

**MOLDOVA STATE UNIVERSITY
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND EDUCATION**

**With manuscript title
CZU: 81`38`42=00(043)**

BANTEA MAGDALINA

**SOMATIC SYMBOL:
SEMANTIC-FUNCTIONAL AND COMPARATIVE ASPECTS
(Based on the corpus of French, English, Italian and Romanian
languages)**

621.06 – TEXT THEORY, DISCOURSE ANALYSIS, STYLISTICS

Summary of the doctoral thesis in philology

CHISINAU 2023

The thesis was developed within the Doctoral School of Humanities
of the Moldova State University.

Scientific advisor:

HANGANU Aurelia, Dr. habil. in philology, associate professor

Composition of the Ph.D. Committee:

President – DRUTA Inga, Dr. habil. in philology, associate researcher

PhD supervisor – HANGANU Aurelia, Dr. habil. in philology, associate professor

Referent 1 – MINCU Eugenia, Dr. habil. in philology, associate professor

Referent 2 – LACUSTA Elena, Ph.D. in philology, associate professor

Referee 3 – CEPRAGA Lucia, Ph.D. in philology, associate professor

Scientific secretary – DEMENTIEVA Diana, PhD in philology.

The defence will take place on 27.11.2023 at 14:00, in the public meeting of the Doctoral
Committee of the Doctoral School of Humanities and Education of the Moldova State
University, location: auditorium nr.18, Moldova State University (Chisinau, 3/2 Academiei str.)

The doctoral thesis and the summary can be consulted at the National Library of the Republic of
Moldova, the library of the Moldova State University and on the ANACEC website
(www.cnaa.md).

The summary was sent on _____

Author:

Bantea Magdalena_____

Scientific advisor:

Hanganu Aurelia

Doctor Habilitatus, associate professor_____

© BANTEA MAGDALINA - 2023

CONTENT

1. CONCEPTUAL MARKINGS OF THE RESEARCH.....	4
2. CONTENT OF THE THESIS.....	12
3. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	25
4. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	28
5. LIST OF SCIENTIFIC PAPERS ON THE THEME OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS...31	
6. ANNOTATION (in English, Romanian, Russian).....	33

CONCEPTUAL MARKINGS OF THE RESEARCH

Actuality and importance of the problem addressed. The structuralist paradigm, which dominated a good part of the 20th century (in which philosophy was approached through the prism of positivism, psychology – through behaviorism, sociology was marked by functionalism, and linguistics was studied through functional semantics), became at a given moment exhaustive, a fact that generated its transformation into anthropocentric paradigm. This led to the reconsideration of certain linguistic phenomena and concepts from a cognitivist, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic and intercultural perspectives, towards the creation of new spaces for the valorization of information in a pragmatic and constructivist manner. Somatic symbology, being tangent to several sciences such as: sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, semiopragmatics, stylistics, hermeneutics, poetics, philosophy, psychology, has a dynamic character and is not exempt from transformation and expansion due to diachronic and synchronic changes that take place in historical contexts, cultural, intercultural and social, which is why the contrastive-comparative study of semantic-functional aspects of the somatic symbol through constitutive elements was initiated.

The research of visible and invisible mental processes that are externalized both verbally and non-verbally, voluntarily or involuntarily, reflected by the semantic-functional aspects of somatic symbols, represents the primary goal of somatic symbology.

The topicality of this theme is determined by the need to identify, distinguish and elucidate the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* that are interpreted contrary to the rigors established by the dictionary due to dynamism, linguistic relativity, certain external decision-making factors, which influence the valence and weight of the *somatic symbol*, offering an ambiguous and multidimensional image. There are studied in detail: the etymology and historical course of the *symbol* concept in a philosophical, linguistic, sociolinguistic and cognitivist approaches, in which the semantic-functional evolution of the *symbol* is analyzed and its conceptual dimensions are delimited through the prism of definitions and typologies aimed at: the individualization and framing of the *symbol*, and its semantic-functional aspects in the view of modern and contemporary scholars. This fact motivates us to deduce and establish: a) definitions of the *somatic symbol*; b) the way of forming meanings and somatic symbolic functions in syntagmatic and paradigmatic circumstances, in sociocultural and intercultural dimensions, thus performing the contrastive-comparative and semantic-functional study of the *somatic symbol*, in order to facilitate its individualization in the situational framework.

The need for this study is motivated by the interest in knowing the semantic-functional specificity of the *somatic symbol*, as well as the complex nature of the symbolic phenomenon

that involves a multidimensional exegesis being the center of scientific interests common to several disciplines like: psychology, philosophy, sociolinguistics, ethno-linguistics, pragmatics semantics, poetics, hermeneutics, aesthetics and literature.

The elucidation of ambiguities and the clarification of symbolic connotations through the prism of semantic-functional aspects, from sociolinguistic and cognitive-pragmatic perspectives, expand the spectrum of visions, enrich the sphere of knowledge and allow the creation of: clear, well-defined, structured, categorized and typed concepts about the *somatic symbol*, which mitigates the rigors set by dictionaries and expands the field of knowledge.

Description of the situation in the field of research. In the investigative process of our scientific research, the researches of the following scientists were useful to us: Hippocrates, Aristotle, St. Augustine, S. State, D. Cojanu, I. Guțu, G. Vignato, J. Tresidder, H. de Saint-Victor, F. Hegel, H. Morier, C. Pont-Humbert, Ph. Seringe, A. Nosedar, J.E. Cirlot, P. Ricoeur, E. Cassirer, N. Chomsky, E. Sapir, B. Whorf, I. Kant, K. Bühler, Tz. Todorov, U. Eco, showed us the etymological and philosophical course of the symbol; F. de Saussure, D. Zemmour, L. Hjelmslev, H. Wald, T. Sebeok, T. Vianu, D. Mcquail, V. Vinogradov, E. Parpală-Afana, I. Coteanu, E. Coșeriu, F. de Saussure, J. Klinkenberg, Ch. Peirce, F. Rastier, A. Losev, E. Shelestyuk, E. Uzențova, I. Evseev, A. Graur, H. J. Sandkühler, I. Guțu, V. Lifari, D. Melenciuc, P. Miclău, M. Mancaș, G. Colțun, I. Condrea, L. Zbanț, G. Molinié, E. Granjon, E. Engelberg, B. Pottier, R. Jakobson, N. Corlăteanu, I. Melniciuc inspired us definitions and characteristics of the *symbol* from a linguistic, sociolinguistic and literary-artistic perspective; S. Freud, C.G. Jung, J. Jacobi, J. Chevalier, M. Eliade, N. Chomsky, R. Firth, L.W. Barsalou, A. Bernstein, D. Chandler, J. S. DeLoache, S. Goldin-Meadow & D. McNeill, G. Lakoff & M. Johnson, V. Lifari, I. Mathé, A. Newell, R. Ornstein, L. Talmy, A. Wierzbicka highlighted the psycholinguistic and cognitive-pragmatic course of the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* in various associative circumstances. In highlighting the meanings and functions of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic *somatic symbol*, the studies of scholars: I. Guțu, G. Colțun, A. Birtalan, G. Cincilei, I. Evseev, A. Sobrero, E. Lăcustă, A. Gherasim, A. Reboul, J. Moeschler, L. Raciula, G. Gheorghe, F. Montreynaud, E. Gorunescu, A. Rey, J. Chevalier, V. Ilinca, I. Manoli were useful to us.

The purpose proposed in this work is to highlight the semantic-functional specificity of conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic *somatic symbols*, through the lens of several subdivisions of knowledge mentioned in the article *Semantic-functional aspects of the somatic symbol in the European poetic text*: 1. the structural framework of the *symbol somatic*: *symbol-concept*, *symbol-sentence*, *symbol-phraseological unit*, *symbol-sentence*, *symbol-image*, *symbol-text*, *symbol-intertext*, *symbol-paradigm*; 2. the situational segment of the *symbol* that refers to

the deictic information of the constituent element; 3. the disciplinary framework of the *symbol* aimed at the conceptualization of the *somatic symbol* in various disciplines; 4. the functional aspect of the *somatic symbol* which represents its role in the situational framework and conforms to the statutory framework of the *somatic symbol*; 5. the componential framework of the *somatic symbol* aimed at semantic analysis based on the decomposition of meanings; 6. the formal segment that refers to the systemic categories of the *somatic symbol*: a) simple/complex, b) denotative/connotative, c) verbal/non-verbal, d) abstract/concrete, e) positive/negative/neutral, f) individual/universal 7. the expression framework of the *somatic symbol* that reflects the style and manner of expression of the *somatic symbol*; 8. the cultural dimension of the *somatic symbol* aimed at its sociolinguistic conceptualization in order to individualize the sociocultural imagery; 9. the intercultural segment of the *somatic symbol* that reflects its contrastive-comparative evidence at the intercultural level that appear as a result of the externalization of cultural symbolic meanings and functions (French, English, Italian, Romanian) in order to identify and frame the *somatic symbol* (universal (congenital/ acquired)/individual (sociocultural/singular); 10. the cognitivist-pragmatic subdivision of the *somatic symbol* which highlights the psycholinguistic influence of the symbolic expression, in order to establish the contact, interest and imagination of the receiver, through the prism of the constitutive elements, in which the conceptual metaphor represents the element of basis and favors the decoding of the symbolic meaning; 11. the intensity framework of the *somatic symbol* that reveals its pragmatic-semantic evidence through the constitutive-situational prism [14, p. 339], in order to facilitate its individualization in various cultural and intercultural communication situations.

Achieving the goal required establishing the following **scientific objectives**:

- to present the evolutionary framework of the *symbol* from the: philosophical, anthropological, linguistic, sociolinguistic and cognitivist-pragmatic perspectives;
- to highlight the difference between sign and *symbol*;
- to define the *somatic symbol* based on the scientific approaches of scientists;
- to identify the semantic and functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* through the prism of the constitutive elements;
- specify the identity of the *symbol* in the: biblical, paroemic, linguostylistic and sociolinguistic domains;
- to present and compare the frequency of *somatic symbols* at the syntagmatic and paradigmatic level in intercultural interaction;
- to identify the similarities and differences of intercultural language in phraseological-somatic circumstances;

- to specify the impact of the erroneous reception of the message at the intercultural level and to determine certain consequences thereof;
- to calculate contrastive-comparative statistics regarding the *somatic symbol* and analyze their results;
- generalize the results of the thesis and recommend directions for future scientific research.

Research hypotheses:

1. The *somatic symbol* is characterized by universality and semantic-functional diversity depending on several factors that outline the meanings and functions of the *somatic symbol*.
2. The same *somatic symbol* in different linguistic associative circumstances (*symbol-concept*, *symbol-syntax*, *symbol-phraseological unit*, *symbol-sentence*, *symbol-image*, *symbol-text*, *symbol-hypertext*, *symbol-intertext*, *symbol-paradigm*) assimilates differentiated semantic-functional aspects, conforming to: sciocultural, cognitivist, pragmasemantic and linguostylistic imageries.
3. The functions of the *somatic symbol*, which represent its role in the situational-associative framework, comply with the statutory and disciplinary framework of the *somatic symbol*.
4. The component framework of the *somatic symbol* aimed at the semantic analysis based on the decomposition of meanings manifests both universality and intercultural diversity through the prism of the acquired conceptual metaphor.
5. Within different types of text, the *somatic symbol* expresses differential weight.

The research of the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic level (based on the corpus of the French, English, Italian and Romanian languages) requires the following study methods:

The comparative-historical analysis of the *symbol* allows us to follow the evolution of the notion from diachronic and synchronic perspectives in order to clarify and delimit its importance in the European space, through French, English, Italian and Romanian languages.

The method of deduction applied in the process of extracting the definitions of the *somatic symbol* facilitates the creation of definitions directly aimed at the *somatic symbol*.

The induction method used in this investigation represents a form of reasoning that makes the transition from particular to general, from cultural to intercultural/universal, thus expanding the spectrum of action from the conceptual *somatic symbol* to the syntagmatic and paradigmatic *somatic symbol*.

The semasiological analysis "science des significations" [18, p. 70] studies the *symbol* through the prism of its meanings.

The onomasiological analysis "science des désignations" [Ibidem] studies the possibilities of expressing the *symbol*, starting from the concept, in one or more languages, given the fact that, as a translinguistic entity, it does not depend on the structure of languages.

Semantic or componential analysis helps us to study the semantic content of the *somatic symbol* from the lexicographic point of view from different perspectives and its semantic weight through the prism of the constituent elements at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels. The given analysis is based on the correlation between hyperonyms and hyponyms, which helps us determine the semantic-functional fields of *somatic symbols*.

The functional analysis of the *somatic symbol* highlights the role of its distinctive elements, through the prism of functional valences at conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels; it clarifies, distinguishes and orders the functional aspects of the *somatic symbol*, according to certain internal and external factors that give it a plurivalent dimension with polyfunctional features.

The distributional analysis is based on the concept of the distribution of the surroundings in which the *somatic symbol* can appear and serves to establish the sum of the occurrences in which each *somatic symbol* is attested.

The contrastive analysis of the semantic-functional aspects of the *symbol* within intercultural interactions, at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic level, highlights the various possibilities of externalizing the symbolic meanings and functions, and establishes the authenticity of the *symbol* at the level of various cultures.

The cognitivist method studies the processes of mental organization of identification, assimilation, storage and externalization of information through the prism of cognitive linguistics, which is oriented towards the coding and transformation of information from a conceptual-pragmatic perspective in order to identify the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* in the cultural and intercultural framework.

The statistical methods aims at the *somatic symbol* phenomenon from a quantitative point of view, with the aim of elaborating laws that structure and frame this concept at a scientific, sociocultural and intercultural level.

The corpus of this research was made up of a selection of about 3400 somatic conceptual units, related to 11 *somatic symbols*: *heart, head, hair, face, mouth, tongue, nose, eye, ear, hand, foot*. The *somatic symbols* were extracted, based on the criterion of frequency and the difficulty of contrastive-comparative interpretation, from: a) the symbology and explanatory dictionaries of the languages discussed; b) Psalter and the Gospel of the Bible; c) textbooks and paroemic dictionaries. The predefined conventional status of *somatic symbols* at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic level allowed the correct, precise and conclusive assessment of

their semantic-functional aspects in the sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic framework, as well as the establishment of the *somatic symbol* on the value axis of the sociocultural and cognitive-pragmatic imagery. Somatic phraseological expressions and proverbs excellently reflected the originality of each individual culture, distinguished the diversity of the sociocultural imagery and highlighted the multifunctional universality of the *somatic symbol* at the intercultural level, a fact that facilitated the development of a model for appreciating the multifunctionality of the somatic symbol from a cultural, linguistics, sociolinguistics and cognitivist-pragmatic perspectives.

The scientific novelty and originality of the research consists in approaching the *somatic symbol* from the perspective of the cognitivist-pragmatic philosophy of language in the contrastive-comparative study that highlights numerous possibilities of externalizing the cognitivist-semantic meanings of the *somatic symbol* through the prism of the functional-pragmatic aspects at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic level, based on the corpus of the English, French, Italian and Romanian languages, in order to establish the multifunctionality of the *somatic symbol* within the semantic-functional cultural and pluricultural interpretations. This facilitates the individualization of cognitive-pragmatic, sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic similarities and differences, allows the choice of an efficient semantic-functional code of intercultural communication through the prism of the sociocultural imagery and prevents the erroneous reception of the symbolic message at the contrastive-comparative level. The scientific study identifies the similarities and differences of the sociocultural imagery of these four cultures, goes through the process of identification, understanding, assimilation and effect of the somatic symbol through the prism of:

1. Structural status: a) concept-symbol; b) title-symbol; c) phrase-symbol; d) phrase-symbol; e) image-symbol; f) paradigm-symbol.
2. Systemic categories: a) simple/complex; b) denotative/connotative; c) verbal/non-verbal; d) abstract/concrete; e) positive/negative/neutral; f) active/passive gesture; g) universal/individual; h) constructive/destructive; i) attenuated/matched/accentuated semantic intensity; j) congenital/acquired.
3. a) Semantic conceptual composition highlighted by the lexicography of the *somatic symbol*;
b) semantic composition reflected by the "referential categories: size, color, shape, quantity, quality, functionality, modality state" [26, p. 59-63] identified by the philologist I. Guțu;
c) textual or image semantic composition, individualized through the prism of circumstantial constituent elements;
d) syntagmatic and paradigmatic semantic composition that highlights the sum of occurrences in which the reference *symbol* is attested;
4. Functions:

- a) of the conceptual *symbol*: informative, expressive, orientative, enantiosemic, cognitive and pragmatic;
- b) of the syntagmatic *symbol*: seat of feelings, state of mind, state of emotional affect, human characteristic, action carried out in detail, favorable action, deictic value, dimensional or metric value, delimiting value, pejorative value, appreciative value, result of human activity, social phenomenon, abstract notion related to different aspects of human existence, ethical, aesthetic and philosophical category, abstract or concrete image/landscape, proper name, relief form, somatism, object, instrument or tool, plant name or animal, name of food, odd body, non-existent amount, large amount of objects;
- c) of the *symbol*-image through stylistic expressions: metonymy, synecdoche, metaphor, allusion, allegory, personification, etc.;
- d) of the paradigm symbol that highlights all functions that referential *somatic symbol* can fulfill.

The important scientific problem solved in the field of investigation

The semantic-functional investigative study identified the *somatic symbol* through the prism of several segments of knowledge and demonstrated: 1) the conceptual, syntagmatic, paradigmatic and disciplinary *somatic symbolic* diversity highlighted via semantic and functional reference contents; 2) the intercultural *somatic symbolic* diversity, highlighted through sociocultural imagery reflected by the individualized conceptual metaphor, which constitutes the basic element that contributes to the decoding of the symbolic meaning. 3) generative somatic symbolic universality that reflects symbolic evidence with the help of innate traits, common to all nations due to the structure of the human body.

The theoretical importance of the work lies in the following:

- presentation of the evolutionary framework of the *symbol* from the: philosophical, anthropological, linguistic, sociolinguistic and cognitivist-pragmatic perspectives;
- highlighting the difference between sign and *symbol*;
- defining the *somatic symbol* based on the scientific approaches of scientists;
- identifying the semantic and functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* through the prism of the constitutive elements;
- specifying the identity of the *symbol* in the: biblical, paroemic, linguostylistic and sociolinguistic domains;
- presenting and comparing the frequency of *somatic symbols* at the syntagmatic and paradigmatic level in intercultural interaction;
- identifying the similarities and differences of intercultural language in phraseological-somatic circumstances;

- specifying the impact of the erroneous reception of the message at the intercultural level and determining certain consequences thereof;
- calculation of contrastive-comparative statistics regarding the *somatic symbol* and analysis of their results;
- generalizing the results of the thesis and recommending directions for future scientific research.

Main scientific results submitted for support:

1. The application of the methodological-interpretive model of appreciation of the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* contributes to its identification and conceptual framing on the: cognitivist-pragmatic, sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic axes and constitutes an advantage in the efficiency of delimiting the weight of the *somatic symbol* in the cultural and intercultural framework.
2. The disciplinary dimension of the *somatic symbol* that aims at its dimensional conceptualization, illustrates universalized character, at the intercultural level and differentiated sociocultural imagery, through the prism of the objects of study.
3. The intercultural segment of the *somatic symbol* that reflects its contrastive-comparative evidence that appears as a result of the externalization of cultural symbolic meanings and functions (French, English, Italian and Romanian), identifies both the universality of the *somatic symbol* and its individuality, at the sociolinguistic level from a cognitivist-pragmatic perspective.
4. The cultural-historical subdivision of the *somatic symbol* manifests a differentiated weight at the intercultural level, depending on the historical transformations that are attested in various periods.

The theoretical significance and the applied value of the work are determined by the cultural and intercultural approaches of the *somatic symbol* at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic level. The application of the methodological-interpretive model of appreciation of the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* contributes to its identification and conceptual framing on the cognitivist-pragmatic, sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic axes and constitutes an advantage in streamlining the weighting of the *somatic symbol* in the cultural and intercultural framework.

Summary of the sections of the thesis. The thesis contains the following sections: annotation (in Romanian, English and Russian), introduction, three chapters, conclusions and recommendations, bibliography of 203 titles and 4 appendices.

Key words: *symbol*, *somatic symbol*, component-semantic framework, functions, situational segment, phraseological *somatic symbol*, sociocultural imagery, contrastive-comparative framework, culturality, interculturality, universality, diversity, multifunctionality.

CONTENT OF THE THESIS

In the Introduction, is carried out the synthesis of the thesis, which reflects the actuality and importance of the problem addressed, the purpose and scientific objectives of the research, the investigative methodology that involves both analytical (qualitative) and synthetic (quantitative) methods, the description of the object of study and the corpus containing about 3400 somatic symbolic units related to 11 *symbols* (*heart, head, hair, face, mouth, tongue, nose, eye, ear, hand, foot*). There are briefly presented: the scientific novelty and originality of the research, the important scientific problem solved in the field of investigation, the theoretical significance and the applied value of the work. Also are mentioned the approvals of the research results, the summary of the thesis sections and the possibility of implementing the scientific results.

Chapter 1, The *Symbol*: Philosophical, Anthropological, Linguistic and Cognitivist Approaches, represents the evolutionary framework of the *symbol*, its definitions and typologies, based on the scientific studies of the researchers. Philosophical, anthropological, linguistic and cognitivist approaches of scholars delimit conceptually the notion of *symbol* through the prism of typologies and their visions.

”The history of the origin of the *symbol* evokes the idea of restoring unity, of reintegration, of validating an alliance” [17, p.15], mentions D. Cojanu. Thus, the first function of the *symbol* designated the reconstitution of a unit, appropriating the semes: [+reintegration], [+recovery] and [+alliance]. For example, the archetype of the value of peace of ancient origin finds a symbolic setting in the dove with the olive branch that chose the helmet of the god Mars (the god of war) to nest in, thus prolonging the state of peace and preventing the god from fulfilling his function. We find that the first ways of cultural or intercultural communication were with the help of different signs, which later, by convention, became *symbols* or symbolizing signs and were used in different relationships. So, the notion of *symbol* represented a connection of two dimensions, through the prism of certain common semes, in order to create an archetypal symbolic value, therefore sacred, which reflects universalized meaning.

Definitions of the *symbol* from the philosophical perspective of scholars: I. Kant, F. Hegel, E. Cassirer, P. Ricoeur, Tz. Todorov, H. Morier, U. Eco, S. Freud, J. Piaget, J. Chevalier, C.G. Jung, M. Eliade offers interpretative breadth, contributes to the elucidation of the sociocultural, psycholinguistic and cognitivist-pragmatic imagery through the prism of several subdivisions of knowledge, which fix the evolutionary-historical position of society on this notion.

The Swiss psychologist and philosopher J. Piaget (1896-1980) distinguishes two types of symbols: 1) **conscious** (symbolic drawings by which censorship must be deceived); 2) **unconscious** (the content of which is unknown to the subject, who uses them, for example, in a dream).

E. Fromm (1900-1980), psychoanalyst and philosopher who explored the interaction between psychology and society, indicates three categories of symbols: "1. **conventional**, 2. **accidental** and 3. **Universal**" [apud 27, p. 100], thus assigning the accidental *symbol* to the individual imagery and, respectively, the others - to the sociocultural imagery.

The Romanian philosopher and historian of religions M. Eliade (1907-1986) distinguishes two categories of *symbols* related to the dogmatic and cultic phenomenon [22, p. 9]: 1. the **sacred symbol**, highlighted via dogmatic, conventional elements, and 2. the **profane symbol** which refers to: secular, conventional and non-conventional *symbols*, adopted following a cognitivist-pragmatic study of symbolic constituent elements. Thus, the first category of *symbols* designates the cultic, religious *symbol*, which appropriates historical records, related to the knowledge of the world, while the second category of *symbol* refers to the intuitive *symbol*, adopted through the prism of its semantic-functional elements.

The pluriaspectuality, multidimension and multifunctionality of the *symbol* require an extensive and complex study in many sciences, which consider this notion as a reference element, to constitute, encompass or generalize certain: concepts, ideas or statistics.

One of the subdivisions of cultural anthropology is **symbolic anthropology**, which studies and interprets the complex meanings of *symbols* at social, cultural, and cross-cultural levels. The foundations of symbolic anthropology are constituted by Aristotelian principles, which reflect the role of sociocultural metaphor in symbolic representations. "The highlighting of cultural *symbols* expressed at the level of the concrete act of speech, are able to reflect specific sociocultural values and coordinates" [30, p. 46] mentions the researcher V. Negrea. For example, the cultural *symbol* of greeting is reflected through the prism of several distinctive elements, in various cultures, in various historical periods and in various speech styles. So, we understand that **sociocultural somatic symbology** is essential in the formation of society and the personality of individuals, thus facilitating contact, communication and the interpenetration of cultures.

Modern and contemporary researchers such as J. Gumpez, D. Hymes, I. Condrea, P. Bourdieu, E. Coşeriu, U. Eco, T. Vianu, A. Losev, L. Hjelmslev, F. de Saussure, Ch. S. Peirce, F. Rastier, B. Pottier or J. M. Klinkenberg explore ideological, sociocultural, linguistic aspects of society and the way in which the *symbol* is reflected through the prism of

language as a social phenomenon, its ethnic character, representations and social essence, the sociocultural imagery and the cognitivist conceptualization pragmatic.

The Romanian esthetician, historian and literary critic T. Vianu (1898-1964) distinguishes **linguistic** and **artistic symbols**: "Linguistic symbols signify a precise notion and therefore have a closed and limited perspective, while art symbols have an open and unlimited, as evidenced by their historical life and the possibility of their varied reception in different successive eras" [33, p. 81]. Thus, we liken linguistic *symbols* to operational or systemic ones, because they are stipulated by a certain convention and indicate a limited number of semes, on the other hand, artistic or poetic *symbols* can be received by each interlocutor through the prism of knowledge they possess regarding this term. Therefore, symbols can be expressed in denotative or connotative, individualized or traditional forms, conditioned by certain aspects imposed by ethnicity, language, discipline or social category.

Contemporary researchers with a literary-artistic predilection distinguish several types of **poetic symbol**: 1. **Biblical symbols** occupy an important place in symbology, due to the fact that all writers resorted to biblical motifs to express their thoughts. They can be both conventional and arbitrarily motivated. 2. "**Mythological** or bookish *symbols*, unlike biblical and religious symbols, no longer have a (partial) unitary meaning, because the meaning of each one is strictly dependent on the meaning and primary features of the figure, incident or mythological situation evoked; the semantic field of "disappeared worlds and civilizations" obviously predominates" [28, p. 61, 162]. 3. **Folkloric symbols** represent the sociocultural image of the ethnicity reflected through the prism of traditional customs, rites and beliefs.

The symbol represents a conventional notion in all languages, and not an arbitrary one like the sign, therefore, the sign meaning assigned to the *symbol* in the lexicographic dictionaries is a figurative one. The so-called sign, in fact, represents a sign of the sign, in the view of the linguists V. Vinogradov, A. Losev and O. Necrasova [apud 26, p. 51], code of the code [4, p. 224], in the view of the researcher U. Eco, double sign, in the conception of the scholar E. Parpală-Afana [31, p. 70], from which arbitrariness is excluded, this being under the auspices of a convention that can manifest itself in isolation, unlike a sign that, even if adopted arbitrarily, it appears in a functional and well-structured linguistic system in which signs correlate with each other and are interdependent. So both the *symbol* and the sign follow the principles of a convention, while the *symbol* obeys a surface conventional system, its arbitrariness being visible in depth, the sign that appears on the surface as an arbitrary one, operates in a well-organized conventional system.

The founder of the school of ethnology, the famous anthropologist E. Sapir (1884-1939) "raised the issue of the relationship between language and thought, insists on the indissoluble

link between these two phenomena and highlights the role of language in the formation and crystallization of ideas: the tool makes the product possible, and the product perfects the tool” [25, p. 163]. Therefore, language and thought are interdependent; thought is the important mechanism that provides expression through language and language, in turn, contributes to the refinement of thought.

”Cognitive models are used from referential or metonymic reasoning” emphasizes the scholar G. Lakoff [5, p. 13]. In this context we can liken cognitive models to symbolic models or codes, which are formed by virtue of a referential and pragmatic correspondence.

According to the semiotician D. Chandler (1952) “The convention of codes represents a social dimension in semiotics. Codes do not represent simple communicative conventions but rather some procedural systems of conventions that operate in certain fields” [2, p. 149]. Thus, the code represents a set of familiar practices for users operating within social life and society itself depends on the existence of so-called symbolic meaning systems. For example, the operational *symbol* P in different disciplines will be identified differently: a. linguistic perspective: capital letter interpreted differently in the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets; b. mathematical perspective: perimeter; c. chemical perspective: phosphorus; d. administrative perspective: parking. Speaking of gestural symbology, we also identify numerous differences, both at an interdisciplinary level (in underwater sports the crossed hands located at chest level symbolize [-discomfort], while the same gesture in cultic religion symbology symbolizes [+ the sign of the cross] and [+ submission] that Christians adopt in communion), as well as cross-culturally (eye contact is welcome in Romanic cultures during a communication, while Asian cultures avoid looking at each other during conversations). Thus, we conclude that the science of symbology meets, in turn, a set of predetermined codes, represented by certain: cultures, generations, religions, genders, social levels, disciplines, to which it conforms.

The science that studies the *symbol* in general and the *somatic symbol*, respectively, is a relatively new science, therefore, the division of the *somatic symbol* has been approached by scholars superficially. So, we applied the deduction method in defining this type of *symbol* using the definitions of the *symbol* in general, provided by philosophers, anthropologists, linguists, sociolinguists, cognitivists and psycholinguists such as: Hippocrates, P. Ricoeur, H. Morier, B. Pottier, C. Cardia, U. Eco, I. Coteanu, E. Parpală-Afana, I. Guțu, M. Mancaș, E. Coșeriu, Ch. Peirce, R. Firth, R. Wellek and A. Warren, C.G. Jung, J. Chevalier and I came to the conclusion that the evolutionary process of transfiguration and interpretation of the sociocultural *somatic symbol* is continuous, the: ethno-linguistic, sociolinguistic and cognitivist-pragmatic imageries contributing to amplification or simplification of its constitutive meanings and functions.

In our opinion, from a psycholinguistic perspective, the *somatic symbol* represents a complex image, which brings together at least five somatic constituents related to: 1. the object frame that reflects the formal symbolic somatic image; 2. the conceptual-semantic segment aimed at the expression of somatic semantic contents; 3. the visual-deictic dimension that refers to the situational image of the constitutive somatic elements; 4. the kinesthetic framework that frames passive or active gesture; and 5. the prosodic framework that refers to the acoustic elements of the *somatic symbol*.

Examining the ideologies of contemporary researchers: N. Corlăteanu and I. Melniciuc [16, p. 42-44], V. Bahnaru [15, p. 121-122], S. Maznic [29, p. 101-103], U. Eco [4, p. 237], L.W. Barsalou [1, p. 583-588] regarding the semantic evolution of the linguistic sign and the cognitivist-pragmatic characteristics of the *symbol*, we find that the processes of semantic evolution of *somatic symbols* are similar to the trends of semantic evolution of the linguistic sign, here being reinterpreted certain dominant semes, in order to obtain symbolic meanings. In this sense, we develop a similar approach in the **semantic evolution of the somatic symbol**, which manifests itself through several formation techniques (expansion, contraction, descent, ascent, obsolescence, semantic polarization, replacement, different conceptualization, universalization). It should be mentioned that the evolution of the *somatic symbol* is carried out on the basis of variationist sociolinguistics according to the conception of researchers C. Frîncu and Ch. Touratier [23, p. 114], [11, p. 68-69] and functional linguistics according to the linguist E. Coșeriu [21, p. 263-274]: "diachronic variation (e.g. the ancient language of the chroniclers is different from today's), diatopic variation (spatial and regional variants, e.g. dialects, dialects), diastratic variation (linguistic variants determined by age, occupation, level of education), diaphasic variation (variants corresponding to various speech styles)" according to the linguist I. Condrea [19, p. 37-38].

Thus, we conclude that symbology is a multidisciplinary entity, which gathers in itself a set of archetypal conventions, generated and represented by certain cultures, generations, religions, genders, social levels, to which it conforms. *Symbols* constitute the imprint of each era and contribute to the elucidation of the sociocultural imagery according to traditions and beliefs, which fix the evolutionary-historical position of society and frame the specific standards of that era in the light of pragmatic thinking.

Chapter 2, Ways of forming somatic symbolic functions and meanings in syntagmatic and paradigmatic circumstances in the French, English, Italian and Romanian languages, establishes the criteria for the appreciation, identification and framing of the *somatic symbol* at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic level. It reflects the functions of the *somatic symbol* based on dictionaries and the interpretations of modern scholars, the functions of

the textual *somatic symbol* in relation to the functions of the language, the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* in the biblical and in the paroemic texts, and comparative linguistic aspects of the *somatic symbol* functioning. The conclusions of the chapter present the identity of the *somatic symbol* in the: semiotic, literary-artistic, stylistic, pragmatic and cognitivist dimensions and identify its semantic-functional aspects through the prism of constituent elements.

The scientific problem of the chapter requires elucidating the functional specifics of the notional *somatic symbol*, based on dictionaries and scholars' interpretations, in order to identify the degree of universality-diversity related to syntagmatic, phraseological, textual and paradigmatic symbols.

Encyclopaedia Universalis offers three kinds of functional relevance of the *symbol*: „The *symbol* shows, unites and directs” [35, p. 1]. We find that the role of the *somatic symbol* in conceptual circumstances is: 1) to reveal certain abstract values, vices, virtues, powers, through the prism of its somatic constitutive elements; 2) to unite two or more dimensions, which appropriate certain common somatic characteristics; and 3) to direct the interlocutor through the situational framework, which indicates the deictic information of the somatic structural element. ”Different forms and levels of experience and relationship with reality (sacred and profane) are related to the concepts of *symbol*, sign and image. The function of the *symbol* is to represent a reality or truth and to reveal it either instantly or gradually. The *symbol* is sometimes identified with the reality it represents and sometimes seen as a pure transparency of it” [36, p. 1]. So we note that the primary function of the *somatic symbol* is to reveal, either momentarily or gradually, a reality through its somatic referential aspects.

Cognitive scientists: W. Heinz and K. Bernard, followers of the ethnologist R. Firth argue that ”*Symbols* can be formed and used in the cognitive construction of the human world, because they are entities that constitute the function of representation. We use the *symbol* in two senses: a) to highlight a fusion or indissolubility of form and meaning; b) in designating a pattern or a configuration in an environment (sounds, lines, body movements, etc.), this being taken as content” [12, p. 13-15]. Therefore, in our case, the *somatic symbol* actively contributes to the process of memorizing and storing information, through the prism of the representation it carries. Moreover, it highlights the connection of the signified with the signifier by means of several important perceptible characteristics, which are stored in the human cognitive construction and can assimilate a new model-distinction, called *somatic symbol*.

In this context, we join the view of the scholar J. S. DeLoache, who claims that ”The *symbol* is intentional” [3, p. 67]. So we understand that the *somatic symbol* intentionally represents something, by means of some somatic characteristics. The human intention to

represent one entity through the lens of another is conclusive in establishing a symbolic relationship. A *symbol* arises from the need to represent a typed and structured image from several constituent elements. We conclude that the *somatic* perceptual *symbol* is plurivalent and requires the organization of several cognitive components to be used.

Another source of functional enumeration of the symbol gives us 5 main functions [37, p. 1] (semiotic, revelatory, universalist, transformative and magical) related to the significant semantic features and its external factors (structural framework, situational segment, cultural segment, intercultural framework, cognitivist-pragmatic framework), which directs the notional integration, thus assigning it a multifunctional symbolic framework.

The investigation of the textual *somatic symbol* requires several levels of analysis, thus, it is investigated by the semiotician I. Guțu [26, p. 95-125] pretextually, (intra) textually, contextually, intertextually, supratextually and assimilates the following functions: denominative, delimitative, orientational, enantiosemic, informative, expressive, pragmatic and contrastive.

The *Book of Books* represents the foundation of the way of rendering human thoughts, ideas, concepts, representations from ancient times to the present day. "The religious book has always been one of the basic pillars of the culture of any people, through it, language, spirituality, beauty and truth have acquired value and permanence" [20, p. 142] emphasizes the scholar I. Condrea. Therefore, the sayings, the stories, the teachings of the *Divine Book* have not stopped striking us with clairvoyance and wisdom, remaining current throughout the millennia, a fact recognized by scholars and researchers: "De l'abondance du coeur la bouche parle" (fr.) [6, p. 37]/ „Căci din prisosul inimii grăiește gura" (ro.) [38, p. 1111]/ Dall'abbondanza del cuore parla la bocca (it.) [32, p. 898]/ *From the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaks* (eng.) [39, p. 1]. We notice that the biblical proverb is represented by two somatic symbols: a) the *heart* being the causative container, in which the thoughts and soulful experiences of man are accumulated, assimilates the function of somatic terms [+/-brain] and [+/-mouth] symbolizing: [+reason], [+cognition], [+wisdom], [+/-feeling], [+/-emotion] and [+/-experience]; b) the *mouth* represents the result or effect of the causer and appropriates the same *symbols* symbolizing the *heart* with an informative function.

Analyzing some of the meanings of *somatic symbols* in the Gospel, we conclude that the circumstances in which the *somatic symbol* is used are decisive; moreover, somatisms assimilate the weight, connotation and characteristics of the referent. The biblical writings are universal, in whatever language we read them, and remain imprinted in eternity despite the ephemeral time and changing nature.

The symbology of a culture is represented by its paroemic treasury through which people highlight their traditions, customs and wisdom of thoughts, expressed through *symbols* extracted from: phraseological expressions, maxims, sayings and proverbs.

For example, in the set of proverbs: "*Chi sa, ha dieci occhi, chi non sa, e cieco affato* (it.)/ *Qui art a partout part a* (fr.)/ *He who knows a book has four eyes (and nine minds) / Two eyes see better than one* (ro.)" [24, p. 82]/ "*Have an eye for something*" (eng.) [34, p. 520], the *somatic symbol eye*, belongs to human reality, behaves more many functions with a positive connotation (denominative, informative, expressive) and is doubled by: 1. metonymy that reflects a relationship of contiguity in which the concrete (*eyes*) designates the abstract (vision), 2. synecdoche being designated as a variety of metonymy, in which the particular/ hyponym: *eyes*, denotes the general/ hyperonym: head/heads/persons, 3. hyperbole which consists in exaggerating information, 4. metaphor in which the *eyes* symbolize [+clairvoyance], [+wisdom], [+intelligence], [+cleverness]. In the given textual sequence, the denominative function represents the *somatic symbol eye* in both explicit and implicit manner, the visual organ appropriating a double quality: a) denotative aspect-own vision; b) connotative aspect- [+clairvoyance], [+judgment], [+appreciation], [+distinction] and [+consideration]. The expressive function appropriates dynamic character and is realized through the level of intention and appreciation on the intercultural value axis.

In the researchers' view, gestural or non-verbal communication, both written and oral, represents about 60% of daily interactions, a fact that attests the *somatic symbol* as one of the most important levers in kinesthetic communication.

"Gestures are as eloquent as phrases and speeches, and gestural errors have interpersonal or institutional consequences as serious as linguistic errors, because gestures configure the individual's identity, optimizing or distorting communication" [8, p. 2]. Thus, gestural symbols are an integral part of any discourse and their correct identification facilitates numerous interactions: disciplinary, cultural, social, interdisciplinary and intercultural. "In the construction of meaning, a very important role is played by all the paralinguistic elements (intonation, speed, pauses, etc.) and gestures that accompany (and in the case of gestures, sometimes substitute) linguistic achievements, in face-to-face interactions" [9, p. 428]. Therefore, the non-verbal symbol constitutes an accumulation of particularizing aspects that position it on a constitutive-value axis of acceptability. For example, "the contact between the hands symbolizes an exchange of an affective nature" [10, p. 194], mentions the researcher D. Shandrovski. A speech accompanied by a calm, intoned voice, at an appropriate speed and with strict pauses, is sure to sensitize any audience and symbolizes [+poise], [+insight], [+lightness] and [+dexterity]. We conclude that symbolic kinesthetic and paralinguistic peculiarities contribute to the efficiency of

verbal expression through non-verbal expression, these being often interdependent and reciprocal.

Verbal styles represent important generators in the expansion or suppression of the *somatic symbol* and stylistic figures are significant levers for the reintegration of the linguostylistic system. This fact motivated us to study in depth the symbolic transfiguration in a stylistic approach and to demonstrate that the *somatic symbol* represents a complex figure, for the quality of substituting any stylistic figure, of including several tropes at the same time and coexisting in more many dimensions, which is why it can be called a multidimensional entity.

Analyzing the correlation of the *somatic symbol* with the stylized expression, we drew the following conclusions:

1. To the *somatic symbol* can be attributed the quality of a microstructural figure for the ability to be expressed on short textual segments such as: lexeme, phrase, phraseological unit; and to coincide with microstructural figures (synecdoche, metonymy, metaphor, etc.).

2. The *somatic symbol* can be called a macrostructural figure for its ability to be revealed on extended textual areas: phrase, paragraph, text, hypertext, paradigm; and to coincide with macrostructural figures such as: allegory, image, allusion, irony, etc.

3. The *somatic symbol* can be called the hierarchically superior figure or stylistic macrofigure for the quality of accumulating and appropriating at the same time several stylistic figures and numerous meanings.

4. The *somatic symbol* represents a multidimensional figure due to the ability to represent several dimensions or sciences such as: semiotics, pragmatics, sociology, culturology, hermeneutics, philosophy, etc.

5. Any figure of speech can become a *symbol*, but not every *symbol* designates a certain figure of style for the fact that the *symbol* represents a multidimensional concept.

6. Any figure of speech becomes a code in stylistic interpretation and the same figure of speech becomes a *symbol* in pragmatic-cognitivist interpretation.

Following the contrastive-comparative analysis of the paroemic text, we can draw the following conclusions: to a large extent, at the level of semantic and even lexical components, the four languages have a similar sociocultural imagery that highlights the same *somatic symbols* expressed through similar pragmasemantic expressions, a fact that demonstrates the human cognitivist-pragmatic universality based on the innate effects of somatisms. In some cases, however, we note the diversity of thought directed by means of *somatic symbols* integrated into phraseological units or aphorisms, due to: 1) the sociocultural imagery, 2) the surrounding reality, 3) the diversity of the expression of the symbolic code, in which the conceptual metaphor represents the basic element, this favoring the decoding of symbolic meaning.

Chapter 3, Semantic-functional peculiarities of the *somatic symbol* in syntagmatic units, at the paradigmatic level (based on the corpus of the French, English, Italian and Romanian languages), reflects the multiaspectual quality of the *somatic symbol* at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels by highlighting the semantic and functional plurality of it; distinguish the individual character of the phraseological *somatic symbol* in cultural and intercultural context, provide its frequency statistics and establish the similarities and differences of intercultural language; specifies the impact of the erroneous reception of the message at the multicultural level delimiting its consequences and outlines the importance of the *somatic symbol* on the value axis of the sociocultural imagery and the philosophy of the cognitivist-pragmatic language, through the prism of its semantic-functional aspects. Later, contrastive-comparative statistics targeting the phraseological *somatic symbol* are calculated and analyzed.

Any symbolic concept, through the prism of multifunctionality and archetypal quality, faces plurisemanticism, a fact attested by researchers: G. Cincilei, E. Olshanschy, I. Evseev, J. Chevalier, I. Guțu and others. The polyvalence of the *symbol* results from the dimensional plurality that interweave with the: 1) sociocultural, 2) linguistic and 3) cognitive-pragmatic imageries in the conceptual framework of the *symbol*, towards its creation. It is appropriate to mention that the mechanism of formation of the *somatic symbol* is based on the dominant characteristics of the *symbol*: color, content, quantity, quality, shape, number, structure, named by the scholar I. Guțu symbolizing referential categories.

Following the analysis of the *somatic symbol* in referential associative situations, we conclude that it assimilates polysemantic, enantiosemanic and polyenantiosemanic qualities, the respective attributes being due to the multiaspectuality and multiculturalism of the *symbol*, through the prism of several decisive factors, which aim at the structure of the surrounding reality, the sociocultural imagery and the cognitivist-pragmatic approach of the *symbol* at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels.

Based on several classifications related to the functions of the somatic symbol, elaborated by scientific researchers such as: V. Lifari, A. Birtalan, G. Colțun, I. Guțu, I. Evseev and others, we structured a compilation of the functions and meanings of the *somatic symbol* at the syntagmatic level, targeting the Romanian, English, French and Italian languages [13, p. 52-56]:

1. Seat of feelings,
2. State of mind,
3. State of emotional affect,
4. States of emotional affect with contradictory spirit,
5. Human character and behavior/trait,
6. Action performed thoroughly,
7. Favorable action,
8. Deictic value,
9. Dimensional or metric value,
10. Delimiting value,
11. Pejorative value,
12. Appreciative value,
13. Result of human activity,
14. Social phenomenon,
15. Abstract notion referring to different aspects of human existence,

16. Aesthetic and Philosophical Ethics Category, 17. Image/abstract or concrete landscape, 18. Proper name, 19. Landform, 20. Somatic term, 21. Human being, 22. Object, instrument, tool, 23. Name of plant or animal (parts), 24. Name of food, 25. Odd body, 26. Non-existent quantity, 27. Large quantity of objects.

The *symbols* integrated in the *somatic* phraseological units make a connection between the abstract and the real world, in order to obtain a thought, an idea, a conception expressed with the help of the conceptual metaphor, created by the sociocultural imagery. Every language possesses its own individuality, its own characteristics, its own traditions and a special culture even if there are apparently groups of languages similar in expression, judgment or morals. Therefore, the coincidence of phraseological expressions, to express a certain *symbol* in different cultures, is relative due to the diversity of sociocultural imageries. Moreover, multicultural conceptual diversity attests to different priorities and predilections, thus different *symbols*. This fact motivated us to carry out a semantic-functional analysis of the phraseological *somatic symbol*, targeting the Romanian, English, French and Italian languages. Each culture possesses a wide spectrum of somatic phraseological units, however, a preselection of 11 *somatic symbols* found in somatic phraseology, which were studied analytically and synthetically, was useful to us.

Therefore, the phraseological *somatic symbol* combines the individually acquired experience with the dominant cultural metaphor, goes through the process of lexicalization and assimilates the abstracted meaning of the sociocultural imagery.

Following the contrastive-comparative analysis of 11 *somatic symbols*, individualized into **3406 conceptual, syntagmatic and phraseological units**, belonging to the studied cultures, of which: **595** French linguistic units, **600** English expressions, **597** Italian linguistic units and **1614** Romanian somatic units, we come to the conclusion that each sociocultural imagery assimilates distinctions according to the present cultural specificity. The fact that French, English and Italian are languages of European circulation attests to their similar diachronic level. In other words, the cognitivist-pragmatic conceptualization of French-English-Italian sociocultural imageries is more similar than, for example, the conceptual metaphors of French-Romanian cultures. The Romanian language is much more analytical in thinking and expression and shows similar predilections in symbolization, often, with the Italian language, a fact exemplified in the expressions of this chapter. The number of somatic units in the Romanian vocabulary far exceeds the number of somatic units in other analyzed languages, which motivates us to consider that, according to the value-diachronic axis, the Romanian culture assimilates a different level, less advanced compared to the other cultures under discussion. Thus, we conclude that one of the

important factors contributing to the similarity of cross-cultural symbolization is the similar diachronic level of languages, regardless of belonging to the same language group.

Table 1.1. The percentage quality of 11 analyzed symbols highlighted in phraseology

Quality/culture	Fr.	Engl.	It.	Ro.	Unique values
[-]	27%	30%	33%	34%	31%
[+]	20%	28%	19%	14%	20%
[-/+]	53%	42%	48%	52%	49%

It is appropriate to point out that the most positive *somatic symbol* in all languages is the *heart*, which appears with an average of 45% in languages under discussion. Most negative circumstances (49%) are used with the *symbol nose*, which is positive in only 11% of somatic units. The *somatic symbol eye* is used in 64% of ambivalent or neutral expressions.

So, the conceptual, syntagmatic and phraseological *somatic symbol* combines the individually acquired experience with the cultural-dominant metaphor, goes through the process of lexicalization and assimilates the abstracted meaning of the sociocultural imagery. Therefore, at the structural, semantic and functional levels, the phenomenon of phraseological symbolic universality is less obvious compared to other types of text, the variety being individualized within the diversities: linguostylistic, cognitivist, pragmasemantic, cultural, intercultural, disciplinary, interdisciplinary and historical, what creates, integrates, maintains or eliminates the *somatic symbol* in contemporary society.

Plurivalence is emphasized in somatic symbology, equivocation can arise due to sociolinguistic diversity, which influences the cognitivist-pragmatic approach through the prism of variety: cultural codes, generations, social categories, genders and education. Therefore, a qualified translator also studies the source and target sociocultural imageries, reflected in phraseological expressions, thus carrying out the decoding and, respectively, encoding of the information in order to obtain a suitable equivalent. "The interpreter's strategy allows the transition from a simple decoding, which provides only a partial interpretation of the expressions, to their complete interpretation" [7, p. 21]. Therefore, the interpreter must know a series of codes that are useful to him in the process of interpretation, translation and narration of the source text, with a view to an intelligible and auspicious decoding.

The phraseological unit bears the imprint of the sociocultural imagery of any culture, is equated with the conceptual metaphor and represents increased difficulty in the identification of the *somatic symbol* and translation, because the meaning of the phraseological combination appropriates a unitary character and, therefore, differs from the meaning of the constituent elements of the phraseology analyzed individually. Thus, the increased level of difficulty in intercultural interpretation motivated us to conduct a contrastive-comparative study of the

impediments to identification, translation and interpretation of the *somatic symbol* in cultural and intercultural phraseological circumstances. Phraseological *somatic symbols* represent a complex difficulty in interpretation, due to the fact that they go through several correspondence filters: 1. Phraseological unitary character; 2. Meaningful cultural plurality, 3. Cross-cultural (different/universal) phraseological meaning; 4. Intercultural emotional intensity (different/universal), 5. The verb accompanying the somatic symbol in the phraseological unit (different/universal), 6. The preposition accompanying the somatic symbol (different/universal).

The contrastive-comparative analysis of the somatic symbols integrated in the phraseological units of the French, English, Italian and Romanian languages demonstrated that, in most cases, they carry connotative weight, assimilate the meaning of phraseology, appropriate a relatively universal character, conform to several interpretation filters and it often does not possess a faithful equivalent at the intercultural level, because it adapts to sociocultural imageries. So, phraseological symbolic interpretations face a high level of difficulty, due to the diversity of sociocultural imageries that prioritize, abstract and emphasize certain characteristics, in particular. Therefore, any somatic symbol within the textual framework assimilates meaningful cultural distinctions of reference. Linguistic, cognitivist, pragmasemantic and symbolic diversities are expressed with the help of conceptual metaphors accompanied by various intensifiers that definitively create the somatic archetype or symbol.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the contrastive-comparative study of the semantic-functional aspects of the somatic symbol (based on the corpus of the French, English, Italian and Romanian languages), the hypothesis of the scientific study validated the following conclusions:

1. The philosophical symbol is a subjective, multidimensional notion, based on certain conventions, which expresses an abstract idea with the help of a concrete element through the prism of knowledge segments; the anthropological symbol aims at social, cultural and intercultural interpretation; the linguistic symbol assimilates semantic-functional aspects differentiated according to the linguistic associative circumstances (symbol-concept, symbol-syntax, symbol-phraseological unit, symbol-sentence, symbol-image, symbol-text, symbol-hypertext, symbol-intertext, symbol- paradigm); the sociolinguistic somatic symbol varies from a diachronic, diatopic, diastratic, diaphasic, dimensional, sequential, kinesthetic and prosodic point of view; the cognitivist-pragmatic somatic symbol highlights the psycholinguistic influence of the symbolic expression in order to establish the contact, interest and imagination of the receiver through the constitutive elements, in which the conceptual metaphor represents the basic component that favors the decoding of the symbolic meaning;

2. Both the *symbol* and the sign follow the principles of a convention. The *symbol* obeys a conventional surface system, its arbitrariness being visible in depth, the sign, which appears on the surface as an arbitrary one, operates in a well-organized conventional system. The *symbol* is hierarchically superior to the sign, for its semantic-functional complexity and multidimensionality.

3. The *somatic symbol* represents a multifunctional, multiaspectual, multivalent and multidisciplinary notion, deciphered by the receiver, according to the cognitive, dimensional and cultural plurality that it distinguishes and possesses. Equivocation is prominent in somatic symbology, being identified in cultural, cross-cultural, historical, ethical and disciplinary circumstances.

4. Studying contrastively-comparatively semantic-functional aspects of the somatic symbol in French, English, Italian and Romanian cultures, we find: 1) the somatic symbolic universality of European languages due to the innate distinctive aspects; 2) the dynamism of languages through mutual influence and interdependence, thus creating intertextuality and symbolic interculturality; 3) the symbolic diversity conforming to the sociocultural imagery in the light of the individual conceptual metaphor that reflects expression, emotional status and differentiated intensity, related to the systemic categories of the *somatic symbol*:

a) simple/complex, b) denotative/connotative, c) verbal/non-verbal, d) abstract/concrete, e) positive/negative/neutral, f) individual/universal.

5. The biblical *somatic symbol* assimilates universal specificity increased through the prism of specific and referential elements, but often each culture conforms to its own sociocultural imagery by highlighting certain concretizations, abstractions, intensifications of major importance for the given society; the paroemic *somatic symbol*, to a large extent, at the level of semantic and even lexical components, carries a similar sociocultural imagery, in some cases, however, we note the diversity of directed thinking due to: 1) the differentiated sociocultural imagery, 2) the different surrounding reality, 3) the diversity of the expression of the symbolic code, in which the conceptual metaphor is the basic element, favoring the decoding of the symbolic meaning; the linguostylistic *somatic symbol* is hierarchically superior to stylistic figures, for the quality of substituting or coinciding with any type of micro- or macrostructural trope; the sociolinguistic *somatic symbol* represents a complex image that brings together several constitutive somatic elements related to the object frame, the conceptual-semantic segment, the situational image, the historical segment and the cultural dimension of the *somatic symbol*.

6. In the intercultural dimension, the contrastive-comparative study of European languages (French, English, Italian and Romanian) demonstrated diversity and sociocultural similarity of the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol*, both at the level of structure and meaning; structural difference may reveal semantic similarity and literal equivalence may denote conceptual diversity. The symbolic expression is highlighted by the conceptual metaphor that favors the decoding of the symbolic meaning through sociocultural imageries.

7. The phraseological *somatic symbol* represents an increased difficulty in interpretation, due to the fact that it goes through several correspondence filters. The complex contextual-stylistic load of the phraseological units requires a vast knowledge of the cultures that include: paroemic thesaurus, the mentality, priority of social ages, cultural codes, social imagery and linguistic diversity. The coincidence of phraseological expressions to express a certain *symbol*, in different cultures, is relative, due to the diversity of sociocultural imageries that attest to different priorities, respectively, diverse *symbols* and varied symbolizations. The sociocultural imagery of the same language can have several almost similar phraseological expressions, but which acquire different or even contrastive interpretations.

8. Plurivalence is emphasized in somatic symbology, equivocation can arise due to sociolinguistic diversity, which influences the cognitivist-pragmatic approach through the prism of variety: cultural codes, generations, social categories, genders and education. Sociocultural variety conforms to the cultural-geographical area and the value-diachronic axis of languages, thus, symbolization is carried out not only by means of belonging to a certain group of languages

but also by cognitive-pragmatic conceptualization. Structural or lexical similarity can often be distinguished by the conceptual diversity of sociocultural imageries.

9. Following the contrastive-comparative analysis of 11 *somatic symbols*, individualized into 3406 units: conceptual, syntagmatic and phraseological, belonging to the studied cultures, of which: 595 French linguistic units, 600 English expressions, 597 Italian linguistic units and 1614 Romanian somatic units, we come to the conclusion that each sociocultural imagery assimilates distinctions according to the present cultural specificity. The conceptual, syntagmatic and phraseological *somatic symbol* combines the individually acquired experience with the cultural-dominant metaphor, goes through the process of lexicalization and assimilates the abstracted meaning of the sociocultural imagery. The most positive *somatic symbol* in the studied languages is the *heart*, which appears with an average of 45%. Most negative circumstances (49%) are used with the *symbol nose*, which is positive in only 11% of somatic language units. The *somatic symbol eye* is used in 64% of ambivalent or neutral expressions.

10. We cannot establish a rigorous hierarchy in the definition of the *somatic symbol*, each conceptual unit imposing a sphere of individual meaning, which is subordinated to certain conventions and rigors predetermined by society, but we can appreciate, with certainty, the dynamic and unpredictable character of the *somatic symbol* which carries a complex informative value, being special in that it is of a polyvalent, ambiguous and changing nature. The context in which it is used is decisive and its characteristics are revealed through external factors, which play the primary role in elucidating the meaning of the *symbol*, which is of an elusive, abstract and multivalent nature, and gives it uniqueness and originality.

For further research topics related to the multiaspectuality of the *somatic symbol*, we propose: 1. The development of an intercultural dictionary of the phraseological *somatic symbol*, which would clearly distinguish the similarity and diversity of the semantic-functional aspects of the *symbol* within the sociocultural imagery; 2. The study of the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* in the folkloric-poetic text and in the artistic text; 3. Analysis of the semantic-functional aspects of the *somatic symbol* in the political text; 4. Examining the semantic-functional aspects within the journalistic texts; 5. Investigating the *somatic symbol* in jurisprudence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. BARSALOU, L. Perceptual symbol system. In: *Behavioral and Brain Science*. Cambridge University Press: 1999, no. 22, p. 577-660.
2. CHANDLER, D. *Semiotics. The Basics*. New York: Routledge, 2007. 326 p. ISBN 10: 0-415-36376-4(hbk)
3. DeLoache, J.S. Becoming symbol-minded. In: *TRENDS in cognitive sciences*. Vol. 8, 2004, no. 2, p. 66-70.
4. ECO, U. *Sémiotique et philosophie du langage*. Paris: Puf Quadrige, 2001. 285 p
5. LAKOFF, G. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. 1987.
6. MONTREYNAUD, F. *Dictionnaire de proverbes et dictons*. Paris: Le Robert, 1997. 491 p.
7. REBOUL, A., MOESCHLER, J. *La pragmatique aujourd'hui. Une nouvelle science de la communication*. France: Edition du Seuil. 1998. 209 p. ISBN 2-02-030442-2.
8. *Semiotica gestuală* [quote: 18.08.2018]. Available: <http://www.scribub.com/sociologie/psihologie/comunicare/SEMIOTICA-GESTUALA31477.php>
9. SOBRERO, A. A. *Introduzione all'italiano contemporaneo. Le strutture*. Roma: Editori Laterza. Manuali Laterza 42. Seconda Edizione. 1996. 484 p. ISBN 88-420-4309-5.
10. ȘANDROVSCHI, D. La dimension du geste dans le texte: aspects syntaxique, sémantique et pragmatique sémiotiques, p. 193-195, In: *Actele Colocviului științific internațional consacrat profesorului Grigore Cincilei cu prilejul aniversării a 80-ea de la naștere*. République de Moldova. Chișinău: CEP USM, 2008. 259 p.
11. TOURATIER, C. *La sémantique*. Paris: Armand Colin. 2000. 191 p. ISBN 2-200-25210-2
12. WERNER, H., KAPLAN, B. *Symbol Formation*. New York: Psychology Press, Taylor and Francis Group 2014. ISBN 0-89859-370-0
13. BANTEA, M. Funcții ale simbolului somatic la nivel sintagmatic în baza limbilor engleză, italiană, franceză, română. In: *Conferința științifică națională cu participare internațională din 8-9 noiembrie 2018. Integrare prin cercetare și inovare. Rezumate ale comunicărilor*. Chișinău: CEP USM, 2018. Universitatea de Stat din Moldova. p. 52-56. ISBN 978-9975-142-48-9.
14. BANTEA, M. Aspecte semantico-funcționale ale simbolului somatic în textul poetic european. In: *Materialele Colocviului Internațional organizat de Biblioteca Universității „Ștefan cel Mare” din Suceava „Patrimoniul Canonic-Suport al Vitalității și Diversității*

- Culturale*”, Suceava: 4-6 aprilie, 2019. Published in EISH (CODFREURCOR), Nr.7, 2020, ISSN 1987-8753, p. 336-350.
15. BAHNARU, V. *Mutații de sens: cauze; modalități; efecte*. Chișinău: Știința, 1988. 256 p.
 16. CORLĂTEANU, N., MELNICIUC, I. *Lexicologia*. Chișinău: Lumina 1992, 222 p.
 17. COJANU, D. *Ipostaze ale simbolului în lumea tradițională/The symbol in the Traditional World*. Iași: Editura Lumen, 2009, [quote: 06.06.2017]. Available: <https://books.google.md/books?id=IbKr03UG998C&pg=PT5&hl=>
 18. COMES, E. *Principii de elaborare a unei gramatici de orientare semantică*, Constanța: Ovidius University Press. Ovidius University Annals of Philology. Volume XIII. 2002 p. 69-84.
 19. CONDREA, I. *Sociolingvistica*. Chișinău: CEP USM, 2018. 208 p. ISBN 978-9975-71-994-0.
 20. CONDREA, I. Structura primelor cărți religioase în limba română, tipărite în tipografia exarhicească din Chișinău. In: *Academos Revistă de știință, inovare, cultură și artă*, 1/2016. Filologie. p.142-146.
 21. COȘERIU, E. *Lecții de lingvistică generală*, Editura ARC, Chișinău 2000, 302 p. ISBN 9975-61-146-X
 22. ELIADE, M. *Sacrul și profanul*. București: Humanitas. 1995. 128 p. ISBN 973-28-0598-6.
 23. FRÂNCU, C. *Curenți și tendințe în lingvistica secolului nostru*. Iași: Casa Editorială „Demiurg”. 1999. 155 p. ISBN: 973-98105-7-8
 24. GHEORGHE, G. *Proverbe românești și proverbele lumii romanice, Studiu comparativ*. București: Editura Albatros, 1986. 423 p.
 25. GRAUR, A., Wald, L. *Scurtă istorie a lingvisticii*. București: Editura științifică, 1965. 182 p.
 26. GUȚU, I. *Dimensiuni novatoare ale cercetării cuvântului – simbol*. București: Editura Fundației România de mâine, 2015. 167 p. ISBN 978-973-163-922-2
 27. JACOBI, J. *Complex, arhetip, simbol în psihologia lui C. G. Jung*. București: Editura Trei. 2018. 220 p. ISBN:978-606-40-0551-9.
 28. MANCAȘ, M. *Limbajul artistic românesc în secolul XX*. București: Editura științifică 1991, 318 p.
 29. MAZNIC, S. Restricție și extensiune în evoluția semantică de la latină spre română. In: *Buletin de lingvistică, 2010, nr.11*. p. 101-104.

30. NEGREA, V. Discursul cognitiv al antropologiei lingvistice-sursă pentru potențarea cunoașterii. Târgu Mureș: *Studia Universitatis Petru Maior. Philologia*,19, 2015. p. 44-50. ISSN: 1582-9960.
31. PARPALĂ-AFANA, E. *Stilistica*. Craiova: Editura Unuversitaria, 2006. 315 p.
32. RAVASI, G., ROSSANO, P. *La grande bibbia del giubileo*. Milano: Edizione San Paolo, 1997. 1151 p.
33. VIANU, T. *Despre stil și arta literară*. București: Editura Tineretului, 1965. 108 p.
34. HORNBY, A. S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Seventh Edition. Oxford: University Press, 2010. 1715 p. ISBN-13: 978-0-19-4316583
35. *Encyclopedie Universalis* [quote: 21.03.2020]. Available: <https://www.universalis.fr/encyclopedie/symbole/1-la-fonction-du-symbole/>
36. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* [quote: 21.03.2020]. Available: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/religious-symbolism/Varieties-and-meanings-associated-with-the-term-symbol>
37. *Wikimedia France* [quote: 20.03.19]. Available: <https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symbole>
38. *Biblia*. Chișinău: Complexul de Edituri al Bisericii Ortodoxe din Moldova, 2004. 1416 p.
39. *Bible* [quote: 27.06.2020]. Available: <https://www.info-bible.org/bible/index.htm>

LIST OF SCIENTIFIC PAPERS ON THE THEME OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

THE SOMATIC SYMBOL: SEMANTIC-FUNCTIONAL AND COMPARATIVE ASPECTS (based on the language corpus of French, English, Italian and Romanian)

1. Articles in scientific journals

1.1. in journals from the Web of Science and SCOPUS databases

1. BANTEA Magdalena. *Aspecte semantico-funcționale ale simbolului somatic în textul poetic european*. In: Etudes Interdisciplinaires en Sciences humaines (EISH), nr. 7, 2020, p. 336-350. ISSN 197-8753. <https://ojs.iliauni.edu.ge/index.php/eish/article/view/493>

1.2 in journals from other databases accepted by ANACEC

2. BANTEA Magdalena. *Rolul simbolului somatic frazeologic în exprimarea emoției prin prisma semioticii gestuale*. In Studia Universitatis Moldaviae. 2019, nr.10(130) Seria „Științe Umanistice” p. 8-13 [online-2345-1009]. ISSN 1811-2668
https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/j_nr_file/Stiinte%20Umanistice_10_130_2019.pdf

3. BANTEA Magdalena. *Particularități semantico-funcționale ale simbolului somatic „inimă” în cultura frazeologică romano-germanică*. Chișinău: INTERTEXT, ULIM, 2020, nr. 3/4 (55/56), Anul 14, Categoria B+. p. 93-101. ISSN 1857-3711
https://www.academia.edu/63279838/INTERTEXT_Scientific_Journal_N3_4_2020

2. Articles in conference proceedings and other scientific events

2.1. in the works of scientific events included in other databases accepted by ANACEC

1. BANTEA Magdalena. *Dimensiuni istorice, culturologice și lingvistice ale simbolului. Aspecte semantico-funcționale*. In: Norma Limbii literare între tradiție și inovație. Materialele Simpozionului științific cu participare internațională, 19 mai 2017. Chișinău: CEP USM, 2017. p. 71-77. ISBN 978-9975-71-906-3

2. BANTEA Magdalena. *Aspecte stilistice ale funcționării simbolului somatic*. In: Integrare prin cercetare și inovare. Conferința științifică națională cu participare internațională, 9-10 noiembrie 2017. Rezumate ale comunicărilor. Chișinău: CEP USM 2017. p. 91-94. ISBN 978-9975-71-568-3 https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/91-95_24.pdf

3. BANTEA Magdalena. *Aspecte lingvostilistice comparate ale simbolului somatic în textul folcloric (în baza corpusului francez-român)*. In: Colocviul internațional de științe ale limbajului „Eugen Coșeriu” (CISL). Ediția a XIV-a. Chișinău: CEP USM 2018. p. 251- 257. ISBN978-9975-142-05-2
4. BANTEA Magdalena. *Particularități ale simbolului somatic în culturologia romano-germanică*. In: Limba română actuală: normă și diversitate stilistică. Simpozion științific cu participare internațională. 11 mai 2018. Chișinău: CEP USM, 2018. p. 76-87. ISBN 978-9975-142-02-1 https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/65-76_1.pdf
5. BANTEA Magdalena. *Funcții ale simbolului somatic la nivel sintagmatic în baza limbilor engleză, italiană, franceză, română*. In: Integrare prin cercetare și inovare. Conferința științifică națională cu participare internațională 8-9 noiembrie 2018. Rezumate ale comunicărilor. Chișinău: CEP USM, 2018. p. 52-56. ISBN 978-9975-142-48-9
https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/52-56_11.pdf
6. BANTEA Magdalena. *Aspecte semantico-funcționale ale simbolului somatic în textul biblic*. In: Materialele simpozionului științific internațional Anatol Ciobanu – Omul Cetății Limba Română. In memoriam: 85 de ani de la naștere. 17 mai 2019, Chișinău: CEP USM, 2019. p. 149-156. ISBN 978-9975-149-05-1 https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/149-156_1.pdf
7. BANTEA Magdalena. *Corelația simbolului somatic cu figurile de stil*. In: Materialele simpozionului științific internațional „Profesorul și Savantul Irina Condrea – Prezență Remarcabilă în Mediul Academic și Cultural din Republica Moldova” 25 octombrie 2019. Chișinău: CEP USM, 2019. p. 163-170. ISBN 978-9975-149-53-2
https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/163-170_5.pdf
8. BANTEA Magdalena. *Emotions Reflected by the Somatic Symbols in Phraseological Units (based on the corpus of English, French, Italian and Romanian languages)*. In: Integrare prin cercetare și inovare. Conferința științifică națională cu participare internațională, 14-15 noiembrie 2019 (Rezumate ale comunicărilor). Chișinău: CEP USM, 2019. p. 202-206
https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/202-206_3.pdf

ANNOTATION

Bantea Magdalena, **The Somatic Symbol: Semantic-functional and Compared Aspects (based on the corpus of French, English, Italian and Romanian languages)**, Thesis for the Doctor's Degree in Philology, speciality 621.06 Theory of the text, analysis of the discourse, stylistics, Moldova State University, Chişinău, 2023.

The thesis comprises an introduction, three chapters, conclusions and recommendations, a bibliography of 203 entries, 4 annexes and 98 tables. The basic text of the thesis covers 134 pages. The results of the present study were published in 11 research articles.

Key words: symbol, somatic symbol, componential framework, functions, situational segment, phraseological somatic symbol, sociocultural imagery, culturality, interculturality, universality, diversity, multifunctionality.

The domain of study The semantic-functional analysis of the somatic symbol, based on the corpus of French, English, Italian and Romanian languages, includes a complex study in which interact, at least, four subdivisions of knowledge: 1) the structural framework of the somatic symbol; 2) the functional dimension of the somatic symbol; 3) the situational information of the constituent elements; 4) the componential framework of the investigated notion.

The goal and objectives proposed reside in elucidation of the semantic-functional specificity of somatic symbols, from the contrastive-comparative and cognitivist-pragmatic perspectives, in syntagmatic and paradigmatic contexts, based on the corpus of English, French, Italian and Romanian languages, in order to highlight the concept of the somatic symbol through the sociocultural, sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic and intercultural imagery.

The research novelty and originality consists in approaching the somatic symbol from the cognitivist-pragmatic perspective, in the contrastive-comparative study. The phenomenon highlights numerous possibilities of externalizing meanings of the somatic symbol through the prism of functional-pragmatic aspects at the conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels, from the semasiological and onomasiological points of view, based on the corpus of: English, French, Italian and Romanian languages, in order to establish the multifunctionality of the somatic symbol within the cultural and intercultural semantic-functional interpretation which facilitates the identification of the cognitivist-pragmatic, sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic similarities and differences.

The important scientific problem solved in the investigated area. The model of the constitutive interpretation of the somatic symbol, based on the sociolinguistic, ethnolinguistic and cognitivist-pragmatic imageries, reflects the semantic-functional aspects of the somatic symbol, at a conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels, fact that allows appreciation of the symbolic meanings and functions within cultural and intercultural frameworks.

The theoretical and applicative values of the research are determined by the cultural and intercultural approaches of the somatic symbol at a conceptual, syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels. The application of the methodological-interpretive model, of the appreciation of semantic-functional aspects of the somatic symbol, contributes to its identification and conceptual framing on the cognitivist-pragmatic, sociocultural and ethnolinguistic axes.

The implementation of scientific results. The results of the research are significant for university courses in: symbology, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics and intercultural communication. They can serve as a solid support for new research focused on the subject under investigation.

ADNOTARE

Bantea Magdalena, *Simbolul somatic: aspecte semantico-funcționale și comparate (în baza corpusului limbilor franceză, engleză, italiană și română)*, teză de doctor în filologie, specialitatea 621.06 Teoria textului, analiza discursului, stilistica, Universitatea de Stat din Moldova, Chișinău, 2023.

Structural teza constă din introducere, trei capitole, concluzii și recomandări, bibliografie (203 de titluri), 4 anexe, 98 de tabele și 134 de pagini de text de bază. Rezultatele obținute la tema tezei sunt reflectate în 11 lucrări științifice.

Cuvinte-cheie: *simbol*, *simbol somatic*, cadru componential, funcții, segment situațional, *simbol somatic* frazeologic, imaginar sociocultural, culturalitate, interculturalitate, universalitate, diversitate, multifuncționalitate.

Domeniu de cercetare. Analiza semantico-funcțională a *simbolului somatic*, în baza corpusului limbilor franceză, engleză, italiană și română, include un studiu complex în care interacționează cel puțin patru subdiviziuni ale cunoașterii: 1) cadrul structural al *simbolului somatic*; 2) dimensiunea funcțională a *simbolului somatic*; 3) segmentul situațional al elementelor constitutive; și 4) cadrul componential al *simbolului somatic*.

Scopul și obiectivele propuse rezidă în elucidarea specificului semantico-funcțional al *simbolurilor somatice*, din perspectivele contrastiv-comparativă și cognitivist-pragmatică, în contexte sintagmatice și paradigmatic în baza corpusului limbilor engleză, franceză, italiană și română, în vederea reliefării *simbolului somatic* prin prisma imaginarelor: sociocultural, sociolingvistic, etnolingvistic și intercultural.

Noutatea și originalitatea științifică a cercetării constă în abordarea *simbolului somatic* din perspectivă cognitivist-pragmatică în studiul contrastiv-comparativ. Fenomenul relevă numeroase posibilități de exteriorizare a semnificațiilor *simbolului somatic* în lumina aspectelor funcțional-pragmatice la nivel conceptual, sintagmatic și paradigmatic, din punctele de vedere semasiologic și onomasiologic, în baza corpusului limbilor engleză, franceză, italiană și română, în vederea stabilirii multifuncționalității *simbolului somatic* în cadrul interpretării semantico-funcționale culturale și pluriculturale. Acest lucru facilitează individualizarea similarităților și diferențelor cognitivist-pragmatice, sociolingvistice și etnolingvistice.

Problema științifică importantă soluționată în domeniul de investigație. Modelul interpretării constitutive a *simbolului somatic* în baza imaginarelor sociocultural, sociolingvistic și cognitivist-pragmatic reflectă aspectele semantico-funcționale ale acestuia, la nivel conceptual, sintagmatic și paradigmatic, fapt ce permite aprecierea semnificațiilor și funcțiilor simbolice somatice în cadrul cultural și intercultural.

Semnificația teoretică și valoarea aplicativă a lucrării sunt determinate de abordările culturale și interculturale ale *simbolului somatic* la nivel conceptual, sintagmatic și paradigmatic. Aplicarea modelului metodologic-interpretativ de apreciere a aspectelor semantico-funcționale ale *simbolului somatic*, contribuie la identificarea și încadrarea conceptuală a acestuia pe axele cognitivist-pragmatică, sociolingvistică și etnolingvistică.

Implementarea rezultatelor științifice. Rezultatele cercetării prezintă importanță pentru cursurile universitare de simbologie, sociolingvistică, etnolingvistică și comunicare interculturală. Ele pot servi drept suport solid pentru noile cercetări axate pe tematica investigată.

АДНОТАЦИЯ

Бантя Магдалина, **Соматический символ: семантико-функциональные и сравненные аспекты (на основе корпуса французского, английского, итальянского и румынского языков)**, диссертация на соискание учёной степени доктора филологических наук по специальности 621.06 Теория текста, анализ речи, стилистика, Государственный Университет Молдовы, Кишинёв, 2023.

Объём и структура диссертации: введение, три главы, вывод и рекомендации, библиография включающая 203 наименований, 4 приложения, 98 таблиц, 134 страниц основного текста. Основное содержание диссертации было опубликовано в 11 научных работах.

Ключевые слова: символ, соматический символ, семантическая структура, функции, ситуационный сегмент, фразеологический соматический символ, социокультурная образность, культурность, межкультурность, универсальность, диверсификация, многофункциональность.

Область исследования. Семантико-функциональный анализ соматического символа на основе корпуса французского, английского, итальянского и румынского языков, включает комплексное исследование, в котором взаимодействуют как минимум четыре подразделения знаний: 1) структурные рамки соматического символа; 2) функциональное измерение соматического символа; 3) ситуационный сегмент составных элементов; 4) компонентная структура соматического символа.

Цель исследования заключается в выяснении семантико-функциональной специфики соматических символов с контрастно-сравнительной и когнитивно-прагматической точек зрения, в синтагматических и парадигматических контекстах, основанных на корпусе английского, французского, итальянского и румынского языков, чтобы подчеркнуть концепцию соматического символа через социокультурную, социолингвистическую, этнолингвистическую и межкультурную образности.

Научная новизна и оригинальность исследования заключается в подходе к соматическому символу с когнитивно-прагматической точки зрения в контрастно-сравнительном изыскании. Феномен подчеркивает многочисленные возможности экстернализации значений соматического символа через призму функционально-прагматических аспектов на концептуальном, синтагматическом и парадигматическом уровнях, на основе корпуса английского, французского, итальянского и румынского языков, чтобы установить многофункциональность соматического символа в рамках культурной и многокультурной семантико-функциональной интерпретации, которая облегчает выявление когнитивно-прагматических, социолингвистических и этнолингвистических сходств и различий.

Важная научная проблема, которая была решена в соответствующей области. Модель конститутивной интерпретации соматического символа, основанная на социолингвистических, этнолингвистических и когнитивно-прагматических образностях, отражает семантико-функциональные аспекты соматического символа на концептуальном, синтагматическом и парадигматическом уровнях. Этот факт позволяет оценить символические значения и функции в культурных и мультикультурных рамках.

Теоретическая значимость и практическая применимость исследования определяются культурным и межкультурным подходами соматического символа на концептуальном, синтагматическом и парадигматическом уровнях. Применение методологико-интерпретативной оценки семантико-функциональных аспектов соматического символа способствует его идентификации и концептуальному оформлению на когнитивистско-прагматическом, социокультурном и этнолингвистическом направлениях.

Внедрение научных результатов. Результаты исследования представляют интерес для университетских курсов по: символической, социолингвистике, этнолингвистике и межкультурной коммуникации. Они могут стать надёжной опорой для новых исследований, направленных на изучаемую тему.

BANTEA Magdalena

**THE SOMATIC SYMBOL: SEMANTIC-FUNCTIONAL AND
COMPARATIVE ASPECTS**

**(based on the language corpus of French, English, Italian and
Romanian)**

621.06 – Text theory, discourse analysis, stylistics

Summary of the doctoral thesis in philology

Approved for printing: 18.10.2023

Offset paper.

Printing sheets: 2.2

Paper size: 60x84 1/16

Offset printing Print run: 30 ex.

Order no. 95/23

The summary was printed at Centru Editorial-Poligrafic al USM, str. A. Mateevici 60,
Chişinău, MD-2009, Republica Moldova