

BASIC PROBLEMS OF PHRASE STUDIES IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Venzhynovych N.F.

INTRODUCTION

Idioms, inherent in a great number of languages of the world, attract an intensified attention of researchers during the last decades, when strengthening the principle of anthropocentrism provides the study of all language aspects from the point of view of human activities being oriented at man as the main personage of speech generation. The first endeavours to include "phrases and idioms" into dictionaries, which are close to words, were found in M. Lomonosov's transactions¹

The issues of modern approaches to phrase studies are available in the publications of I. Baudouin de Courtenay², F. Buslayev³, S. Denysenko⁴, V. Denysyuk⁵, S. Yermolenko, Bechko⁶, H. Udovychenko⁷, L. Shcherba⁸, etc.

One of the first well-known linguists who proposed a detailed characteristic of phrases was Sh. Ballie⁹. The first attempt of studying set phrases in Russian belongs

¹ Ломоносов М.В. Труды по фразеологии: полн. собр. соч. М. – Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1952. Т.4. 605 с.

² Бодуэн де Куртене И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. М. 1963. URL: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=e>

³ Буслаяв Ф.И. Русские пословицы и поговорки, собранные и объясненные. М., 1954. 457 с.

⁴ Денисенко С. Культурологічний компонент в семантиці фразеологічних одиниць (на матеріалі німецької фразеології) // *Мова і культура: наук. щоріч. журн.* К.: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2000. Вип. 1.Т. 2. С. 73 – 78.

⁵ Денисюк В.В. Фразотвірна концепція О.О. Потебні і проблеми фразотворення // *Мовознавство*. 2015. № 6. С. 52 – 65.

⁶ Єрмоленко С.С., Бечко Я.В. Відображення семантичної структури багатозначних слів на фразеологічному рівні // *Мовознавство*. 2010. № 6. С. 43 – 54.

⁷ Удовиченко Г.М. Фразеологічний словник української мови: У 2 т. / К.: Вища школа, 1984. Т. 1 – 2.

⁸ Щерба Л.В. О трояком аспекте языковых явлений и об эксперименте в языкознании // *Языковая система и речевая деятельность*. Л., 1974. С. 24 – 39). URL: <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/shcherba-74a.htm>

⁹ Балли Ш. Французская стилистика. М.: Изд-во иностран. лит., 1961. 394 с.

to A. Shakhmatov¹⁰ who investigated polytypic syntactical combinations in the context of their disintegration. A little later (in the 1940-s – 1970-s) the theoretical problems of phraseology were ascertained in the transactions of O. Akhmanova¹¹, V. Vinogradov¹², A. Koonin¹³, A. Molotkov¹⁴, N. Shansky¹⁵.

It is this period, called classic by V. Teliya¹⁶, that is noted for the endeavour to preserve basic views on the essence and classification of phrases, expressed by V. Vinogradov. The fundamental feature of this period is singling out phraseology as an independent linguistic field of knowledge, the principal task of which was dealing with such problems as the definition of phraseological units and their distinctions from free word groups, on the one hand, and individual words on the other.

We share H. Udovychenko's opinion¹⁷, who painted out, in particular, that "Modern Ukrainian as other languages of the Indo-European family inherited phrases of different origin from the previous periods of its development, which are the second stage of cognition, though in the cognitive plane they, as words, began taking shape at the first shape of cognition, that is on the level of sensory data comprehension. And no matter how desemantized the phrases of modern language speakers are perceived as far as lexical meanings of word-components are concerned – they have the same subject correlation as autonomous lexically notional words".

¹⁰ Шахматов А. А. Очерк современного русского литературного языка. М.: Учпедгиз, 1941. 288 с.

¹¹ Ахманова О.С. Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии. М.: Учпедгиз, 1957. 562 с.

¹² Виноградов В.В. Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. М.: Наука, 1977. 312 с.

¹³ Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка М.: Высшая школа. Дубна: Издат. Центр „Феникс”, 1996. 81 с.

¹⁴ Молотков А.И. Основы фразеологии русского языка. Л., 1977. 284 с.

¹⁵ Шанский Н.М. Лексикология современного русского языка. М., 1971. 328 с.

¹⁶ Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты: монография. М.: Школа. Языки русской культуры, 1996. 286 с.

¹⁷ Удовиченко Г.М. Фразеологічний словник української мови: У 2 т. / К.: Вища школа, 1984. Т. 1. С. 4.

1. The notion phrase and the most important classifications of phraseological units

The scholar also pointed out, that contemporary phrases were syntactically free word combinations and sentences in the past, which figuratively reproduced the most diverse manifestations of being and activities of man. Laconicism of the expression form, emotional and expressive emphasis of syntactically free formations favoured easy, memorizing and keeping in mind of different generations.

The assertion by I. Hnatyuk¹⁸, in our opinion, is opportune, who points out that noticeable success of domestic linguistics in phrase research is connected above all with the edition of L. Skrypnyk's monograph "Phraseology of the Ukrainian Language" in 1973¹⁹. In this first in Ukraine monographic research in phraseology the many-sidedness and diversity of genre and grammatical types of phrases have been revealed, the systemic interconnection has been traced, the specificity of form and contents of these language units have been characterized. Much attention has also been paid to the evolutionary processes which continually operate in the sphere of phraseology. Characterizing the collection and systematization of the Ukrainian phraseological material, the author as an experienced lexicologist and lexicographer gives objective, scholarly reasoned assessments of phraseographic transactions, published in Ukraine, sometimes commenting representation of individual phrases in them. Despite the fact that the fundamental work "Phraseology of the Ukrainian Language" was published several decades ago, it has not lost its topicality till nowadays, because it is one of the best scholarly achievements in the field of Ukrainian Linguistics of the second half of the 20-th century. This work has been a desk-book of scholars, lecturers and students in the course of many years. Any

¹⁸ Гнатюк І.С. Відповідальність перед словом: професор Лариса Григорівна Скрипник // *Українська лексикографія в загальнослов'янському контексті: теорія, практика, типологія. Ларисі Григорівні Скрипник*. К.: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2011. С. 17 – 22.

¹⁹ Скрипник Л.Г. Фразеологія української мови [АН УРСР, Інститут мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні / відп. ред. Л.С. Паламарчук. К.: Наук. думка, 1973б. 280 с.

serious research, dealing with the problems of Ukrainian Phraseology does not begin without reference to L. Skrypnyk's transactions. She is a model of theoretical profundity, the author's scholarly research, professional operation with a rich actual material, a skilful possession of the Ukrainian phrase.

Phraseology and Linguostylistics with their diverse problems are constantly within scholarly eye-sight of V. Kalashnyk²⁰. In his monograph "Phrase-formation in the Soviet Period" the researcher defined basic elements of the poetic speech and carried out a typological analysis of poetic phrase-formation as the process of forming sense unities of artistic contents. The linguist is interested in superword means of figurativeness: metaphorized structures, phrases proper, periphrases, symbols, aphorisms, etc. V. Kalashnyk convincingly establishes traditional and innovatory means of the figurative system in the texts of modern and older poets.

M. Demskyi²¹ points out that one of the topical issues of Modern Phraseology is the problem of phrase creation, or phrase derivation. The scholar names the following means of phrase-creation of Modern Ukrainian: 1) on the basis of individual word; 2) free syntactical constructions (preposition and case, those that consist of the particle "ne", "ni" and a notional word, of a conjunction and notional word, free word groups and sentences); 3) proverbs, saying and riddles; 4) tales, anecdotes, fables, nonsenses; 5) available phrases; 6) foreign phrases.

V. Uzhchenko indicated that in Ukrainistics "studying linguistic, regional and ethnographic as well as cultural-historical aspects of phraseology has just begun"²². We share the opinion of the well-known researcher who summarised the opinion that "phrases formation is the reflection of the processes of different time profundity, extinction and renewal of figurativeness, continual idiom-formation, in which

²⁰ Калашник В.С. Фразотворення в українській поетичній мові радянського періоду: семантико-типологічний аспект: монографія. Харків: Вища школа, видавництво при ХДУ, 1985. 172 с.

²¹ Демський М.Т. Дери́вація фразем на базі слів та вільних синтаксичних конструкцій // *Мовознавство*. 1988. № 1 (127). С. 37 – 45.

²² Ужченко В.Д. Історико-лінгвістичний аспект формування української фразеології: автореф. дис. ... доктора філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 1994. 34 с.

metaphor, metonymy, euphemism, pun actively participate and the dominating role is played by anthropocentrism, piercing the whole system of transferences” [ibidem, p. 28].

A fundamental collective monograph ”The History of the Ukrainian Language. Lexis and Phraseology” has also been within eye-sight of our attention²³. The history of lexis and phrase formation of Ukrainian since ancient times up to that indicated time in which the authors paid attention to the common basis of the lexical system of East European languages – the word-stock of the Old Russian language. Notwithstanding much time since the publication of this book and the new transactions in this field of knowledge, however, the monograph has not its significance till now.

The postclassical period in phraseology studies is characterized by the endeavours to propose new methods, close to lexicological, and describe phraseological stock as the system of all its units on the basis of appropriate phrase signs or to describe it as a subsystem of lexical and phraseological language system.

Nowadays linguistic studies attract attention to the evident fact that classificational and systemic approach to phraseological meaning studies has exhausted itself and the isolation of phraseology from other linguistic disciplines restricts its theoretical scope. This state of affairs in phrase studies caused that order of the day, which includes issues, linked with considering phrases as signs, characterized by their peculiar role in language and speech functions as well as elucidating the reasons of their distinctions and preferences in comparison with other sign types. That is why, the pressing tasks of phraseology as a linguistic discipline, in V. Teliya’s opinion²⁴, are the studies, related to the profound learning of correlation

²³ Винник В.О., Горобець В.Й., Карпова В.Л., Німчук В.В. та ін. Історія української мови. Лексика і фразеологія: монографія; АН УРСР, Ін-т мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні. К.: Наук. думка, 1983. 742, [1] с.

²⁴ Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты: монография. М.: Школа. Языки русской культуры, 1996. 286 с.

of objective and subjective factors in phrase meaning as well as their adaptation to communicative processes, the ability to accomplish nominative tasks in the course of expression organization, entering cognitive procedures securing comprehension and social speech conditions, characterizing the status of communicants, etc.

Well-known for the public at large are doctoral studies in phraseology by V. Mokiienko²⁵, V. Uzhchenko²⁶. Candidate dissertations by N. Zubets²⁷, O. Kolomiyets²⁸, etc. are also of great interest. O. Selivanova²⁹ singles out the following basic vectors of studying modern phraseology: characteristic of constantly reproduced links of phrases with the structure of ethnic consciousness, the sense producing devices of which are not only mental images, but also feelings, senses, intuition, transcendence in a new foreshortening of motivational processes; nosing for "imprints" of people's culture, its traditions, customs, rituals, beliefs, superstitions, myths in the processes of stereotyping ethnic ideals about man, his or her environment and inner reflective experience, designated with phrases; the description of regularities based on sign re-interpretation in the phrase system of cultural codes, concerning Ukrainian ethnos, revelation of appraising orientations of the ethnic community, fixed up in phraseological denominations and their sign dynamics; the analysis of the connection of language paradoxicality, represented in phrases, with operations and peculiarities of ethnic consciousness, semiotic language regularities; establishing devices of preservation and transmission of knowledge with the phrases system of the Ukrainian language.

²⁵ Мокиєнко В.М. Противоречия фразеологии и ее динамика: автореф. дис. ... доктора филол. наук: спец. 10.02.03. Ленинград, 1976. 32 с.

²⁶ Ужченко В.Д. Историко-лінгвістичний аспект формування української фразеології: автореф. дис. ... доктора філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 1994. 34 с.

²⁷ Зубець Н.О. Мінімальні ідіоми в українській мові: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 1997. 20 с.

²⁸ Коломієць О.М. Фразеологічна синоніміка мови української художньої прози (на матеріалі творів .П.Гуцала): автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 2006. 20 с.

²⁹ Селіванова О. Нариси з української фразеології (психокогнітивний та етнокультурний аспекти): монографія. К. Черкаси: Брама, 2004. С.8.

M. Skab³⁰ refers to the thoughts of well-known scholars: F. Buslayev, V. Maslova, V. Teliya on the nature of phrases. In her opinion, phrases are peculiar microworlds, having both morale and common sense, expressed in a short expression, which were bequeathed by the ancestors for the descendants. Phrases are the heart of every national language in which the spirit and originality of a nation is expressed in its peculiar way, as in phrases unlike every other language unit a specific national colouring is manifested, the peculiarities of the figurative national thinking, people's proper perception of the language world model, the reflection of characteristic features of culture and mode of life, folk-customs, historical past, etc. It is not without reason that V. Teliya calls the phraseological stock as a mirror in which a linguocultural community identifies its national self-consciousness.

Since the time, when W. von Humboldt³¹ noticed that unlimited possibilities are inherent in language at its limited means, the immediate task has become studying the most general models and rules of linguistic structures. The second course of insufficient attention to phrase studies in linguistics is the fact that they are not registered in the scheme of language investigation, proposed by structural linguistics, underlain by the thesis about the ability of large-scale language segments to consist of smaller ones, which are not yielded to further segmentation and analysis.

V. Denysyuk³² points out, in particular, that a phrase-formation conception by O. Potebnya is the reflection of the scholar's view on language-creation of the ethnos, which is closely connected with its culture and psychology.

A set phrase (proverb, saying, aphorism, popular expression, phraseologism) according to a linguist's study is filled not with abstract and idealistic contents but a historical concrete thing, stipulated by the history of people – a native speaker. The

³⁰ Скаб М.В. Закономірності концептуалізації та мовної категоризації сакральної сфери: монографія. Чернівці: Рута, 2008. С.325 – 326.

³¹ Гумбольдт фон В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. М.: Прогресс, 2001. 400 с.

³² Денисюк В.В. Фразотвірна концепція О.О. Потебні і проблеми фразотворення // *Мовознавство*. 2015. № 6. С. 52 – 65.

subsoil of phrase-creation conception is the emergence of an image on the basis of observations, an original, according to the scholar's words, thickening of the thought.

Very valuable is V. Uzhchenko's³³ masterpiece, who ascertains that at present "anthropocentrism as a motive power of developing nominative language means that enables language analysis as the system of cultural categories. ... Anthropocentrism is taken in as a trend of language units at designating the world of man, a "human being in language", and a language meaning is the interpretation of the world by an individual. ... The anthropocentric approach enabled paying attention to psychological aspects of forming a language (phraseological) world model, and consider cultural phenomena as constants of culture.

That is why Modern Linguistics is characterized by the intensified interest to the anthropocentric paradigm, which began as far back as the time of W. von Humboldt's life. He especially pointed out, that "language is not only a means of exchange, serving mutual understanding, but a real world, which the inner work of spiritual force is called to place between itself and things: language is the world of outer phenomena and the inner human world". He also pointed out, that "different languages are not different designations of one and the same thing, but a different vision of it"³⁴. As the language of ethnos is general and its constituents that also cover set phrases in any way are "the spokesman of its conceptional, intellectual, moral, psychological, customary and other principles, and it is in language that the image of ethnical world arises, at first unconscious, in which general initial images and motives doze, but after some time conscious in its being"³⁵.

V. Zhaivoronok's thought is detailed by V. Kononenko³⁶, pointing out that "the expressions, built on metaphorical world usages ... cause appraisal and emotional

³³ Ужченко В.Д., Ужченко Д.В. Фразеологія сучасної української мови / К.: Знання, 2007. С.435.

³⁴ Цит. за: Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика: учеб. пособие. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. Минск: ТетраСистемс, 2008. С. 104.

³⁵ Жайворонок В.В. Мова та етносвіт // *Культура народів Причорномор'я*: наук. журнал. Сімферополь, 2009. № 168. Т. 1.С. 259.

³⁶ Кононенко В. Мова у контексті культури: монографія. К.; Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2008. С. 6.

effect because of their correlation with usual perception, consolidated in national consciousness. The processes of mental character make an imprint on sensation of the world even in the conditions of individual author sense transformations of verbal images”.

At the same time M. Zhuikova³⁷ points out, that the basic feature of the phraseological system, which distinguishes it from other language subsystem is a high anthropocentric orientation (anthropocentricity) that is manifested above all in selective nomination: by means of phraseological units a language community verbalizes just those fragments of the world around, which, in her point of view, have the greatest relevance.

We share V. Uzhchenko's³⁸ assertion that "phrases as signs of culture are marked with cultural and semiotic significance, are sign-microcontexts, mental and structural presentations of the most versatile codes of culture. Human realization of cultural significance, embodied in phraseological sign-microcontexts, is reflexive. Phrases are characterized with unequal detailing of different conceptual scopes”.

A number of phrase definitions have been given in scholarly literature. One of the most complete is the definition, proposed by O. Selivanova³⁹, considering it as "a stable, connected with the unity of contents, constantly reproduced in speech word combinations or expressions, based on stereotypes of ethnic consciousness, is a representative of human culture and characterized with figurativeness and expressiveness”. It is this phrase comprehension that underlies the basis of both lexicographical and text representation of language units, which form macro- and microgroups, on the one hand, and semantic fields, on the other.

³⁷ Жуйкова М.В. Динамічні процеси у фразеологічній системі східнослов'янських мов: монографія. Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа», 2007. С. 7.

³⁸ Ужченко В.Д. Нові лінгвістичні парадигми „концепт – фразеологізм – мовна картина світу” // *Східнослов'янські мови в їх історичному розвитку: зб. наук. праць*. Запоріжжя, 2006. С. 149.

³⁹ Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми: підручн. Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2008. С. 641.

Phrases are complicated complexes, which are simple forms, on the one hand, and syntactical structures, on the other. The problems that are the subject-matter of scholarly discussions within modern phraseological theory have no monosemantic answer because of great variety of language material, which belongs to phraseological corpora of different languages.

Thus, till now there is no unity of opinion among the researchers in the issue of scope and limits of phraseology to which they enlist: 1) idioms – the main body of the phraseological stock, as only they are word equivalents as far as the accomplishment of the whole nominative function is concerned; 2) phraseological collocations – phrases with an analytical type of meaning, which with their structure immediately interact with the units of lexico-semantic language system; 3) proverbs, sayings, aphorisms with direct and figurative meanings; 4) speech stock phrase; 5) polytypic clichés; 6) popular expressions.

We, however, share the opinion of those researchers, who refer only first three types to the scope of phraseology. At this we point out that proverbs and are saying referred to the special type of phraseological units – communicative. A great number of domestic and foreign scholars point out the following categorical phrase properties: 1) idiomaticity / non-motivation of meaning; 2) reproduction; 3) stability; 4) wholeness. Besides, words and phrases enter common ideographic collocations (fields, groups, etc.), which are revealed by means of the method of componential analysis, the application of which is possible owing to the same structure of meanings of both words and phrases. Some researchers stressed structural and semantic originality of phrases and distinguished them as special, autonomous language level.

Closer to the truth, in our opinion is considering them as the units of transitional type, that are between lexico-semantic and syntactic levels, being more tightly linked with lexico-semantic system. Such an approach by no means contradicts the general view on language as an extraordinary complicated hierarchical system, one of the basic signs of which are variability and transition.

One more important problem of modern phraseology is the establishment of typology of phraseological units. As it is known, one of the first endeavours of their

systematization of components was Sh. Bally's classification⁴⁰, in which he based his opinion on the degree of component coherence within the stock of phrases. According to this classification "word groups may represent a different degree of fusion within the limits of two extreme cases" and proposed to distinguish two basic types of set phrases: phraseological set or a usual phraseological group in which a word combination is relatively free, and a phraseological unity in which the individual sense of word components is altogether lost.

In linguistics there is a well-known V. Vinogradov's classification⁴¹ of phrases underlain by the degree of component coherence among phraseological units as well as the degree of motivation of their meanings. The scholar distinguishes the following three types of phraseological fusions or idioms, that are absolutely indivisible phraseological units, the meaning of which is utterly independent on their components: *брати на решето* – 'to slander anybody'; *на батьківських* – 'on foot'; 2) phraseological units, that is the type of closely set phraseological groups, which are also syntactically indivisible and are also the expression of unique integral meaning, motivated as the amalgamation of meanings of lexical components, e.g., Ukrainian *мати руку* – 'to make use of somebody's support, protection, etc.'; *лобом горіхи розбивати* – 'to waist efforts, time, doing monkey business'; 3) phraseological collocations, which are defined as phraseological groups, formed by way of realizing involuntary, bound word meanings, e.g., *показати поріг (дорогу, одвірок, шлях і т. ін.)* – 'to set an affair going'.

Different classifications of phraseological units, that are based on their structural peculiarities, are proposed. Thus, A. Smirnitkii⁴² distinguishes two structural and semantic types of phraseological units in English: one-top, two-top and multi-top phraseological units.

⁴⁰ Балли Ш. Французская стилистика. М.: Изд-во иностран. лит., 1961. С. 89 – 90.

⁴¹ Виноградов В.В. Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. М.: Наука, 1977. С.121.

⁴² Смирницкий А. И. Лексикология английского языка. М.: МГУ, 1998. С. 215 – 223.

Concretizing his classification the author distinguishes three the most frequent types of one-top phraseological units (verb – adverbial phrases, e.g. Engl. *to ring up* – ‘дзвонити’); preposition – nominal: *by heart* – ‘напам’ять’; *for good* – ‘назавжди’; as well as the following phrases: *be tied* – ‘бути втомленим’, *be surprise* – ‘бути здивованим’, etc., four types of two and multi-top phrases (attributive-nominal, e.g.: *first night* – ‘перем’єра’, verbal-substantive, etc.: *to take the floor* – ‘брати слово’, adverbial, e.g.: *every other day* – ‘через день’, as well as multi - type reiterations, e.g.: *now or never* – ‘тепер або ніколи’).

A more detailed structural classification taking into account specificity of functioning phraseological units and their part-of speech meaning are represented in the transactions of A. Koonin⁴³: 1) nominative phrases within the limits of which substantive units are distinguished, e.g., Engl.: *crocodile tears* – ‘крокодилячі сльози’, adjective, e.g.: *as swift as thought* – ‘швидкий як думка’, adverbial, e.g.: *out of a clear sky* – ‘з чистого неба’; 2) interjective phrases; 3) phrases with modal meanings, e.g.: *at any price* – ‘за будь яку ціну’; 4) communicative phrases, referring to proverbs and saying, e.g.: *there is no smoke without fire* – ‘димю без вогню не буває’, *East or West home is best* – ‘всюди добре, а вдома найкраще’.

At present some researchers distinguish structural-semantic types of phrases. Thus, e.g., V. Mokiienko⁴⁴ proposes his classification, based on the notion phraseological patterns, bearing in mind structural-semantic invariant of set phrases that schematically reflect relative stability of their form and meaning [Mokiienko 1989].

From this follows, that complex approach to systematizing phraseological units is based on taking into account polytypic criteria – structural (A. Smirnitskii), semantic (V. Vinogradov), syntactical (A. Koonin), structural-semantic (V. Mokiienko).

⁴³ Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа. Дубна: Издат. Центр „Феникс”, 1996. 81 с.

⁴⁴ Мокиенко В.М. Славянская фразеология. 2-е изд. М., 1989. 287 с.

2. The problems of the inner form of a phrase and phraseological meaning

The most difficult for solution now is the question about phraseological meaning. Till now there is no unanimous opinion about the essence of phraseological meaning. Some scholars consider that phraseological units are characterized by lexical meaning, though they point out its originality – A. Molotkov⁴⁵, N. Shansky⁴⁶. However, the majority of linguists, admitting that there is much in common between a phrase and word, accentuate the availability of phraseological meaning, which must be considered as a special type of a language one. At the same time a thought is advanced that it consists of a figurative representation of metaphorical, metonymical and comparative type, through which denotatum is called and a connotative characteristic in significatum is given.

In studying the nature of phraseological meaning an important constituent is the issue on relating the integral phraseological meaning to semantics of its components. Thus, O. Akhmanova⁴⁷, accentuating the integrity of nomination as a distinctive feature of a phraseological unit, points out the complication of the component nature in phraseological units, which is a potential word, capable of actualizing a new meaning, that has developed against the background of the general phraseological meaning.

The specificity of phraseological meaning in the most complete way is expounded in V. Teliya's transactions⁴⁸, who distinguished four basic categorical signs of this meaning: 1) synsemanticity of phraseologically bound meaning, that is the ability of a word to point out the object of nomination only during common

⁴⁵ Молотков А.И. Основы фразеологии русского языка. Л., 1977. 284 с.

⁴⁶ Шанский Н.М. Лексикология современного русского языка. М., 1971. 328 с.

⁴⁷ Ахманова О.С. Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии. М.: Учпедгиз, 1957. С. 169 – 171.

⁴⁸ Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты: монография. М.: Школа. Языки русской культуры, 1996. С. 166.

realization with a semantical keywords; 2) non-independence of the sign functions of words with a phraseologically bound meaning; 3) a phraseologically bound word meaning has an indirect derivative character: under the influence of the supporting name in the word under reinterpretation, the following sense microcomponents in its "previous" meaning are realized, which arise on the basis of really associative similarity of primary and secondary subjects of nomination; 4) connotativeness of phraseologically bound word meaning. This microcomponent is a certain remainder, "splinter" of the inner word form that has a link of the reinterpreted meaning with a supporting name for it.

The study of the phraseological complex which has lexical units in its inner form, belonging to a certain thematic sphere, enables revealing systemic relations between lexical and phraseologically bound meaning of this units and the whole phraseological complex. In defining a phraseological meaning as a special semantic category the scholars call linguo-creative basis, firstly, dialectal unity of associative and figurative indirect and derivative reflection of repeated denotative situation and phrase – creative interactions of level-heterogeneous units of primary sign designation; secondary, a relatively integral contentment and the way of separately combined functioning of phraseological units; thirdly, the generating means of forming phrasological meaning is the inner form of phraseological units.

The term *the inner form* belongs to those, which have a great number of interpretations in linguistic literature. At first it was introduced by W. von Humboldt for designating inner language consideration in general. Henceforth this notion was actively used in the description of different lexemes, undergoing considerable changes. However, till now there is no unanimous opinion as far as the essence of the inner form is concerned, one group of researchers considers this phenomenon from the standpoint of diachrony and refers it to the nearest etymological meaning, the others – the sign of nomination, expressed with a word and amalgamates as a special component with the lexical word meaning. The results of the inner form word studies were used by phraseologists during the description of the inner form of phraseological units. However, because of the fact, that a phrase is a specific

language unit characterized by a separate combination, idiomaticity, reproduction, etc., the definition of *the inner phrase form* significantly differs from the definition of *the inner word form*. That is why a great number of researchers point out a greater topicality of the inner phrase form in comparison with a word one, considering it as an element of idea about a certain fact, event, situation that were often repeated, had similar signs of other phenomena which were convenient for generalization.

A. Melerovich⁴⁹ considers the phraseological inner form as "sense contents, embodied in the material form of a language sign, formalized in conformity with a certain actual meaning with which derivational relations are established". In her opinion, the inner form emerges as a result of word complex abstraction from a solitary instance or situation, for naming and characteristic of which it was created. It is the specificity of abstraction that stipulates the availability of different types of the inner forms.

In the process of metaphorical and metonymical transference of meaning semantic displacement in the component meaning of derivational bases occurs which directly leads to the non-primary meaning of word-components. Thus, e.g., Y. Gvozdarov⁵⁰ considers, that the inner form is "relation of the primary meaning of a derivational basis to the secondary component-meaning and a common meaning of a phrase". A similar point of view on the problem of the inner form definition we find in A. Koonin⁵¹. The last, researcher, besides, analyses different prototypes as the constituents of the inner form and distinguishes their four varieties: language, speech, out of language and mixed. In A. Koonin's opinion, the meaning of the prototype is linked with the actual phrase meaning by means of derivational connection, being the inner form.

⁴⁹ Мелерович А.М. Семантическая структура фразеологических единиц современного русского языка как лингвистическая проблема: автореф. дис. ... доктора филол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Л., 1982. С.18.

⁵⁰ Гвоздарёв Ю.А. Основы русского фразообразования. Ростов: Изд-во Ростовск. ун-та, 1977. С.48.

⁵¹ Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. М.: Высшая школа. Дубна: Издат. Центр „Феникс”, 1996. С. 73.

The views of V. Zhukov⁵² on the problem of the inner form is somewhat contradictory. On the one hand, under the inner form he understands the image that emerges as a result of interaction of a free word combination with a reinterpreted phrase on its basis. At the same time the revelation of the inner form is possible through the appliqué of a free word combination on this phrase of the same lexical stock. According to this assertion *the inner form* is inherent only in a limited number of language units, namely – phraseological unities. On the other hand, V. Zhukov points out, that the inner form is an independent (etymological) meaning, available side by side with actual that is accompanying for it As we see, here the confusion of two approaches to the study of the inner form occurs – synchronic and diachronic as the sign of equality is set between form and the standard. The inner form is an important component, that favours the comprehension of a phrase. Notwithstanding the diversity of points of view on the inner form, the majority of researchers are of the same opinion, that the inner form adds sense and appraisal-stylistic signs.

The inner form performs the function of "a holder of verbal associations", which are "literal" phrase readings with the initial image for awakening a certain feeling the attitude towards the designated objects during phrase perception. Dead inner forms, after the model of *мати на увазі, отримати верх, ніякого відчуття* do not cause any attitude. At the same time the inner forms, that are associated with nonsenses or sound irritants, e.g., *ні до ладу, ні до прикладу; раз та гаразд* influence the emotional sphere, awaking feelings – attitude. In modern researchers of phrases, based on cognitive paradigm, studying the inner form acquires special topicality, because it most exactly preserves semantic connection of the language structure with the perceptual one, underlying it.

V. Teliya⁵³ looks into the inner form within a motivational macrocomponent of meaning. On the one hand, the inner form is a way of organizing phrase meaning, based on the typical idea; on the other one – the image medium – "reduced and

⁵² Жуков В.П. Семантика фразеологических оборотов. М.: Прогресс, 1978. С. 8.

⁵³ Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты: монография. М.: Школа. Языки русской культуры, 1996. С. 166. С. 41.

typified copy of the image with the real or fabricated situation, which is inserted by a direct meaning of the word combination. This image is nothing more, than gestalt-structure, which can be represented visually or in the form of sounds. Figurative gestalt-structure operates in the conditions of similarity, introduced with the meaning "as if", e.g., *to give away home secrets – as if to wash one's dirty linen in public*. Thus, the inner form is the complex, which includes not only the element of idea, but also an image, emerging during a phrase perception. The term *gestalt-structure*, introduced by the researcher, designates the phenomenon, which has the name imagery in traditional linguistics.

In the linguistic aspect imagery is studied on the whole as a semantic basis of expressiveness. Imagery is a decisive factor of phrase allotting in language, as in this way the tendency to speech expressiveness finds its reflection. Studying phraseological language stock, V. Mokiienko⁵⁴ represents the process of phrase functioning as the way from the figurative to the non-figurative. He also points out a close connection of figurativeness and expressiveness. Phraseological figurativeness is a clearly defined lingual essence, with metaphor, being a universal means of its formation.

Phraseologists point out signs, which distinguish phraseological metaphor from a literary one: 1) standardness, loss of individuality; 2) transition from a figure of speech to a language sign; 3) systemic character; 4) situativeness, that is transference of meaning is accomplished according to the similarity of the whole situation. The correlation of the inner form and figurativeness in linguistic literature has no single solution till the present time. Thus, e.g. V. Zhukov⁵⁵ identifies these two notions.

In our opinion, these are different things: the inner form is a systemic phenomenon, the result of complicated speech-thinking processes, which anticipate language embodiment of different mental forms in naming reality.

⁵⁴ Мокиенко В.М. Славянская фразеология. 2-е изд. М., 1989. С.157.

⁵⁵ Жуков В.П. Семантика фразеологических оборотов. М.: Прогресс, 1978. С.8.

On the pages of linguistic literature one may often encounter the term metaphorization, which is immediately connected with the emergence of new phrases. In B. Larin's opinion, this process is the basic "condition for transforming a simple sentence into an idiomatic"⁵⁶. The transition of phrase study towards cognitive direction is stipulated by the whole course of the humanitarian thought in Modern Linguistics. Cognitive linguistics enables the analysis of the processes, occurring during phraseologization, that is the formation of phraseological concepts and designate devices of correlating language and cognitive aspects in phraseology.

Until now there is no monosemantic typology of semes that are members of the sememe. Thus, e.g., among semes V. Hak⁵⁷ distinguishes archsemes, which are common for the whole class of semes, and differential semes, available this sememe. I. Sternin distinguishes usual and occasional semes. Besides, the scholar distinguishes systemic semes that are members of the sememe structure and are generally known for the whole community of speakers and personal semes, available only in the individual language competence, yet they are not well-known. During the sememe analysis from the point of view of semes that are its members, Z. Popova and I. Sternin⁵⁸ distinguish basic ones among them, which determine meanings and consist of archsemes and differential semes. Basic semes are sufficient for characterizing a sememe. However, besides them, every sememe may have an unlimited number of diverse semes, which detail the signs of the sememe. They are: probable, potential and inmost sememes. Probable semes are manifested in the sememe, when a more profound cognition of new properties of a subject of phenomenon occurs. Potential semes are additional, optional, which may not be perceived during some word and phrase usages. Thus, a sememe is a hierarchical integrity, consisting of polytypic semes.

⁵⁶ Ларин Б.А. История русского языка и общее языкознание. М.: Просвещение, 1977. С.105.

⁵⁷ Гак В.Г. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. М.: Либроком, 2010. 228 с.

⁵⁸ Попова З.Д., Стернин И.А. Язык и национальная картина мира. Воронеж: Истоки, 2002. 58 с.

As it was already mentioned above sememes are divided into denotative and connotative. At present the notion of connotation may consist of different contents. Some scholars consider, that connotation is the phenomenon of the associative nature. As far as connotative elements are concerned, they are not included in the sign meaning of word signs, but are generated by specific conditions of their usage in speech acts. Other scholars, admitting connotation to be a part of a word meaning, differ in views as far as its meaning is concerned. They include the following three components into connotation: emotive, appraisal and stylistic. V. Shakhovskii⁵⁹ is an adherent of the narrow connotation comprehension. He considers, that connotation is the aspect of lexical meaning of a language unit, with the help of which the emotional state of a speaker is expressed as well as stipulated with its attitude towards addressee, object and subject of speech, situation, in which some speech communication is held. He distinguishes the following three types of connotation: inherent phraseological connotation, that is, connotation of a phrase combination in the proper sense of a word; adherent phraseological connotation that is manifested in realizing text-creating potencies of phraseological units; occasional, that anticipates pragmatic presupposition. The study of set phrases on the basis of seme analysis enables demonstrating semantic processes, that lead to the formation of phraseological meaning. The process of actualization, cancellation or re-grouping semes in a sememe, which leads to emerging connotative sememe that is formed only in phrase combination, comes into being as a result of performing dynamic cognitive processes of transforming knowledge gained: from concrete to abstract.

CONCLUSIONS

The device of forming connotation is the reflection of cognitive processes in language, which are based on the knowledge, underlying it.

⁵⁹ Шаховский В.И. Эмотивность фразеологии как межкультурный феномен // *Культурные слои во фразеологизмах и дискурсивных практиках* / отв. ред. В.Н. Телия. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. С. 46 – 52.

To make this transition possible and carried out one must have appropriate knowledge. The process of setting phrase-combination as the transition from D1 D2 to K1 K1 the formation of connotative sememes as a result of their denotative sememe development. The seme stock of sememe D1 is transformed by means of loss or change of hierarchy of some semes. Sememe K1 has no direct outlet to the denotation on the basis of referring to the image of another denotation. In the course of using lexemes in the K1 status the combination of images D1 and K1 takes place, besides, that sememe K1 in this language has another name, another lexeme, which characterizes it in status D1. The researchers quite equitably consider, that the meanings of the sememe D1 "is based o the knowledge about the subject, phenomena of real actuality that are called by it. ... The peculiarity and the most important place of the sememe D1 in the system of sememes consists in the fact that it underlies lexical system, serves as its foundation, realizing a direct connection with the images of denotata in the intellectual activities of a human being, changing and manifesting these images in the process of thought generation"⁶⁰. A denotative sememe designates a subject or phenomenon immediately through visual and sensory level of the concept. Visual and sensory thinking fixes not only individual images, verbalized with the help of a word, but also whole situations. A way of verbalizing denotative semes D1 D1 which is a prototype, basis of the process of phrase-formation.

E.g. a denotative situation, verbalized with a word *сідати (вилазити) на голову / сісти (впізти на голову)* D1 D1 in which the verb *сідати* has the meaning of 'subdue'. Let us nose the development of the denotative situation *сідати на голову* towards connotative, having the main sense "wholly subdue anybody according to one's own will". As a result of mental processes that are based on associative links, a cognitive metaphorical transference of distinguished mental signs takes place (subjugation and the intention to realize one's will) on any other action, connected with the necessity of total loss of one's will. On the verbal level this process looks like this. Denotative situation, expressed with lexemes D1 D1 *сідати*

⁶⁰ Копыленко М.М., Попова З.Д. Очерки по общей фразеологии. Воронеж: Либроком, 2010. 192 с.

на голову means 'totally subdue anybody to one's will'. Sememe *ciđamu* has a potential seme *totally* meaning 'universality in action manifestation', getting actual and abstract from a denotative situation, connected with realization of pressure from top to bottom, extends its meaning to any action, tied up with the refusal of one's own will as a result of pressure realized by a person, being on a higher level of social hierarchy. The result of such an action is the formation of a set phrase K1 K1 that preserves a motivating sign 'a total refusal from one's own will as a result of accomplished pressure'. From this example it is becoming evident that the process of phraseologization is the abstraction from a concrete image to the real situation by means of metaphorization and seme re-grouping.

The above-mentioned contemplations give every reason for the assertion that the process of phraseologization manifests basic regularities of the phraseological meaning development, the ways of its formation, underlain by the models, demonstrating general principles of semantic transformation and represent the formation of phrase combinations as a cognitive process.

SUMMARY

The article deals with the description and analysis of basic problems of phraseology study in Modern Linguistics, as phraseological expressions are inherent in a great number of people of the world and attract intensified attention of the researchers during the last decades, when the strengthening of the principle of anthropomorphism anticipates a language study orienting at a human being as the basic personage of speech activities. The opinions of domestic and foreign scholars on the problem under study have been nosed after from the source to the present time. In particular, different approaches to the definition of the notion *phrase* have been characterized as well as the most important classifications of phraseological units. The problem of phrase typology has been accentuated. The author points out that a complex approach to systematizing phraseological units is based on taking into account polytypic criteria – structural, semantic, syntactical and structural-semantic. Modern approaches to the notions *the inner phrase form*, *phraseological meaning* have been described. As the result of the accomplished study the author draws a

conclusion that the process of phraseologization manifests basic regularities of the phraseological meaning development, the ways of its formation, underlain by the models, demonstrating general principles of semantic transformation and represent the creation of phrase combinations as a cognitive process.

REFERENCES

1. Ахманова О.С. Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии. М.:Учпедгиз, 1957. 562 с.
2. Балли Ш. Французская стилистика. М.: Изд-во иностран. лит., 1961. 394 с.
3. Бодуэн де Куртене И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. М. 1963. URL: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=e>
4. Буслаев Ф.И. Русские пословицы и поговорки, собранные и объясненные. М., 1954. 457 с.
5. Винник В.О., Горобець В.Й., Карпова В.Л., Німчук В.В. та ін. Історія української мови. Лексика і фразеологія: монографія; АН УРСР, Ін-т мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні. К.: Наук. думка, 1983. 742, [1] с.
6. Виноградов В.В. Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. М.: Наука, 1977. 312 с.
7. Гак В.Г. Сравнительная типология французского и русского языков. М.: Либроком, 2010. 228 с.
8. Гвоздарёв Ю.А. Основы русского фразообразования. Ростов: Изд-во Ростовск. ун-та, 1977. 184 с.
9. Гнатюк І.С. Відповідальність перед словом: професор Лариса Григорівна Скрипник // *Українська лексикографія в загальнослов'янському контексті: теорія, практика, типологія. Ларисі Григорівні Скрипник*. К.: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2011. С. 17 – 22.
10. Гумбольдт фон В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. М.: Прогресс, 2001. 400 с.
11. Демський М.Т. Деривація фразем на базі слів та вільних синтаксичних конструкцій // *Мовознавство*. 1988. № 1 (127). С. 37 – 45.

12. Денисенко С. Культурологічний компонент в семантиці фразеологічних одиниць (на матеріалі німецької фразеології) // *Мова і культура: наук. щоріч. журн.* К.: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2000. Вип. 1. Т. 2. С. 73 – 78.
13. Денисюк В.В. Фразотвірна концепція О.О. Потебні і проблеми фразотворення // *Мовознавство*. 2015. № 6. С. 52 – 65.
14. Єрмоленко С.С., Бечко Я.В. Відображення семантичної структури багатозначних слів на фразеологічному рівні // *Мовознавство*. 2010. № 6. С. 43 – 54.
15. Жайворонок В.В. Мова та етносвіт // *Культура народів Причорномор'я: наук. журнал*. Сімферополь, 2009. № 168. Т. 1. С. 259 – 261.
16. Жуйкова М.В. Динамічні процеси у фразеологічній системі східнослов'янських мов: монографія. Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа», 2007. 416 с.
17. Жуков В.П. Семантика фразеологічних оборотів. М.: Прогресс, 1978. 160 с.
18. Зубець Н.О. Мінімальні ідіоми в українській мові: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 1997. 20 с.
19. Калашник В.С. Фразотворення в українській поетичній мові радянського періоду: семантико-типологічний аспект: монографія. Харків: Вища школа, видавництво при ХДУ, 1985. 172 с.
20. Коломієць О.М. Фразеологічна синоніміка мови української художньої прози (на матеріалі творів Є.П.Гуцала): автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 2006. 20 с.
21. Кононенко В. Мова у контексті культури: монографія. К.; Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 2008. 390 с.
22. Копыленко М.М., Попова З.Д. Очерки по общей фразеологии. Воронеж: Либроком, 2010. 192 с.
23. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка М.: Высшая школа. Дубна: Издат. Центр „Феникс”, 1996. 81 с.

- 24.Ларин Б.А. История русского языка и общее языкознание. М.: Просвещение, 1977. 286 с.
- 25.Ломоносов М.В. Труды по фразеологии: полн. собр. соч. М. – Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1952. Т.4. 605 с.
- 26.Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика: учеб. пособие. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. Минск: ТетраСистемс, 2008. 272 с.
- 27.Мелерович А.М. Семантическая структура фразеологических единиц современного русского языка как лингвистическая проблема: автореф. дис. ... доктора филол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Л., 1982. 40 с.
- 28.Мокиенко В.М. Противоречия фразеологии и ее динамика: автореф. дис. ... доктора филол. наук: спец. 10.02.03. Ленинград, 1976. 32 с.
- 29.Мокиенко В.М. Славянская фразеология. 2-е изд. М., 1989. 287 с.
- 30.Молотков А.И. Основы фразеологии русского языка. Л., 1977. 284 с.
- 31.Попова З.Д., Стернин И.А. Язык и национальная картина мира Воронеж: Истоки, 2002. 58 с.
- 32.Селіванова О. Нариси з української фразеології (психоконітивний та етнокультурний аспекти): монографія. К. Черкаси: Брама, 2004. 276 с.
- 33.Селіванова О.О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми: підручн. Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2008. 712 с.
- 34.Скаб М.В. Закономірності концептуалізації та мовної категоризації сакральної сфери: монографія. Чернівці: Рута, 2008. 560 с.
- 35.Скрипник Л.Г. Фразеологія української мови [АН УРСР, Інститут мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні / відп. ред. Л.С. Паламарчук. К.: Наук. думка, 1973б. 280 с.
- 36.Смирницкий А. И. Лексикология английского языка. М.: МГУ, 1998. 260 с.
- 37.Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты: монография. М.: Школа. Языки русской культуры, 1996. 286 с.
- 38.Удовиченко Г.М. Фразеологічний словник української мови: У 2 т. / К.: Вища школа, 1984. Т. 1 – 2.

39. Ужченко В.Д. Історико-лінгвістичний аспект формування української фразеології: автореф. дис. ... доктора філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01. Дніпропетровськ, 1994. 34 с.
40. Ужченко В.Д. Нові лінгвістичні парадигми „концепт – фразеологізм – мовна картина світу” // *Східнослов'янські мови в їх історичному розвитку: зб. наук. праць*. Запоріжжя, 2006. С. 146 – 151.
41. Ужченко В.Д., Ужченко Д.В. Фразеологія сучасної української мови / К.: Знання, 2007. 494 с.
42. Шанский Н.М. Лексикология современного русского языка. М., 1971. 328 с.
43. Шахматов А. А. Очерк современного русского литературного языка. М.: Учпедгиз, 1941. 288 с.
44. Шаховский В.И. Эмотивность фразеологии как межкультурный феномен // *Культурные слои во фразеологизмах и дискурсивных практиках* / отв. ред. В.Н. Телия. М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. С. 46 – 52.
45. Щерба Л.В. О тройном аспекте языковых явлений и об эксперименте в языкознании // *Языковая система и речевая деятельность*. Л., 1974. С. 24 – 39). URL: <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/shcherba-74a.htm>

Information about the author:

Venzhynovych N.F.,

Doctor of Philological Sciences,

Professor of the Ukrainian Language Department

Uzhhorod National University

14, Universytetska str., Uzhhorod , 88017, Ukraine