

Pregledni rad  
811.161.2'373.7

**Larysa KALMYKOVA (Kyiv)**

Department of Psychology and Pedagogy of Preschool Education,  
Hryhoriy Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav, Ukraine  
klo377@ukr.net

**Nataliia KHARCHENKO (Kyiv)**

Department of Psychology and Pedagogy of Preschool Education,  
Hryhoriy Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav, Ukraine  
kharchenko.nataliia.v@gmail.com

**Inna MYSAN (Kyiv)**

Department of Psychology and Pedagogy of Preschool Education,  
Hryhoriy Skovoroda University in Pereiaslav, Ukraine  
mysan.iv79@gmail.com

**RESEARCH ON PHRASEOLOGISMS IN THE  
EASTERN EUROPEAN LINGUISTICS**

The article is devoted to the analysis of few psycholinguistic pieces of research on phraseological units which are important for linguistics. These studies describe how phraseological units, which are considered in their functional aspect as operational speech units, blocks of perception and reproduction of stable expressions, can function in human utterances. It has been discovered that in terms of speech competence two groups of phraseological expressions are distinguished: (1) phraseologisms of communicative nature, which are predicative phrases equivalent to a sentence, as they form a complete utterance and express a certain judgment; (2) phraseological expressions of a nominative nature, which are a combination of words identical only to a certain part of a sentence, or act as a verbal form of a particular concept and, as words, they perform a nominative function in the language (Shanskyi, 1968). It is established that semantic and stylistic nuances have been taken into account in the classifications of phraseological units.

Key words: *phraseologisms, phraseological units, phraseological meaning, classification of phraseologisms*

## Introduction

The actualization of phraseology problems in the world of modern philological science is caused by several factors. In particular, firstly, by the attention of scientists to everyday „living“ speech communication of its subjects, where phraseologisms are functioning on equal terms with other linguistic units; secondly, by the efforts of researchers to go deeper in understanding and describing how native speakers reconsider a free word combination, how its nominative meaning is lost in a phraseologism and the new, figurative meaning is acquired; thirdly, by how phraseologisms reflect human mind and human emotions; fourthly, by what potential opportunities such phraseological units have, etc. These and other factors formed the basis for many scientists to turn to this issue. For instance, many well-known linguists have devoted their works to the study of phraseologisms, including *Eastern European scientists* (Avksentiev, 1986; Babych, 1971; Bally, 1961; Bulakhovskiy, 1927; Vinogradov, 1947, 1955, 1972; Dahl, 1984; Demskyi, 1972, 1988; Izhakevych, 1973; Lychuk, 2019; Kosmeda, 2000; Potebnya, 1993; Sytar, 2017; Syzonov, 2018; Skrypnyk, 1973; Uzhchenko, 1993, 2003; V. Uzhchenko & D. Uzhchenko, 2007; Shanskyi, 1968, 1969; Shcherba, 1974, etc.) as well as *Western European and American scientists* (Bilyanova et al., 2019; Caillies & Butcher, 2007; Cordero, 2018; Espinal, 2009; Inoue, 2016; Gehrke & McNally, 2019; Gray & Biber, 2015; Holsinger, 2013; Krzysnik, 2010; Nunberg et al., 1994; Fellbaum, 2007, 2019; Sprenger et al., 2006; Svensen, 2009; Zolotaryova & Nguyen, 2018; Tabossi et al., 2008; Titone & Connine, 1999; Bargmann & Sailer, 2015; Cowie, 1998; Fraser, 1970; Kay et al., 2012; Tabossi et al., 2009; Ernst, 1981; Espinal & Jaume, 2010).

Most scholars mainly define *phraseologisms* as the independent linguistic units which are characterized by holistic meaning, component composition, grammatical categories, and reproducibility. They believe that the set of linguistic units that are inherent in these features constitute the volume of phraseology in any language.

As *linguistic units*, phraseologisms are: a) *metaphorical codified signs* that accumulate the cultural potential of the people and the mentality of the nation and are stored in the social memory of the ethnos; b) *phraseologically established and standardized codes*, the meanings of which provide an abstract representation for the component of cultural and national connotations, and embody the national consciousness and the people's spiritual world etc.

According to Sizonov (2018), „Phraseology is not just a constituent linguistic unit. It has a wider meaning – that of a certain concept, an expressive universal, which imparts additional emotional intensity to a mass media text (p. 288).“

Therefore, the **purpose of the article** is to analyse the modern understanding of phraseologisms and their functional role in communicative processes and states experienced by subjects of interaction.

### **Research methods**

The following theoretical methods were used in the study: the analysis of linguistic literature, systematization and generalization of its results to determine the theoretical foundations of the phraseology problem; classification of particular linguistic provisions in order to determine communicative and stylistic functions of phraseologisms.

### **Basic material**

In the presence of a large variety of terminological interpretations, the term „phraseological unit“, or its synonyms, „phraseologism“ or „idiom“ (in Western science), are recognized as the most convenient generic names for designation of a linguistic unit, which is the basic element of phraseology.

Being formed predominantly on the semantic-grammatical grounds, phraseological units are substantially different from free syntactic combinations, both in content and origin. Free word combinations are characterized by each word having the direct meaning. Such expressions are generated whenever there is a need to build a unit of linguistic communication. Phraseological entities have a holistic meaning and they are not generated every time but reproduced as ready-made structures for use in speech. The meaning of a free word combination is always the sum of meanings of the words that it is made of, and they form a living semantic and grammatical relationship. Instead, a phraseological unit arises as a result of reconsidering a free word combination: the words which make it up lose their direct meanings as a result of metaphorization, and they acquire new meanings when used in a phraseologism.

The issues connected with phraseological composition of the Ukrainian language are widely presented in research works by Avksentyev (1986), Bulakhovskiy (1927), Potebnya (1993), Skrypnyk (1973), Udovychenko (1984), Uzhchenko (1993, 2003) and others.

In Ukrainian contemporary language standard terminology, the phraseologism is referred to as „the combination of words, which is reproduced in the language, and is lexically indivisible, stable in its composition, and integral in its meaning (Kovaliv, 2007, p. 546)“. Idioms are also interpreted as a deviation from the semantically determined connection between the components of a particular linguistic unit (phrase) and its meaning: as we move away

from the historically established primary meaning of the phrase components that caused the idiom to form, the connection between the form and the meaning becomes increasingly opaque, and obscured (Dunbar, 1991). The use of phraseologisms as signs of secondary nomination adds more expressiveness to speech. In literature, phraseologisms expand the potential of fiction, but also cause difficulties when it comes to translation into other languages (Kovaliv, 2007, p. 546).

A significant contribution to the definition of the essence of phraseologisms, classification of phraseological units, and their origins was made by Vinogradov (1947, 1955, 1972), Fortunatov (1957), Shakhmatov (2001), Shcherba (1974) and others (based on the material of the Russian language). The semantic classification of phraseological units, suggested by Vinogradov (1972), has become widespread in the modern Eastern European linguistics. Scientists have identified three groups of phraseologisms: (1) *phraseological fusions*, or idioms (idiomatic expressions); (2) phraseological unities; (3) phraseological compounds. Yet this division of all phraseologisms into three types is not conclusive.

While emphasizing the most essential features of phraseologisms (reproducibility in the process of communication, the integrity of meaning), M. Shanskyi (1968) based his phraseological theory on the degree of modification of the word's meaning in different syntactic and stylistic conditions of phrase formation. Having preserved the three main classes of phraseological units found in Vinogradov's scheme, Shanskyi distinguished the fourth class – *phraseological expressions*, which include „phraseological phrases so stable in their composition and use that they are not only semantically divisive, but also consist entirely of words with the free end */all is not gold that glitters/* (Shanskyi, 1968: 69)“.

From among all phraseological expressions, Shanskyi (1968) distinguishes two groups in terms of speech competence: (1) *phraseologisms of communicative nature*, which are predicative word-combinations equivalent to a sentence; they form a complete utterance and express a particular judgment */ khrin vid redky ne solodshyj/*; (2) *phraseological expressions of nominative nature*, which are combinations of words identical to only a certain part of a sentence, a verbal form of a particular concept and, as words, perform a nominative function in the language */ trudovi uspihky; palij vijny/* (ibid.).

Classifications of phraseological units (Gavrin, 1972; Efimov, 1969; Kunin, 1985; Cherednichenko, 1962) take into account semantic and stylistic nuances. For example, Gavrin (1972) distinguishes the following types of basic phraseological compounds:

- a) (a) figurative and expressive fixed compounds, which include metaphorical units */pustyty chervonoho pivnya/*, compounds with metaphorical components */yabluko nezgody/*, established comparisons */berehty yak zinytsyu oka/*, euphemisms */iz gryazi v knyazi/*, hyperbolas and litotes */garmatoyu ne prob 'yesh; znyknuty bez slidu/*, tautological conjunctions */svynya svyneyu/*, compounds based on poetic syntax */pravda – dobre, a shchastya – krashche/*;
- b) (b) elliptical compounds that combine fixed word combinations */rad ne rad; ni puhu ni pera/*;
- c) (c) terminological phraseological expressions which include complex terms in the field of science, technology, art */zalomlennya promeniv; lancyugova reakciya; kult osoby/*;
- d) (d) aphoristic phraseologisms which express generalizations */druzi piznayutsya v bidi/*;
- e) (e) contextual compounds identified as fixed combinations, which are referred to as phraseological compounds in Vinogradov's classification;
- f) (f) idioms – fixed phrases that have lost their inner form */bajdyky byty/*.

Gavrin (1972) also classifies proverbs, sayings, and winged phrases modelled on sentences as phraseologisms, and points out the difference between proverbs and sayings in terms of structure. „The distinction between proverbs and sayings in terms of grammatical form is definitely of practical interest because of its apparent simplicity: a proverb is a sentence, while a saying is only a part of a sentence, i.e. its building material (Gavrin, 1972: 49).“

Potebnia (1993) classified a saying as an element of fables or proverbs, which was underdeveloped partially to become one of those: *lysyachyj hvist; sobaka na sini*.

Dahl (1984) defines a saying with this descriptive formula: „Educational expression, figurative language, simple circumlocution, allusion, a way of expression but without a parable, without judgment, an end and an application; it is the first part of a proverb (p. 14).“ A saying describes the qualities of a person, their condition, appearance, different circumstances of life, quantity, etc.

Skrypnyk (1973) notes that sayings are sometimes organized as sentences and are distinguished from proverbs by the following features: (1) they easily form synonymous relations; (2) they state the phenomena occurring at the moment of speaking; (3) they point to the facts that existed in the past or will exist in the future; (4) they only name an object or phenomenon.

The Eastern European linguistics notes that phraseologisms, being a stable combination of two or more words, do not only create semantic integrity in the process of speaking but are also perceived as ready-to-use verbal

formulas. By their specific structural properties, they differ from conventional free syntactic constructions as well as from individual words.

As noted by linguists, numerous phraseological units differ by their genetic, functional and structural-grammatical features. Like words, they belong to different types and classes. Each of them has its own way of formation and development. This applies to proverbs, sayings, winged expressions, and various idiomatic compounds.

The concept of the *content of phraseologism* includes the *lexical meaning* and its *grammatical categories*, which determine the general lexical and grammatical characteristics of a phraseologism, that is, its attribution to a certain category of fixed phrases: nominal */tertyj kalach; synya panchoha/*; verbal */vyhodyty suhym iz vody; pekty rakiv/*; adjectival */nechystyj na ruku; na odyn kopyl shytyj/*; adverbial */svit za ochi/*; exclamatory */czur tobi pek; tym-to j ba!/* and others.

The analysis of verbal phraseological units was made by Demskyi (1972), who presented numerous verbal phraseological series used for description of a person's state and procedural characteristics, aspects of life or peculiarities of ethnic culture.

Batiuk (1979), who described the most common phraseological expressions with participles, has focused on the analysis of proverbs and sayings, for example: *Ne spytavshy brodu, ne liz u vodu; Ne vzyavshys do sokyry, ne zrobysh xaty* and others.

Shevchenko, Rizun and Lysenko (1993) classified phraseologisms by their morphological and syntactic structure. The authors considered which parts of speech were the headword and the words dependent on it, and listed the structural models that are most commonly used:

- (1) noun + adjective: *bila vorona, krokodylyachi slozy*;
- (2) noun + noun: *sobaka na sini*;
- (3) noun + numeral: *za trydevyat zemel*;
- (4) verb + noun: *braty pryklad, kleyity durnya, pravdu kazhuchy*;
- (5) verb + adverb: *ne solono sorbavshy*;
- (6) adjective + noun: *gostryj na yazyk, tugyj na vuxu*;
- (7) preposition + noun: *promizh dilom, pry nagodi, pro sebe*;
- (8) adverb + adverb: *ridko ta yidko, koso-kryvo*.

It is important to note that, like any content word, phraseologisms have their own semes that differentiate their semantics from other linguistic units. This is where the commonality and similarity between a word and a phraseologism lies. Yet such commonality is quite relative because the conceptual content is conveyed, as a rule, with all the stable complex of components; categorical meaning is conveyed grammatically with a basic (dominant)

component: in verbal phraseologisms – with a verbal component, in nominal ones – with a nominal component etc. If it is impossible to distinguish a grammatically invariant component, the categorical meaning of a phraseologism is established syntactically – by the syntactic role of phraseologism in a sentence (Zhovtobriukh, 1984). There are no semantic and formal relations between the components of a phraseological unit that exist between the words in a free word combination. The generalized holistic meaning of a phraseologism acquires the highest degree of indivisibility when the component words lose their semantic and notional meaning completely with their nominative meaning. As emphasized by Sh. Bally, desemantization of the component words reaches such a level that „the speaker’s consciousness connects the whole expression to the idea which this expression symbolizes, and this connection makes one forget the intrinsic meaning of each element within such expression. In all such cases, dimming of the primary meaning and its forgetting are observed, in one way or another. *Either the very meanings of the words that make up a phraseologism are lost, or syntactic links are no longer perceived* (Bally, 1961: 102).“

As noted by Zhukov (1978), the reason for semantic and grammatical de-actualization of the primary meaning of the components is that they lose their objective (denotative) orientation, separately and as a group. From the moment of formation, *a phraseologism begins, with all of its lexical composition, to reflect such extra-linguistic reality* (objects, phenomena, events, properties, ideas etc.) *with which the components themselves have already lost their connection, fully or partially*. Due to such semantic reorientation, the components lose their semantic correlation with the corresponding words of free use.

The meaning of a certain share of phraseologisms is devoid of any motivation. This indicates a high degree of idiomaticity (e.g.: *peremyvayuchy kistochky; lyasy tochyty*). In such phraseological units, Vinogradov (1947) characterized the constituent elements as „a chemical unity“ of some soluble lexical parts which are seen as amorphous by contemporary language standards.

*The metaphorical transfer of words-components in a phraseologism is based on a certain trait*, which is manifested, for one reason or another, as the most significant one and which connects the image and the new formation based on this image-symbol. Speaking about *the general meaning of a phraseologism*, it does not depend in any way on the meaning of the corresponding free word combination, because it is *brought to life by the need and presence of the new things in reality, which „expect and „find“ special means for their expression in the language“* (Kovaliov & Boiko, 1985).



Avksentiev (1986) remarks that semantic indivisibility arises or is supported also by the fact that in phraseological units the structure includes obsolete words-components of foreign origin, archaisms, for example: „*zbyty z pantelyku*“, „*graty va-bank*“, etc.

Phraseological units of the Ukrainian language can enter into systematic *semantic relations* because they are inherent in phenomena of polysemy, homonymy, synonymy, and antonymy, as well as other words.

*The synonymic series of phraseologisms* in the broad sense is a micro-system within the synonymic system and the general system of the language that has arisen because of the possibility to refer in a different way to the same phenomena of the objective reality.

The most significant studies in Ukrainian phraseological synonymy were written by Batiuk (1966), Demskyi (1988), Kolomiiets and Regushevskyi (1988), Skrypnyk (1973), Uzhchenko and Uzhchenko (2007). The scientists analyse same-type categorical meaning of phraseological synonyms, similar semantic compatibility with the words of the environment, conceptual areas of phraseological synonymy; they consider synonymic rows of proverbs and sayings, comparative phrases, they identify specific differences between the members of a series of phraseological synonyms; they identify the areas of use, degrees of emotional-expressive gradation and more.

The emergence of new meanings of a phraseologism (polysemy) is caused by the fact that a free word combination used in various verbal environments acquires varied semantic-syntactic compatibility and repeated metaphorization. Polysemy is based on repeated or parallel rethinking (Skrypnyk, 1973).

In the speech, cases and interpretations of *phrasemes-paronyms* as variants of the same polysemic phraseological unit often occur. Polysemy and paronymy are the two phenomena in the field of systemic links that are naturally related to each other. In this case, the phenomenon of paronymy is described to a lesser extent; this is reflected primarily in the practice of using phraseological units in speech, for example, *u czvitu – ukrytyj czvitom, u czviti – u rozkviti fizychnyx i duxovnyx syl*. The distinction between polysemy and paronymy of phraseologisms plays a significant role in the practice of human speech.

Researchers believe that paronymy in phrasemics is a common phenomenon, although not as common as in vocabulary.

Considering peculiarities of the component composition and structural organization, Demskyi (1988) identifies six types of phraseological paronyms.

*Antonymy* in phraseologisms is a common phenomenon. Antonyms are phraseologisms that contrast in meaning: *ni pary z vust – rozpustyty yazyka*. In addition, antonymic pairs can be formed with to the presence or absence of a negative particle: *nashogo polya yagoda – ne nashogo polya yagoda*, and also



with the use of antonymic words in their composition: *kydaty v zhar* – *kydaty v xolod*.

Most of the time, lexical composition of phraseologisms is stable, but in some cases there might be more variability. Variants can be distinguished by lexical units, word-building patterns, grammatical form, phonemic composition, word order, presence or absence of optional elements. The variability of phraseologisms is determined by the language tradition and it is not allowed in all cases. For example, you cannot say *zyisty psa* instead of *zyisty sobaku*, *lupcyuvaty bajdyky* instead of *byty bajdyky*. Knowing and understanding these concepts helps to improve and enrich the individual language of native speakers.

In linguistics, the issues concerning speech, communicative, and stylistic aspects in analysis of phraseologisms are also highlighted.

In particular, Shanskyi (1969) divided phraseological units of the Russian language into three categories from the viewpoint of stylistic use: inter-style phraseology, colloquial phraseology, and book phraseology.

A slightly different classification of phraseologisms in the Ukrainian language is suggested by Izhakevych (1973), who distinguishes their stylistic and style variety. By their use in speech, Izhakevych identifies three groups of phraseologisms: (a) phraseologisms which actively function in the contemporary Ukrainian language; (b) phraseologisms which are obsolete or extinct at the present stage of language development; (c) new phraseologisms which have recently entered the language or are in the process of formation, or are becoming set expressions (Izhakevych, 1973).

So far, there is no unified approach to development of techniques and methods for creating a communicative-stylistic classification of phraseologisms. Each of the stylistic classifications of phraseologisms allows elucidating expressive-stylistic functions of certain groups of phraseologisms only, but is unable to cover all the multifaceted and diverse phraseological material of the national language (Izhakevych, 1973; Skrypnyk, 1973; Uzhchenko & Avksentiev, 1990).

The sources of phraseologisms are diverse. Most often, they are formed by metaphorical or metonymical rethinking of free concepts from different fields of human activity. The derivative base for phraseological units can be both individual words and phrases. Syzonov (2018) is convinced that „mass media are the main driver and a mirror of the new phraseology’s inception (p. 279)“.

The role of components in disclosing a phraseological meaning is not always similar; they mostly form both metaphorical and metonymic transfers of free word combination meanings differently.

As Shevchenko (1985) notes, in the metaphorical transfer of meaning a phraseological unit undergoes the following stages in its formation:

- (1) the use of a free word combination with the direct meaning of its components, as a regular phrase;
- (2) the phrase used as a comparative expression, when the meaning which the phraseologism will have later is being formed;
- (3) the phrase with a metaphorical meaning which is added with reference to a comparison, emphasizing the figurative nature of such meaning;
- (4) the word-combination with a phraseological meaning without indications to reasons for the transfer.

The difference between the metaphorical and metonymical representation of reality in a phraseological unit lies in the fact that in the metaphorical representation it is required to compare two phenomena, and the metonymical representation covers different features of one unit. Bulakhovskiy (1927) noted that „the changes in meanings caused by association of ideas by contiguity, are generally less frequent than changes of metaphorical nature (p. 51).“ This view is also stated in research works (Uzhchenko & Avksentiev, 1990).

A detailed analysis of figurative-semantic factors of phraseologization is disclosed in the book „Ukrainian Phraseology“ by Uzhchenko and Avksentiev. In addition to metaphorization and metonymization, the authors supplement the list of main means of phraseologism formation with patterns based on synecdoche, hyperbola, litotes, periphrasis, euphemism, pun and symbols (Uzhchenko & Avksentiev, 1990).

In our opinion, the work by Uzhchenko and Uzhchenko (2007) presents the most exhaustive description of phraseologisms in Ukrainian studies, especially in terms of ideographic, semantic, genetic, functional, structural extra-linguistic, ethnic and linguistic-cultural characteristics, their stylistic connotation, basic concepts of Ukrainian culture in the composition of phrases and other aspects. The scientists have analysed new aspects in the study of Ukrainian phraseology; for example, for the purpose of our research we find the psychological-cognitive aspect, and the study of Ukrainian phraseology from ethnic-linguistic and cultural perspectives to be most relevant.

Among the linguistic studies of the last decades in the field of phraseology, a significant place belongs to the works focusing on the study of semantics, and disclosing the peculiarities in organization of phraseological units in different languages. Dobrovolskyi (1991) emphasizes the need to begin explorations of the distinction between conceptual (or cognitive) universals, on the one hand, and the actual speech (systemically immanent) phraseological universals, on the other hand. In his opinion, conceptual universals of phraseologisms are a part of the „language and thinking“ problem, and it can be solved with the use of methods borrowed from logic, psychology and cognitive sciences, along with conventional linguistic methods.

Kovshova (2010) conducted an associative experiment with the word-component *bread* within phraseological units as a representative of the most important symbol of Russian culture. Referring to the linguistic-cultural approach, the author believes that language contributes to the preservation and translation of cultural meanings, and the purpose of cultural research is to identify the ways and means of embodying culture in the content of linguistic signs. A special field for cultural linguistics is the phraseological composition of language, and this is for a reason, because „...phraseologisms are verbal signs with cultural memory; the „traces“ of culture are recorded in the images of phraseologisms; the cultural semantics (including symbolic meanings of culture) is „woven“ into their linguistic semantics (Kovshova, 2010: 165)“.

Velychko (2012) views phraseological syntactic structures as a special communicative type of sentences, proposes their semantic classification, which takes into account the generalized meanings of subjective modality, which are semantic universals and therefore understandable, and easy to learn.

It seems relevant that scientists turn to the origins of phraseological units which stem genetically from the ethnic culture of Ukrainians. All components of social life are the result of long-term development of society, and the speech activity of people reflects the social experience in semantics of phraseological units. As signs of national culture, phraseologisms need more comment on their sources of origin, the sphere of use and their use in a particular context.

## Conclusions

Therefore, from the foregoing analysis of the works by leading linguists, we can see that phraseologisms can be considered, in our opinion, as a multi-vector linguistic phenomenon of speech, because phraseologisms are the combination of mind and emotion, and just like language, they are permeated with impressions, evaluations, and feelings, they are adapted to verbalize the semantics of speaker, listener and reader; they are entirely communicative and practical, with the widest range of connotations. Such intertwining of the subtle nuances of meaning creates their expressive-stylistic colouring and causes a stylistic stratification with boundless potential for functional use. Figurative expressions, which include phraseologisms, conceal a large amount of „compressed“ information, which provides a specific way of representing and evaluating persons, objects, phenomena and features, situations and different relationships. Expressive linguistic units are based on social-psychological and actually linguistic criteria for evaluation of expressive means. Emotionality and attitude-related nature of phraseologisms usually coincide with their expressi-

veness, so linguists consider the latter to be a categorical feature of phraseologisms. As a feature of phraseologisms, emotionality is associated with the function of conveying mood, feelings, emotions, and experiences. The emotional is always expressive; emotional linguistic units contain an evaluative component. The evaluative nature involves giving a monitoring-related characteristics of the subject, expressing opposite feelings and characterizing mental states of the speaker, thus causing the existence of additional stylistic colouring. Stylistics always deals with characterizing expressive aspects of phraseological units, and identifying the spheres of speech and literature/genre-related boundaries of their use. Stylistically coloured phraseologisms are identified by the style they belong to and by being established in certain areas of speech communication which are most closely related to their expressiveness.

### References

- Avksentiev, L. H. (1986). „Osoblyvosti semantyky frazeologichnykh odynyts suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy“ [„Peculiarities of semantics in modern Ukrainian phraseological units“]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature at School*, vol. 3, pp. 29–32 [in Ukrainian].
- Babych, N. D. (1971). *Frazeolohiia ukrainskoi movy [Phraseology of the Ukrainian Language]* (Part 1–2). Chernivtsi: Vyd-vo Chernivetskoho un-tu im. Yu. Fedkovycha [in Ukrainian].
- Bally, Sh. (1961). *Francuzskaya stilistika [French stylistics]*. (K. A. Dolina, Trans). Moscow: Izd-vo inostr. lit. [in Russian].
- Bargmann, S. & Sailer, M. (2015). The Syntactic Flexibility of Non-Decomposable Idioms. *Abstract: 4<sup>th</sup> General Meeting of Parseme (Valletta, 19–20 March 2015)* (pp. 1–3). Goethe University Frankfurt am Main.
- Batiuk, L. I. (1979). „Naiuzhyvanishi frazeologichni zvoroty z diiepryslivnykamy“ [„The most common phraseological turns with participles“]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature at School*, vol. 10, pp. 50–55 [in Ukrainian].
- Bilyalova, A. et al. (2019). Phraseological Units as a Mirror of National Mentality. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, vol. 10, pp. 1–9.
- Bulakhovskyi, L. A. (1927). „Vyrazni ta obrazni zasoby movy“ [„Expressive and figurative means of language“]. *Metodychni uvahy dlia vchytelia serednoi shkoly – Methodical Directives for Secondary School Teachers* (pp. 51). Kharkiv [in Ukrainian].

- 
- Caillies, S. & Butcher, K. (2007). „Processing of Idiomatic Expressions: Evidence for a New Hybrid View“. *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 22, issue 1, pp. 79–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336754>
  - Cherednichenko, I. H. (1962). *Narysy z zahalnoi stylistyky suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy [Essays on General Stylistics of Modern Ukrainian Language]*. Kyiv: Radianska shkola [in Ukrainian].
  - Cordero, M. S. (2018). „Phraseological units with comparative structure: divergences in their delimitation and lexicographic classification“. *Revista Kanina*, vol. 42, issue 3, pp. 141–159. <https://doi.org/10.15517/rk.v42i3.35921>
  - Cowie, A. (1998). *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  - Dahl, V. I. (1984). „Naputnoe“ [„On the Way“]. *Poslovicy russkogo naroda – Proverbs of the Russian People*. (Vols. 1–2). Moscow: Khudozh. pit. [in Russian].
  - Demskyi, M. T. (1972). „Diieslivni frazeolohichni odynytsi“ [„Verbal Phraseological Units“]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature in School*, vol. 6, pp. 36–38 [in Ukrainian].
  - Demskyi, M.T. (1988). „Frazemna paronimiia“ [„Phraseme Paronymy“]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature in School*, vol. 1, pp. 23–32 [in Ukrainian].
  - Dobrovolsky, D. O. (1991). K probleme frazeologicheskikh universalij [On the Problem of Phraseological Universals]. *Filologicheskie nauki – Philological Sciences*, vol. 2, pp. 95–103.
  - Dunbar, G. (1991). *The cognitive lexicon*. Tübingen: Narr.
  - Efimov, A. I. (1969). *Stilistika russkogo yazyka [Stylistics of the Russian Language]*. Moscow: Prosveshhenie [in Russian].
  - Ernst, T. (1981). „Grist for the linguistic mill: Idioms and ‘extra’ adjectives“. *Journal of Linguistic Research*, vol. 1, Issue 3, pp. 51–68.
  - Espinal, M. (2009). „Clitic incorporation and abstract semantic objects in idiomatic constructions“. *Linguistics*, vol. 47, issue 6, pp. 1221–1271. <https://doi.org/10.1515/LING.2009.044>
  - Espinal, M.T. & Jaume, M. (2010). „On classes of idioms and their interpretation“. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 42, issue 5, pp. 1397–1411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.016>
  - Fellbaum, C. (2019). „How flexible are idioms? A corpus-based study“. *Linguistics*, vol. 57, issue 4, pp. 735–767. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2019-0015>
  - Fellbaum, Ch. (2007). The ontological loneliness of idioms. In A. Schalley & D. Zaefferer (Eds.), *Ontolinguistics* (pp. 419–434). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Fortunatov, F. F. (1957). *Izbrannye trudy [Selected Works]*. (Vols. 1–2). Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatelstvo [in Russian].
- Fraser, B. (1970). „Idioms within a transformational grammar“. *Foundations of Language*, vol. 6, pp. 22–42.
- Gavrin, S. G. (1972). „Zametki po teorii frazeologii“ [„Notes On the Theory of Phraseology“]. *Problemy ustojchivosti i variantnosti frazeologizmov – Problems in Stability and Variation of Phraseological Units* (pp. 127–142). Tula [in Russian].
- Gehrke, B. & McNally, L. (2019). „Idioms and the Syntax/Semantics Interface of Descriptive Content vs. Reference“. *Linguistics*, vol. 57, issue 4, pp. 769–814. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2019-0016>
- Gray, B. & Biber, D. (2015). Phraseology. In D. Biber & R. Reppen (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 125–145). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139764377.008>
- Holsinger, E. (2013). „Representing idioms: Syntactic and contextual effects on idiom processing“. *Language and Speech*, vol. 56, issue 3, pp. 373–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830913484899>
- Inoue, A. (2016). „An Eclectic Phraseological Research on the Formation and Degrammaticalization of Phraseological Units“. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, vol. 6, issue 4, pp. 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n4p1>
- Izhakevych, H. P. (1973). Stylistyka frazeolohichnykh odynyts [Stylistics of Phraseological Units]. In I. K. Bilodid (Ed.), *Suchasna ukrainska literaturna mova: stylistyka – Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Language: Stylistics* (pp. 150–210). Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Kay, P. et al. (2012). *A Lexical Theory of Phrasal Idioms*. Unpublished manuscript. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Kolomiets, M. P. & Regushevskiy, Ye. S. (1988). *Slovynek frazeolohichnykh sinonimiv [Dictionary of Phraseological Synonyms]*. Kyiv: Radianska shkola [in Ukrainian].
- Kosmeda, T. (2000). *Aksiolohichni aspekty prahmalinhvistyky [Axiological Aspects of Pragmalinguistics]*. Lviv: LNU im. Ivana Franka [in Ukrainian].
- Kovaliov, V. P. & Boiko, O. V. (1985). „Frazeolohizmy u khudozhnomu movlenni“ [„Phraseologisms in the Language of Fiction“]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature at School*, vol. 10, pp. 32–36 [in Ukrainian].
- Kovaliv, Yu. I. (2007). Frazeolohizm [Phraseologism]. In Yu. I. Kovalev (Ed.), *Literaturna entsyklopediia – Literary Encyclopedia* (Vols. 1–2). (Vol. 2, p. 546). Kyiv: Academy [in Ukrainian].



- Kovshova, M.L. (2010). „Lingvokulturologicheskij analiz i asociativnyj jeksperiment vo vzaimodejstvii: na primere frazeologizmov so slovom-komponentom *hleb*“ [„Linguistic-cultural analysis and associative experiment in interaction: exemplified by phraseological units with the word component *bread*“]. *Voprosy psiholingvistiki – Journal of Psycholinguistics*, vol. 2, issue 12, pp. 165–176.
- Krzysnik, E. (2010). „Idiomatic word or Phraseological Unit“. *Slavisticna Revija*, vol. 58, pp. 83–94.
- Kunin, A. V. (1985). „O porozhdayushhem frazeologicheskom kontekste“ [„On the Generative Phraseological Context“]. *Frazeologicheskaya semantika v kommunikativnom aspekte – Phraseological semantics in the communicative aspect*, vol. 244, pp. 98–102 [in Russian].
- Lychuk, M. (2019). „Cemantyka ironichnoho zaperechennia u strukturi napivfrazeolohizovanykh rechen: cherez pryzmu psykholinhvistychnykh osoblyvostei movlennievoi diialnosti“ [„Semantics of Ironical Negation in the Structure of Semi-Phraseological Sentences: Seen Through the Prism of Psycholinguistic Peculiarities of Speech Activity“]. *Psiholingvistika – Psycholinguistics*, vol. 26, issue 2, pp. 243–259. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2019-26-2-243-259> [in Ukrainian].
- Nunberg, G. et al. (1994). „Idioms“. *Language*, vol. 70, issue 3, pp. 491–538. <https://doi.org/10.2307/416483>
- Potebnya, A. A. (1993). *Mysl i yazyk [Thought and Language]*. Kyiv [in Russian].
- Shakhmatov, A. A. (2001). *Sintaksis russkogo yazyka [Russian Syntax]*. Moscow: Editorial URSS [in Russian].
- Shanskyi, N. M. (1968). „O frazeologizme kak yazykovoj edinice i predmete frazeologii“ [„On phraseologism as a linguistic unit and subject of phraseology“]. *Problemy ustojchivosti i variantnosti frazeologicheskikh edinic – Problems of phraseological units' stability and variation* (p. 69). Tula [in Russian].
- Shanskyi, N. M. (1969). *Frazeologiya sovremennogo russkogo yazyka [Phraseology of the Modern Russian Language]* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., rev.). Moscow: Vysshaya shkola [in Russian].
- Shcherba, L. V. (1974). *Yazykovaya sistema i rechevaya deyatelnost [Language System and Speech Activity]*. Leningrad [in Russian].
- Shevchenko, L. Yu. (1985). „Rol metafory i metonimii u tvorenii frazeolohichnykh odyntyts“ [„The role of metaphor and metonymy in creation of phraseological units“]. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli – Ukrainian Language and Literature in School*, vol. 10, pp. 26–32 [in Ukrainian].



- Shevchenko, L. Yu. et al. (1993). „Suchasna ukrainska mova“ [„Modern Ukrainian Language“]. *Dovidnyk – Directory* (pp. 172–173). Kyiv: Lybid [in Ukrainian].
- Skrypnyk, L. H. (1973). *Frazeolohiia ukrainskoi movy* [Phraseology of the Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
- *Slovnnyk ukrainskoi movy* [Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]. (1970–1980). (Vols. 1–11). Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Sprenger, S. et al. (2006). „Lexical access during the production of idiomatic phrases“. *Journal of Memory and Language*, vol. 54, issue 2, pp. 161–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.11.001>
- Svensen, B. (2009). „Idioms and other fixed word combinations“. In *Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making* (pp. 188–204). Cambridge University Press.
- Sytar, G. (2017). *Syntaksychni frazeologizmy v rozryzi konstruktsiynoyi gramatyky* [Syntactic Phraseologisms in the Context of Structural Grammar]. Vinnytsia: TOV „Nilan-LTD“ [in Ukrainian].
- Syzonov, D. (2018). „Media Phraseology and the Dynamics of the Ukrainian Language: The Psycholinguistic and Stylistic Paradoxes“. *Psiholingvistika – Psycholinguistics*, vol. 24, issue 2, pp. 277–291. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2018-24-2-277-291>
- Tabossi, P. et al. (2008). „Processing idiomatic expressions: Effects of semantic compositionality“. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, vol. 34, issue 2, pp. 313–327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.34.2.313>
- Tabossi, P. et al. (2009). „Idiom syntax: Idiosyncratic or principled?“ *Journal of Memory and Language*, vol. 61, pp. 77–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2009.03.003>
- Titone, D. A. & Connine, C. M. (1999). „On the compositional and noncompositional nature of idiomatic expressions“. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 31, issue 12, pp. 1655–1674. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00008-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00008-9)
- Udovychenko, H. M. (1984). *Frazeolohichni slovnnyk ukrainskoi movy* [Phraseological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]. (Vols. 1–2). Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola [in Ukrainian].
- Uzhchenko, V. D. & Avksentieva, L. H. (1990). *Ukrainska frazeolohiia* [Ukrainian Phraseology]. Kharkiv: Osnova [in Ukrainian].
- Uzhchenko, V. D. & Uzhchenko, D. V. (2007). *Frazeolohiia suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy* [Phraseology of the Modern Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv: Znannia [in Ukrainian].

- Uzhchenko, V. D. (1993). „Vnutrishnia forma frazeolohizmu v zviazku z vnutrishnoi formoi slova“ [„The internal form of phraseologism in relation to the internal form of the word“]. *Movoznavstvo – Linguistics*, vol. 3, pp. 23–30 [in Ukrainian].
- Uzhchenko, V. D. (2003). *Skhidnoukrainska frazeolohiia [Eastern Ukrainian Phraseology]*. Luhansk: Alma-mater [in Ukrainian].
- Velychko, A. V. (2012). Sintaksicheskie sredstva obydennoho obshhenija. Predlozhenija frazeologizirovannoj struktury [Syntactic means of everyday communication. Sentences with phraseological structure]. In E. F. Tarasov, N. F. Ufimceva & V. P. Sinjachkin (Eds.), *Proceedings of the conference „Zhizn jazyka v kulture i sociume-3“ – „Life of the language in culture and society-3“ (Moscow, 20–21 April 2012)*, (pp. 234–236). Moscow: Izd-vo „Jejdos“ [in Russian].
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1947). *Ob osnovnykh tipakh frazeologicheskikh edinicz v russkom yazyke [On the main types of phraseological units in Russian language]*. Moscow – Leningrad: AN SSSR [in Russian].
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1955). „Itogi obsuzhdeniya voprosov stilistiki“ [„Results of the Discussion On Stylistics Issues“]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniya – Linguistics Issues*, vol. 1, pp. 60–87 [in Russian].
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1972). Russkij yazik [Russian language]. In *Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove [Grammar Doctrine of the Word]* (pp. 9–45). Moscow: Prosveshhenie [in Russian].
- Zhovtobriukh, M. A. (1984). *Ukrainska literaturna mova [Ukrainian Literary Language]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Zhukov, V. P. (1978). *Semantika frazeologicheskikh oborotov [Semantics of Phraseological Expressions]*. Moscow: Prosveshhenie [in Russian].
- Zolotaryova, L. A. & Nguyen, A. N. (2018). „Sintaksicheskie frazeologicheskie edinicy v leksikograficheskom predstavlenii“ [„Syntactic Phraseological Units in Lexicographical Description“]. *Nauchnyj dialog – Scientific dialogue*, vol. 6, pp. 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.24224/2227-1295-2018-6-19-31>

**Лариса КАЛМИКОВА**

**Наталія ХАРЧЕНКО**

**Інна МИСАН**

## **ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЗМІВ У СХІДНОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКІЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ**

Стаття присвячена аналізу важливих для мовознавства мало-чисельних психолінгвістичних розвідок фразеологічних одиниць. Ці дослідження репрезентують опис функціонування у висловлюваннях людини фразеологічних виразів, які розглядаються у функціональному аспекті в якості оперативних мовленнєвих одиниць, певних блоків сприймання і відтворення стійких виразів. Досліджено, що з-поміж фразеологічних виразів розрізняються дві групи з погляду мовленнєвої компетенції: 1) фразеологізми комунікативного характеру, що являють собою предикативні словосполучення рівноцінні реченню, вони є цілим висловленням, виражають те чи інше судження; 2) фразеологічні вирази номінативного характеру, що є сполученням слів, ідентичним лише певній частині речення, словесною формою того чи іншого поняття і, як слова, виконують у мові номінативну функцію (Шанский, 1968). Встановлено, що в класифікаціях фразеологічних одиниць враховано семантичні й стилістичні відтінки.

*Ключові слова: фразеологізми, фразеологічні одиниці, фразеологічне значення, класифікація фразеологізмів*