphorisation of a particular group of phraseological units leads to the formation of synonymous meanings. The synonymous meanings created this way are not entirely new – they merely denote new shades of the existing meaning, enriching it in line with the existing synonyms. Consequently, synonyms play an important role not only in shaping style, but also in ensuring the smooth functioning of the linguistic system.

The unity of the world one recognises and analyses and the various relations that interconnect different notions are all reflected in the unity of the lexis controlled by the correlative phenomena of polysemy and synonymy. **Homonymy** and **paronymy** are notions related not to the ‘signified’ but to the ‘signifier’ aspect of linguistic signs.

In the present paper, the investigation of the problems related to **intra-lingual phraseological polysemy and monosemy** are primarily based on the theory formulated by the Moscow school of semantics (Апресян 1992, 1995; Евгеньева 1966, 1966а; Шмелёв 1977; Жуков 1978, 1987; Мокиенко 1997) and the scientific results published in the Hungarian specialist literature on semantics (O. Nagy 1964, 1965, 1966, 1970; Károly 1970; Zsilka 1982; Kiefer 2000; Ruzsiczky 1985, 1998; Hajzer 1969; Татар 1992; Пете 1982; Bibok 1994; Gecső-Spannraft 1998).

Problems related to inter-lingual **phraseological homonymy, antonymy** and **enantiosemy** represent a relatively unexplored area within phraseological semantics. Consequently, the foreign literature available was not at all extensive (Эмирова 1972; Сидоренко 1966; Гольцекер 1979; Hajzer 1969; Татар 1992; Дьёрке 1991а).

Hungarian and foreign linguists have so far avoided the study of **inter-lingual phraseological synonymy, antonymy, homonymy, enantiosemy** and **paronymy** (Földes 1987а; Györke 1991а, 1992). In the present dissertation, I investigate the origins and lexical representations of **intra-lingual** and **inter-lingual phraseological homonymy** based on a rich corpus – a first in Hungarian specialist literature in this field.

For the first time in the field of Russian-Hungarian contrastive phraseology, I analyse the phenomena of **inter-lingual phraseological synonymy and antonymy** from a comparative aspect by examining Hungarian and Russian synonyms and antonyms. In the dissertation I compare the following Russian and Hungarian synonym sequences: 1. ‘**henyél, lustálkodik**’ – ‘**бездельничать**’; 2. ‘**durván leszid, megró, éles szavakkal bírál, büntetéssel fenyeget**’ – ‘**в грубой форме, в резких выражениях сделать выговор, подвергнуть резкой критике, пригрозить наказанием**’; 3. ‘**becsap, rászed, félrevezet, nevetséges helyzetbe hoz vkit**’ – ‘**обманывать кого-л., ставить в глупое, смешное положение**’; 4. ‘**meghal**’ – ‘**умирать/умереть**’.

The inter-lingual comparative analysis of synonym and antonym sequences is of great significance with respect to the formulation of the general theory of comparative semantics and the compiling of bilingual thesauri.

To date the phenomenon of **intra-lingual and inter-lingual phraseological antonymy** has not been covered by the Hungarian specialist literature on phraseology.

Antonymy is not only a linguistic category, but also a logical, conceptual category. In the present paper, the description of inter-lingual phraseological antonymy and the description and comparison of the structural and semantic groups of phraseological antonymy is primarily based on Russian specialist literature (**Аксамитов 1978; Фомина 1990; Эмирова 1972; Кунин 1982; Лендваи 1998**).

The comparative analysis of Russian and Hungarian antonym sequences related to the words ‘**молчать**’ – ‘**hallgat**’ and ‘**говорить**’ – ‘**beszél, fecseg**’ serves to illustrate the complex (polysemous, synonymous, antonymous) meaning relations and networks that constitute the intricate system of semantic relationships within the meaning relations themselves and also as part of the opposition between various meaning relations. The meaning relation between the above-mentioned phraseological synonym sequences (whose constituent parts may be both monosemic and polysemic phraseological units) is antonymous.

In the process of contamination, phraseological units undergo speech-level specific **allomorphic transformation and modification**. Some allomorphs are regular and reflect the distributional properties and valance of phraseological units, while others are considered to be irregular allomorphs, arbitrary authorial modifications.

The speech-level allomorphs of phraseological units are: **inversion, interpolation, reference, ellipsis, substitution, combinational variation and contamination**.

In exploring the speech-level **equivalence-types** of Russian and Hungarian phraseological units I relied on the theoretical and practical results published in the extensive specialist literature on translation theory. Their are numerous concepts relating to the equivalence-types of phraseological units and the methods of establishing equivalence, and the relevant terminology is diverse (**Фёдоров 1983; Комиссаров 1979; Кунин 1967, 1996; Влахов-Флорин 1980; Татар 1997; Дьёрке 1977, 2000; Фёльдеш 1983, 1985, 1987; Читалина 1975; Пете 1989; Солодухо 1977, 1982; Варкони 1984; Юхас 1996; Салаи 1987; Klaudy 1988, 1994; Hajzer 1964; Csige 1982**).

In finding the Hungarian equivalents of Russian phraseological units I applied A. V. Kuniyin’s theory, which – in the translation of English and Russian phraseological units – takes into account both the form and content of phraseologisms as well as the function they serve in sentences (**Кунин 1967, 1996**).

In accordance with the equivalence-types established by Kuniyin, in the paper I differentiate between **full and partial, and analogous phraseological equivalents**. The Hungarian equivalents of Russian phraseological units may be **one-word** equivalents, **free collocations** or a combination of the two in the form of a **periphrase**. The **metaphrasing** and

semi-metaphrasing of phraseological units are tools that are widely applied in literary translation and interpreting.

III RESEARCH PROSPECTS

Taking into consideration the practical needs pertaining to foreign language teaching along with the latest trends and results in theoretical and applied phraseological research, I see the elaboration of research in this field as follows:

1. Continued research in the field of comparative phraseology; expansion of the corpus under study; improvement of the analytical methods applied; expansion of the range of comparative analysis – to cover additional structural and semantic groups of Russian and Hungarian phraseologisms, and eventually, the complete phraseological subsystems of the two languages.
2. Application of the results of comparative analyses in language teaching and bilingual phraseological lexicography. Passive dictionaries offering limited information should give way to the development of lexical entry parameters and the compiling of an active phraseological dictionary – providing comprehensive information on phraseological units and serving educational purposes.
3. My future work in this field requires a comprehensive utilisation of the results of **general and cognitive phraseological research**. General and cognitive phraseological research is assuming an increasing intensity within the field of linguistic research. Linguists are increasingly focusing on the role of human factors in communication. It is within the interaction between man and language that man's naive linguistic worldview and the relationship between the subject and the fragment of reality is conceptualised – with this interactive relationship serving as the conduit for passing on the patterns and stereotypes of national culture from one generation to the next according to some pre-programmed code. Exploring the interaction between culture and language, examining the cultural components of phraseological units and analysing – from an areal and language-typological aspect – the communicational function of the information encoded in phraseological units is of great theoretical and practical significance in the field of linguistic culturology, and the results it yields are also highly useful in language teaching. As phraseological units represent the national cultural worldview and mentality of peoples and nations, they play an important role in the teaching of foreign languages, conveying relevant information pertaining not only to the language in which they are used but also to the country in which that particular language is spoken.

4. In the field of cognitive phraseological research, the investigation of the **inner motivation of the denotative and connotative meaning** – and the **evaluative, emotive and stylistic** properties – of phraseological units seems to be especially promising with regard to opening up new research prospects.

5. I see a need to develop additional research strategies and principles. In **Linguistics and the Theory of Science**, a monography by András Kertész, the author points out that the **principle of contradiction-freeness** plays a significant role in scientific cognition: *“Consequently, one of the essential purposes of problem solving is the development of strategies that resolve contradictions.”* (Kertész 2001:13).

IV PUBLICATIONS ON THE DISSERTATION SUBJECT

Doctoral dissertation:

1. (1977): *Некоторые особенности синтаксической структуры русских фразеологизмов (Простое предложение)*. – Bölcsészdoktori disszertáció, JATE, Szeged, 1977. 150 pages

Papers:

2. (1977): *Некоторые особенности перевода русских фразеологизмов на венгерский язык*. – In: A Juhász Gyula Tanárképző Főiskola Tudományos Közleményei, Szeged, 1977, pp. 77–86
3. (1978): *Некоторые особенности синтаксической структуры русских пословиц и поговорок*. – In: A Juhász Gyula Tanárképző Főiskola Tudományos Közleményei, Szeged, 1978, pp. 55–67
4. (1979): *A szólások és közmondások frazeológiához tartozásának kérdései*. – In: A Juhász Gyula Tanárképző Főiskola Tudományos Közleményei, Szeged, 1979, pp. 63–70
5. (1983): *Сходства и различия в семантике и культурном компоненте русских и венгерских пословиц и поговорок*. – In: A Juhász Gyula Tanárképző Főiskola Tudományos Közleményei, Szeged, 1983, pp. 9–17
6. (1985): *Способы деривации слов на базе фразеологизмов в современном русском и венгерском языках*. – In: Studia Russica, VIII, Institutum Phil. Russicae Facultatis Philosophicae in Universitate Budapestinensi De Rolando Eötvös Nominata, Budapest, 1985, pp. 85–121
7. (1986): *Исследование фразеологии иностранных языков в Венгрии (с приложением избранной библиографии по фразеологии с 1950 по 1985 гг.)* – In: A Juhász Gyula Tanárképző Főiskola Tudományos Közleményei, Szeged, 1986, pp. 29–43 (co-authored)
8. (1987): *Ungarische Beiträge zur Erforschung der Phraseologie im Deutschen. "Deutsche Sprache"* – Berlin /West/Bielefeld/ München 15/1987/1/ pp. 46–57 (co-authored)
9. (1988): *Wortbildung auf der Grundlage von Phraseologismen in der deutschen, russischen und ungarischen Sprache*. – "Zeitschrift für Phonetik Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung" – Berlin 41/1988/1, pp. 102–112 (co-authored)
10. (1989): *Основные направления и перспективы исследования фразеологии русского языка в Венгрии (с приложением избранной библиографии по изучению фразеологии в Венгрии с 1950 по 1985 гг.)* – In: "Zeitschrift für Slawistik". – Berlin 34/1989/3, pp. 427–435 (co-authored)
11. (1989a): *Особенности семантики и структуры парных слов венгерского и русского языков (К вопросу о принадлежности парных слов к фразеологизмам)*. – In: Acta Academiae Paedagogicae Szegediensis Series Linguistica, Litteraria et Aestetica, Szeged, 1989, pp. 63–68
12. (1998): *Составление многоязычных учебных фразеологических словарей с использованием ЭВМ*. – In: Сборник статей по русистике. Выпуск 1. Кафедра русского языка и литературы педагогического института им. Д. Юхаса. Сегед 1998., pp. 43–49
13. (1999): *Основные направления и результаты изучения фразеологии русского языка в Венгрии (в период с 1985 по 1998 гг.)* – In: "Studia Russica", XVII., Budapest ELTE, 1999., pp. 256–260
14. (1999a): *Сопоставительный анализ структуры и семантики фразеологизированных синтаксических конструкций русского и венгерского языков*. – In: Сборник статей

по русистике. Выпуск 2. Кафедра русского языка и литературы педагогического института им. Д. Юхаса. Сегед 1999., pp. 49–57

15. (2000): *Проблемы межъязыковой фразеологической эквивалентности (Калькирование русских ФЕ при переводе на венгерский язык.)* – In: Nyelv-Aspektus-Irodalom. SZTE JGYTF Kara, Orosz Nyelv és Irodalom Tanszéke, Szeged, 2000. pp. 123–137
16. (2002): *Явление энантиосемии в сфере русско-венгерской фразеологии.* – In: “Studia Russica”, XXV Budapest ELTE (pending publication)
17. (2002): *Ономазиологические основы контаминации русских и венгерских фразеологизмов.* – In: “Slavica Szegediensia”, Vol. IV SZTE JGYTF Kara, Orosz Nyelv és Irodalom Tanszéke – Szlovák Nyelv és Irodalom Tanszéke, Szeged (pending publication)

Reviews:

18. (1982): В. П. Фелицина, Ю.Е. Прохоров: *Русские пословицы, поговорки и крылатые выражения. Лиснгвострановедческий словарь.* Под ред. Е.М. Верещагина и В.Г. Костомарова. – In: "Módszertani Közlemények", Szeged, 1982/4, pp. 262–264
19. (1984): Р. П. Рогожникова: *Словарь сочетаний, эквивалентных слову.* – In: "Módszertani Közlemények", Szeged, 1984/5, pp. 322–323
20. (1984a): *Профессор Александр Владимирович Кунин (Библиографический указатель по фразеологии и общему языкознанию)* Отв. ред. Бушуй А.Н. – Самарканд, Самаркандский Гос. Университет им. Алишера Навои, 1984. p. 114 – In: "Studia Russica" VII., Institutum Philologicae Russicae Facultatis Philisophicae in Universitate Budapestinensi De Lorando Eötvös Nominata, 1984. pp. 357–359
21. (1985a): *Словарь паронимов русского языка.* Москва. Изд-во "Русский язык", 1984, p. 350 – In: "Studia Russica" VIII., Institutum Philologicae Russicae Facultatis Philosophicae In Universitate Budapestinensi De Lorando Eötvös Nominata, 1985. pp. 394–402
22. (1986a): О. V. Višnyakova: *Slovar' paronyimov russkogo jazyka.* – In: "Módszertani Közlemények", XXVI, 4, 1986. pp. 258–260
23. (1988a): Н. М. Шанский: *Фразеология современного русского языка. Учебное пособие для вузов, издание 3, исправленное и доп.,* Москва, Изд-во "Высшая школа", 1985, 160 p. –In: "Studia Russica" X., Institutum Philologicae Russicae Facultatis Philosophicae In Universitate Budapestinensi De Lorando Eötvös Nominata, Budapest, 1988. pp. 183–185
24. (1989b): Dr. Földes Csaba: *Magyar-orosz-német beszédfordulatok.* Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest, 1987. – In "Módszertani Közlemények", 1989/1, pp. 59–63
25. (1989c): Р. И. Яранцев, И. И. Горбачева: *Сборник упражнений по русской фразеологии. (Эмоции и чувства человека).* Под ред. Р.И. Яранцева. Изд-во Московского университета, Москва, 1985. p. 91 – In: "Studia Russica" XIII., Institutum Philologicae Russicae Facultatis Philosophicae In Universitate Budapestinensi De Lorando Eötvös Nominata, Budapest, 1989. pp. 350–356
26. (1990): R. Molnár Emma – Vass László: *Stilisztikai ábécé a magyar nyelv tanításához.* – In: "Módszertani Közlemények", Szeged. 1990. Volume XXX, Issue 2, pp.134–136
27. (1992): V. P. Zhukov – A.V. Zhukov: *Shkolnyj frazeologicheskij slovar' russkogo jazyka.*–In: "Módszertani Közlemények", 1992. Volume 32, Issue 2, pp. 111–113
28. (1992a): Földes Csaba: *Német-magyar nyelvészeti szakkifejezések szótára.* – In: "Módszertani Közlemények". 1992. Volume 32, Issue 5, pp. 291–292
29. (1994): Vőö Gabriella: *Igaz ember igazat szól. Közmondások a romániai magyar folklórból.* Kriterion Könyvkiadó, Bucuresti, 1989, p. 280 – In "Magyar Nyelvőr", 118. Volume 1994/3, pp. 359–261

30. (1994a): M. I. Dubrovin – Klaudy Kinga: *Orosz szólások és közmondások képekben*. Tankönyvkiadó, Budapest – Russzkiej jazyk, Moszkva, 1990. – In: Magyar Nyelvőr 119. Volume 1995/1, pp. 85–88
31. (1999): Р. И. Яранцев: *Русская фразеология. Словарь-справочник*. Изд. "Русский язык", 1997. – In: "Studia Russica", XVII, Вр., 1999., pp. 430–431
32. (2000): *Словарь русской фразеологии. Историко-этимологический справочник*. А. К. Бирих, В. М. Мокиенко, Л. И. Степанова. ФОЛИО ПРЕСС, Санкт-Петербург, 1998. In: Вестник Филиала Государственного Института русского языка имени А. С. Пушкина 13. Будапешт 2000., pp. 93–98

Theses of papers presented at conferences:

33. (1977a): *Место и роль фразеологии в системе обучения русскому языку как иностранному*. Тезисы докладов II научно-методической конференции русистов Чонградской области. В сб.: "Вопросы методики преподавания русского языка и литературы". 31 мая 1977. pp. 45–47
34. (1978a): *Работа над фразеологией как средство повышения интереса студентов к изучению русского языка*. В сб.: "Роль учителя в процессе обучения русскому языку. Тезисы докладов научно-методической конференции преподавателей русского языка областей Чонград, Бекеш и Бач. 21 февраля 1978 г. pp. 11–12
35. (1979a): *Методика работы над устойчивыми словосочетаниями на занятиях по развитию речи в пединститутах*. Тезисы докладов научно-методической конференции МАПРЯЛ. В сб.: "Коммуникативная направленность и использование технических средств в обучении русскому языку". Будапешт, 1979, pp. 22–23
36. (1979b): *Работа над синонимами на занятиях по развитию речи как средствоповышения коммуникативной способности студентов*. Тезисы докладов научно-методической конференции МАПРЯЛ. В сб.: "Коммуникативная направленность и использование технических средств в обучении русскому языку". Будапешт, 1979, pp. 66–67 (co-authored)
37. (1979c): *Изучение фразеологии на уроках развития речи как средство расширения словарного запаса студентов*. Тезисы докладов и сообщений IV-ого Международного конгресса МАПРЯЛ, Берлин, 1979, pp. 90–91
38. (1982a): *Особенности раскрытия структурно-семантических сходств и различий в составе русских и венгерских паремий при комментировании культурного фона русских пословиц и поговорок*. Тезисы докладов и сообщений V-ого Международного конгресса МАПРЯЛ, Прага, 1982, p. 287
39. (1985b): *Особенности словообразования на базе фразеологизмов в современном русском и венгерском языках*. В сб.: "Научные традиции и новые направления в преподавании русского языка и литературы". Тезисы докладов и сообщений региональной конференции МАПРЯЛ. Сегед, 1985, pp. 4–5
40. (1986a): *Особенности словообразования на базе фразеологизмов в современном русском и венгерском языках*. В сб. VI-ого Международного конгресса МАПРЯЛ: "Современная лингвистическая теория и ее применение в практике обучения русскому языку". Будапешт, 1986, pp. 67–68
41. (1990a): *Составление двуязычного русско-венгерского учебного фразеологического словаря с использованием ЭВМ*. В сб.: "Русский язык и литература в общении народов мира: Проблемы функционирования и преподавания". Тезисы докладов и сообщений VII-ого Международного конгресса МАПРЯЛ. Москва, 1990, I том, pp. 315–316
42. (1991): *Словообразование на базе ФЕ в русском и венгерском языках*. В сб.: "Соотношение синхронии и диахронии в языковой эволюции". Тезисы докладов

Всесоюзной научной конференции Москва – Ужгород, 23–25 октября 1991 г., pp. 149–151

43. (1991a): *Межъязыковая фразеологическая омонимия в сфере русско-венгерской фразеологии*. – In: Első Magyar Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Konferencia, I, Nyíregyháza, May 1991, 3–4, pp. 382–385
44. (1991b): *Отражение фразеологической полисемии и омонии в русско-венгерских фразеологических словарях*. – In: Nemzetközi Szlavisztikai Napok IV, Ed.: Károly Gadányi, Szombathely, 1991, pp. 391–397
45. (1992): *Псевдоэквивалентные фразеологизмы в составе русской и венгерской фразеологии*. – In: 2. Mezinárodná Frazeologická Konferencia Frazeologia Vo Vychove, Vede a Kulture. (2nd International Conference on Phraseology. Phraseology in Education, Culture and Science.) Nyitra, Sept. 14–16, 1992, p. 20
46. (1998): *Сопоставительный анализ омонимических фразеологизмов в русском и венгерском языках*. В сб.: Тезисы докладов и сообщений Международной Конференции МАПРЯЛ "Общие проблемы русистики и преподавание русского языка и литературы в финно-угорской аудитории". г. Сыктывкар (Россия), 3–6 июля 1998 г., pp. 33–34
47. (1998a): *Szólás- és közmondáskutatók fóruma*. – In: NYELV*INFO A nyelvtanárok lapja. Budapest, 1998/1, pp. 24–27
48. (1999): *Сопоставительный анализ структуры и семантики фразеологизированных синтаксических конструкций русского и венгерского языков*. – In: "Русский язык, литература и культура на рубеже веков I, Тезисы докладов и сообщений IX. Международного Конгресса МАПРЯЛ, Братислава, 1999., p. 69
49. (2002): *Az orosz és a magyar paronimikus frazeológiai egységek szerkezeti, szemantikai egybevető vizsgálata*. – XII. Magyar Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Kongresszus: "Nyelvek és kultúrák találkozása", Szeged (pending publication)

Editor:

50. (1999): *Сборник статей по русистике*. Выпуск 2. Кафедра русского языка и литературы педагогического института им. Д. Юхаса. Сегед 1999.
51. (2000): *Nyelv – aspektus – irodalom* Köszöntő könyv Krékits József 70. születésnapjára. Ed.: Györke Zoltán. SZTE JGYTF Kara, Szeged 2000.
52. (2002): "Slavica Szegediensia", Vol. IV (Eds.: Zoltán Györke and Katalin Marúzsne Sebó) SZTE JGYTF Kara, Orosz Nyelv és Irodalom Tanszéke – Szlovák Nyelv és Irodalom Tanszéke, Szeged (pending publication)