PHRASEOLOGY

**PU as a cultural phenomenon and a linguistic unit.**

Language is the most essential factor of characterizing every nation’s beliefs, culture and the attitude to the world. As beliefs, worldviews and cultures do not look like each other, languages of different nations are not the same. So, it is important to study the language of the nation when we study its culture. Language and culture is an interrelation system, developed together at the same time. ‘Cultural factors are deeply interwoven with the language, and thus are morphologically and structurally reflected in the forms of the language.

As a part of language, phraseology is a kind of picture gallery in which are collected vivid and amusing sketches of the nation's customs, traditions and prejudices, recollections of its past history, scraps of folk songs and fairy-tales. Quotations from great poets are preserved here alongside the dubious pearls of philistine wisdom of crude slang witticisms, for phraseology is only the most colorful democratic area of vocabulary and draws its resources from the very depths of popular speech. Phraseological units, or idioms, as they are called by most western scholars, represent what can probably be described as the most picturesque, colourful and expressive part of the language's vocabulary. Phraseology of each language makes a significant contribution to the formation of figurative pictures of the world. Knowing the phraseology allows to get a deeper understanding of the history and character of the people.

Phraseologisms exist in close connection with vocabulary. Their study helps to get better understanding of the vocabulary structure, education and the use of lexical units in speech. Phraseology is not only the most colourful part of vocabulary, but also the most democratic layer.

For the first time, the concept of PU was formulated by the linguist S. Balli, a representative of the French school of linguistics. He called the PU as ‘combinations that have firmly entered to the language’. English and American researchers such as L.P. Smith, A. Mackay, W. McMordi use the term ‘idiom’ in their writings on the study of PU. By an idiom they mean an expression whose value is not inferred from the value of its individual elements.

The phraseological units or idioms are characterised by a double sense: the current meanings of constituent words build up a certain picture, but the actual meaning of the whole unit has little or nothing to do with that picture, in itself creating an entirely new image. So, *a dark horse* is actually not a horse but a person about whom no one knows anything definite, and so one is not sure what can be expected from him. *A white elephant*, however, is not even a person but a valuable object which involves great expense or trouble for its owner, out of all proportion to its usefulness or value, and which is also difficult to dispose of. *To let the cat out of the bag* has actually nothing to do with cats, but means simply "to let some secret become known". In *to bark up the wrong tree* (Amer.), the current meanings of the constituents create a vivid and amusing picture of a foolish dog sitting under a tree and barking at it while the cat or the squirrel has long since escaped. But the actual meaning of the idiom is "to follow a false scent; to look for somebody or something in a wrong place; to expect from somebody what he is unlikely to do".

The meaning of idiom that is relevant for phraseology is defined as “a peculiarity of language approved by the usage of language, and often having a significance other than its grammatical or logical one”. It follows that PU relates to ‘phraseology broadly defined’, as including collocations and proverbs.

**The scope of PU**

‘(Irreversible) binominals’ are pairs of words characterized by their fixed order, which is shown to follow a number of general principles. They are fully transparent and thus easy to decode. In ‘stereotyped comparisons’ one constituent is used in its normal sense, and it would therefore have been a possibility to categorize them as a special type of collocation (see below).

‘Proverbs’ are sentence-length PUs characterized by their general meaning; they express a general truth, a cultural norm, or a piece of general advice.

‘Winged words’ include a range of typically sentence-length idioms, (‘catchphrases’, ‘slogans’, ‘sententious remarks’, and ‘quotations’) whose stability as part of the lexicon may vary considerably.

Routine formulae are specialized according to discourse context and are characterized as phatic communication.

‘Paraphrasal verbs’ consist of “a transitive verb with a relatively wide range of meaning (e.g. have, pay, give) and a noun phrase (e.g. a look, attention, smile) which carries the semantic weight”.

Restricted collocations are word groups in which one constituent that is used in a specialised or fi gurative sense.

Rhyming Slang. Cockney.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PHRASEOLOGICAL NOMINATIONS** | |
| • noun phrases | a lame duck |
| • adjectival phrases | shipshape and Bristol fashion |
| • adverbial phrases | at a snail’s pace |
| • clauses | find one’s feet |
| (IRREVERSIBLE) BINOMINALS | here and there |
| STEREOTYPED COMPARISONS | sleep like a log |
| PROVERBS | Let sleeping dogs lie Easy come, easy go. |
| **WINGED WORDS** |  |
| • Catchphrases | *Never Surrender, "You dirty old man"* |
| • Slogans | Long live the Queen! |
| • Sententious remarks | the coast is clear |
| • Quotations | Something is rotten in the state of Denmark, *Their Finest Hour* |
| ROUTINE FORMULAE | Many happy returns  last but not least |
| PARAPHRASAL VERBS | to make use of |
| (RESTRICTED) COLLOCATIONS | to have patience |
| RHYMING SLANG | trouble and strife (for ‘wife’) |

**The History of Phraseology**

For the first time, phraseology was used in the study of literature. While translating some fiction from one language into another it became impossible to translate inseparable word combinations. Then the phraseological unities in those languages were researched. The term phraseology was first used in philology in 1558 by the English literary scholar Neander. While translating the literary works Neander had to use this term. Although the biggest part of phraseological materials are included in vocabulary and other sources, the research works on the theory of phraseology have been rarely met in the sources concerning linguistics (L. Smith, D. Curry, W. Ball, Ch.Bally). Up to now the matters of English phraseology have been studied within grammar, stylistics, lexicography and the history of language. Later phraseology has been studied as a branch of lexicology. As the linguistics developed, nowadays phraseology has been admitted and is being researched as an independent branch of linguistics in most languages.

French linguist Ch. Bally (1865-1947) in his book "Précis del Stylistique" (1905) introduced the notion of "locutions phraseologiques" phraseological phrases') into Lexicology and Lexicography and used the Cerm “unité phraséologique" (phraseological unit'), which led to the term frazeologhizm" with the same meaning, and then subsequently borrowed by different languages belonging to the European culture. Though French scholar Charlie Bally put the term phraseologie into the science, this term wasn’t used in the works of Western European and American linguists. Bally uses phraseology within stylistics.

As a scholarly approach to language, phraseology developed in the 20 century. The matter of studying phraseology as an independent branch of linguistics was advanced by Russian linguist E.D. Polivanov. He states that lexis studies separate words’ meanings, morphology studies words’ structure, syntax studies the structure of word combinations. In his opinion, there is a necessity for an independent field which studies peculiar unique word combinations. E.D. Polivanov was sure that phraseology would become firmly fixed in linguistics and it occurred. The matter of studying phraseology as a separate branch of linguistics was promoted by

Professor O. Schachmatov (1864–1920) in his book "Syntax of the Russian Language" (Illaxматов 1925; 1927) paid attention to such phrases with fixed componential structures and meanings which are not predictable from the meanings of their components.

The earliest studies of Phraseology in the former Soviet Union were performed by Academician V. Vinogradov (1894-1969) who used the term “phraseological unit" and elaborated the semantic classification of phraseological units (1977). However, phraseology remained a part of lexicology, because the principal criteria proving that phraseology could be an independent field of linguistics hadn’t been worked out yet. So, phraseology was being learned as the part of lexicology.

After E.D. Polivanov and V.V. Vinogradov the first who promoted the idea of studying phraseology independently was scholar B.A.Larin. He affirmed that enough scientific research hadn’t been done in phraseology.

The study of English set-phrases on a scientific basis was initiated by Professor O. Kunin (1909-1996) whose dictionary of English idioms (1955) has valuable information in this branch of linguistics. In Russian linguist A.V. Kunin’s opinion, phraseology came off the lexicology circle: its range and significance have been raised.

Such outstanding linguists as N.N. Amosova, A.V. Kunin, V.A. Smirnitsky, S.S. Gorelik, V.L. Arkhangelsky, V.V. Vinogradov, B.A. Larin, I.A. Melchuk, D.I. Kveselevich, I.I. Revzin, S.N.Savitskaya, Yu.D. Apresan have great services to this science.

Beginning with the late 1960', phraseology has established itself in German linguistics but was also occasionally touched upon in English linguistics. The earliest English adaptations of phraseology are dome by Uriel Weinreich (1926-1967), a Polish-American linguist, and Leonhard Lipka (1938-2019), Professor of English Linguistics from Frankfurt within the approach of transformational grammar.

In Ukraine, the term "phraseology" designates the discipline as well as its object, the set or totality of phraseological units in a given language. According to the origin of phraseologisms, a line has been drawn between two areas of investigation, namely, linguistic phraseology understood as a community's means of expression and literary phraseology including aphorisms, witticism, word combinations with an accidental character, belonging to certain writers, outstanding people.

The founder of Ukrainian phraseology is considered to be outstanding Ukrainian linguist O. Potebnya (1835-1891) who studied all et-phrases proverbs, sayings, constant combinations of words, which subsequently began to be nominated in linguistic literature as "phraseologisms", "idioms", "phraseological units", etc. D. Kveselevich, V. Uzhchenko (1935-2010), well-known Ukrainian researchers of the phraseological level of the language, emphasize that the emergence and use of phraseology is conditioned by an idea of lexical insufficiency, an attempt to verbalize human emotions, implied in cognitive models of the state of mind.

Thus, the word "phraseology" has very different meanings in Ukraine and in Great Britain or the United States. While the notion of "phraseology" is a very widespread concept, different authors define it differently, sometimes do not provide a clear-cut definition, or conflate several terms that many scholars prefer to distinguish. But it is due to the expansive research in foreign and domestic linguistics that phraseology has been established as a branch of linguistic science in its own right, as an autonomous discipline, the object of research of which consists in phraseological units (or idioms in American linguistics) of a given language (or a group of languages).

**Lexicology and Phraseology**

**Lexicology** is a branch of linguistics, the science of language. The term Lexi c o l o g y is composed of two Greek morphemes: lexis meaning ‘word, phrase’ and logos which denotes ‘learning, a department of knowledge’. Thus, the meaning of the term L e x i с o l о g у is ‘the science of the word’.

Lexicology as a branch of linguistics has its own aims and methods of scientific research, its basic task being a study and systematic description of vocabulary in respect to its origin, development and current use. Lexicology is concerned with words, variable word-groups, phraseological units, and with morphemes which make up words.

The term "**phraseology**" (Greek phrasis 'way of speaking' and logia study of) denotes the youngest branch of linguistics (or a subfield of exicology). Linguists are not unanimous in their opinions about phraseology: how it should be defined, classified, described, and analyzed. P. as science appeared at the beginning of the 20 c. Since 1905, when French linguist Charles Bally (1865-1947) in his book "Précis de Stylistique Français" (1905) introduced the notion of "locutions phraseologiques" ('phraseological phrases') into Lexicology and Lexicography and used the term "unité phraséologique" ('phraseological unit'), which led to the term "frazeologhizm" with the same meaning, Phraseology has entered the sphere of linguistics becoming established as a self-contained linguistic discipline.

The **aim** of Phraseology is the study of set or fixed expressions, such as idioms, phrasal verbs and other types of multi-word lexical units, the meaning of which is different from the meanings of the component parts. For example, *Dutch auction* is composed of the words *Dutch* 'of or pertaining to the Netherlands' and *auction* 'a public sale in which goods are sold to the highest bidder', but its meaning is not a sale in the Netherlands where goods are sold to the highest bidder'. Instead, the phrase has a conventionalized meaning referring to 'any auction where, instead of rising, the prices fall'.

So, the **object** of P. is stable word combinations with integral semantics that are reproduced in speech as ready-made word formulae.

The **tasks** are as follows:

1. to study the peculiarities of PU structure and the principles of semantic integrity creation;
2. to investigate the interrelations of PU with the other linguistic units – words, word-combinations and sentences;
3. to research the history of emerging and development PU;
4. to classify the PU;
5. to reveal the paradigmatic relations of PU;
6. to establish the connections of P. with other sciences.

So, 1. Phraseology is regarded as a self-contained branch of linguistics and not as a part of lexicology.

2. Phraseology deals with a phraseological subsystem of language and not with isolated phraseological units.

3. Phraseology is concerned with all types of set expressions.

**The connection of P. with other sciences**

Phonetics, for instance, investigating the phonetic structure of language, i.e. its system of phonemes and intonation patterns, is concerned with the study of the outer sound form of the word.

Grammar, which is inseparably bound up with Lexicology, is the study of the grammatical structure of language. It is concerned with the various means of expressing grammatical relations between words and with the patterns after which words are combined into word-groups and sentences.

Linguo-Stylistics is concerned with the study of the nature, functions and structure of stylistic devices, on the one hand, and with the investigation of each style of language, on the other, i.e. with its aim, its structure, its characteristic features and the effect it produces as well as its interrelation with the other styles of language.

The **Course of History of the English Language** that aims to describe changes in the structure of the English language from the earliest written records to the present day also displays a necessary connection with Cultorology and P. PU appear due to some cause and either disappear in time or develop new meanings.

For example, *Promised Land* kept its primary meaning (“the land of Canaan, promised by God to Abraham and his descendants as their heritage (Genes is 12:7); heaven, esp. when considered as the goal towards which Christians journey in their earthly lives” [211]) but in the course of English development got the meaning “any longed place where one expects to find greater happiness or fulfilment”. Today it is also connected with the social space “a place, destination, or goal eagerly sought under the belief that it will bring success, happiness.

Turn the tables (the sphere of sports, 17 c.) changed the meaning for “to change the state of affairs”.

The devil among the tailors (досл. “диявол серед кравців”) “метушня, галас, сварка, бійка” is also a name of the old English game with a ball (a devil) and three rows of wooden skittles (tailors). PU apperared due to the scandal at the play “The Tailors: a Tragedy for Warm Weather” in 19 c. The squad of Life Guard was called for and restored order quickly and effectively. The squad was compared to the ball rolled at the pins. So the PU emerges as the secondary usage of the name of the game for the scandal caused by the tailors and then for any scandal in general.

**Lexical Units**

**Words**

We proceed from the assumption that the word is the basic unit of language system, the largest on the morphologic and the smallest on the syntactic plane of linguistic analysis. The word is a structural and semantic entity within the language system. Both words and phraseological units are names for things, namely the names of actions, objects, qualities, etc.

**The word** is a two-facet unit possessing both form and content or, to be more exact, soundform and meaning. In other languages it is not a word, but a meaningless sound-cluster.

The system showing a word in all its word-forms is called its **paradigm**.

The **lexical meaning** оf а word is the same throughout the paradigm, i.e. all the word-forms of one and the same word are lexically identical. The **grammatical meaning** varies from one form to another (cf. to take, takes, took, taking or singer, singer’s, singers, singers’). Therefore, when we speak of the word singer or the word take as used in actual utterances.

Unlike words proper, however, phraseological units are word-groups consisting of two or more words whose combination is integrated as a unit with a specialised meaning of the whole.

To illustrate, the lexical or to be more exact the vocabulary units *tattle, wall, taxi* are words denoting various objects of the outer world; the vocabulary units *black frost, red tape, a skeleton in the cupboard* are phraseological units: each is a word-group with a specialised meaning of the whole.

**Word-groups**

Words put together to form lexical units make up **phrases or word-groups**, realizing syntagmatic relations.

The aptness of a word to appear in various combinations is described as its **lexical valency or collocability.** Valence is a word’s capacity, its potentiality to combine with other words. One may single out such types of valence correspondence in the contrasted languages: a) monovalent, cf.: hazel (eyes) , bay (horse); b) polyvalent, cf.: green (table, cup, dress, etc.)

The “collocability” in theory of language is closely connected with the notions of “distribution” and “context”.

**Distribution** is a set of linguistic contexts (the total of all the environments) in which a lexical item or class of items can occur.

**Context** may be defined as a minimal segment of speech that comes immediately before and after a word, determining its individual (denotative) meaning.

The main factors active in bringing words together are lexical and grammatical valency of the components of word-groups.

It is an indisputable fact that words are used in certain **lexical contexts**, i.e. in combination with other words.

The noun *question*, e.g., is often combined with such adjectives as vital, pressing, urgent, disputable, delicate, etc.

The adjective *heavy*, e.g., is combined with the words food, meals, supper, etc. in the meaning ‘rich and difficult to digest’. But not all the words with more or less the same component of meaning can be combined with this adjective. One cannot say, for instance, *heavy cheese* or *heavy sausage* implying that the cheese or the sausage is difficult to digest.

second. the different meanings of the adjective heavy may be described through the word-groups heavy weight (book, table, etc.), heavy snow (storm, rain, etc.), heavy drinker (eater, etc.), heavy sleep (disappointment, sorrow, etc.), heavy industry (tanks, etc.),

The aptness of a word to appear in specific grammatical (or rather syntactic) structures is termed **g r a m m a t i c a l v a l e n c y**.

The minimal grammatical context in which words are used when brought together to form word-groups is usually described as the **pattern of the word-group**. For instance, the adjective *heavy* can be followed by a noun (e.g. heavy storm or by the infinitive of a verb (e.g. heavy to lift), etc.

**Free word-groups vs. set expressions**

Words put together to form lexical units make up phrases or word-groups. The main factors active in bringing words together are lexical and syntactic valency of the components of word-groups.

**Free word-groups** are so called not because of any absolute freedom in using them but simply because they are each time built up anew in the speech process. Idioms are used as ready-made units with fixed and constant structures.

**Endocentric word-groups** have one central member functionally equivalent to the whole word-group. In the word-group *a little lamb*, *friendly to nature*, the head-words are the noun *lamb* and the adjective *friendly* correspondingly.

According to their central members, word-groups may be classified into: a) nominal groups or phrases (*a green planet*), b) adjectival groups (*friendly to people*), c) verbal groups (*to recite well*), etc.

**Exocentric word-groups** have no central component and the distribution of the whole word-group is different from either of its members. For instance, the distribution of the word-groups *side by side, at first, grow smaller* is not identical with the distribution of their component-members, i.e. the component-members are not syntactically substitutable for the whole word-group.

**The lexical meaning –** the combined lexical meaning of the component words, e.g. *a blind man* may be described denotationally as the combined meaning of the words *blind* and *man*.

The structural meaning of the word-group is the meaning conveyed mainly by the pattern of arrangement of its components, e.g., such word-groups as *school grammar* and *grammar school* are semantically different because of the difference in the pattern of arrangement of the component words. The structural meaning is the meaning expressed by the **pattern of the word-group**.

Syntactic structure and pattern of word-groups is the description of the order and arrangement of member-words in word-groups as parts of speech:

**1. V+N: (to build houses),**

**2. V+prp+N: (to rely on somebody),**

**3. V+N+prp+N: (to hold something against somebody),**

**4. V+N+V(inf.): (to make somebody work),**

**5. V+ V(inf.): (to get to know).**

Syntactic pattern implies the description of the structure of the word-group in which a given word is used as its head. Syntactic patterns are classified into:

1. predicative word-groups have a syntactic structure similar to that of a sentence, they comprise the subject and the predicate, e.g. he went, John works.

2. non-predicative word-groups do not comprise the subject and the predicate and may be subdivided into

a) subordinative (e.g. red flower, a man of wisdom);

b) coordinative (e.g. women and children, do or die).

**Phraseology as a Subsystem of Language. The nomination differences.**

Phraseology forms a special subsystem in the vocabulary system, the units of which are called differently by different linguists. British and American scholars designate such units "idioms". In Ukraine, the generally accepted term is "phraseological unit" (or "phraseologism"), which denotes a fixed, non-motivated word-group consisting of two or more words that cannot be freely made up in speech but is reproduced as a ready-made unit and characterized by the stability of its meaning, structure and function, e.g., Black Death, to show one's teeth.

As different linguists have different opinions of what a phraseological unit is, they indisputably have different opinions about the main criteria used to distinguish types of phraseological units, which causes terminological confusion due to the usage of other terms, such as "idioms", "set phrases", and "word equivalents". These terms cannot be used interchangeably, each of the term highlighting a specific feature of the phenomenon under study.

The term "**idiom**" is mostly applied to phraseological units with completely transferred meanings, ie. to the ones in which the meaning of the whole unit does not correspond to the meanings of its components. The term "**idiom**" generally implies that the essential feature of the linguistic units under consideration is idiomaticity or lack of motivation. Idiomaticity means that the meaning of the whole phrase is not deducible from the meanings of its component parts, ie. it is completely transferred, eg, red tape, tit for tat, heads or tails, etc.

Lack of motivation means that the meaning of the whole phrase can be deducible from the meaning of at least one of its component parts, ie. it is partially transferred, eg, as busy as a bee, as sly as a fox, etc.

**Semi-idioms** have both literal and transferred meanings, for example:

-- chain reaction (term in physics and figurative expression)

-- lay down one's arms. (military term and figurative expression)

The first meaning is usually terminological or professional and the

second one is transferred.

The term "**set phrase**" emphasizes the fixed componential structure implying that the basic criterion of differentiation is stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word-groups, eg, to be in a family way to be a member of the family' and to be in the family way to be pregnant', i.e. no word within a phraseological unit can be replaced by its synonym, antonym, or hyponym.

Lexical and grammatical stability means that the usage of a phraseological unit is not subject to free variations, and grammatical structure of phraseological units is also stable to a certain extent, ie no component of a phrase can be omitted or replaced by another one, eg, red tape NOT red tapes Stability makes phraseological units more similar to words, rather than free word combinations, because no substitution of any element of a set-phrase is possible in the stereotyped set expressions, which differ in many other respects, eg, all the world and his wife, first night, to gild the pill, to hope for the best, as busy as a bee, fair and square, stuff and non-sense, time and again, to and fro, etc.

The term "**word-equivalent**" stresses not only semantic but also functional inseparability of certain word-groups, their reproducibility, i.e. their aptness to function in speech as single words, unchangeable, ready-made collocations, e g., to kick the bucket 'to die', to pull one's leg 'to deceive', an elephant in a china shop 'a clumsy person', to make a clean breast of 'to confess', to get on one's nerves 'to irritate', etc.

Thus, the habitual terms "idioms", "set-phrases", and "word equivalents" reflect to certain extend the main debatable points of Phraseology which centre in the divergent views concerning the nature and essential features of phraseological units as distinguished from the so called free word-groups.

Phraseological units are distinguished from free word-groups, which are formed on definite lexico-grammatical patterns that are generative, ie any word in a phrase may be replaced by its synonym or hyponym eg, brave (courageous, valiant, fearless, bold) man (woman, boy).

Consider *to burn one's fingers* as a set-phrase and a free phrase. Their common features are as follows.

⚫️ both are word-phrases,

⚫️ both are made up of the same words;

⚫️both are characterized by structural separability.

Their different features are as follows:

free-phrase is applied to people or animals, set-phrase is applied only to people,

in the free-phrase, literal meaning of every component denotes something painful, in the set-phrase, figurative meaning is based on

metaphoric transference of meaning,made free-phrase is made up on the generative lexico-grammatical pattern;

set-phrase is made up on the pattern of description,

free-phrase is not registered in dictionaries as a language unit, set

phrase is fixed both in general and phraseological dictionaries.

**Phraseological unit**, as defined by O. Kunin (Kунин 1996), is a set expression with semantic complexity which is not formed on a generative pattern of a free phrase; the pattern of a phraseological unit is that of description, eg, to kick the bucket, Greek gift, drink till all's blue, drunk as a fiddler/ as a lord / as a boiled owl, as mad as a hatter / as a March hare, etc.

According to the theory of prof. O. Kunin phraseological units have three main parameters (Figure 6.1):

1. Phraseological units are language units, their characteristic feature is semantic complexity, i.e. full and partial transference of meaning, eg, to burn one's fingers is used figuratively, it is a metaphor based on the similarity of action.

2. Structural separability and semantic cohesion, eg, to kick the bucket 'to die',

3. A phraseological unit is never formed on a generative pattern of a free word-combination, one cannot predict the formation of a phraseological unit; the patterns in phraseology are of some other character, they are patterns of description (unpredictable). The most common patterns of English and Ukrainian idioms are: Adj + N, e.g., white elephant; V+ N, eg., to pull sb's leg, etc. There are grammatical patterns (noun phrases, verbal phrases, etc.), semantic patterns (metaphoric and metonymic formation).

**The criteria of singling out PU.**

Phraseological units are habitually defined as non-motivated word-groups that cannot be freely made up in speech but are reproduced as ready-made units. The essential features of **phraseological units** are

**lack of motivation** and **stability of the lexical components.**

**The semantic criterion**

Most scholars today accept *the semantic criterion* of distinguishing phraseological units from free word-groups as the major.

Koonin’s definition ("A phraseological unit is a stable word-group characterised by a completely or partially transferred meaning." ) suggests that the degree of semantic change in a phraseological unit may vary ("completely or partially transferred meaning").

In actual fact the semantic change may affect either the whole word-group or only one of its components. The following phraseological units represent the first case: *to skate on thin ice (~ to* put oneself in a dangerous position; to take risks);

*to wear one's heart on one's sleeve1* (*~* to expose, so that everyone knows, one's most intimate feelings);

*to have one's heart in one's boots (~* to be deeply depressed, anxious about something);

*to have one's heart in one's mouth (~* to be greatly alarmed by what is expected to happen);

*to have one's heart in the right place (~* to be a good, honest and generous fellow);

*a crow in borrowed plumes* (a person pretentiously and unsuitably dressed)*;*

*a wolf in a sheep's clothing* (a dangerous enemy who plausibly poses as a friend).

The second type is represented by phraseological units in which one of the components preserves its current meaning and the other is used in a transferred meaning:

*to lose (keep) one's temper,*

*to fly into a temper,*

*to fall ill,*

*to fall in love (out of love),*

*to stick to one's word (promise),*

*to arrive at a conclusion,*

*bosom friends, shop talk* (also: *to talk shop),*

*small talk.*

**The structural criterion*****for distinguishing* phraseological units and contrasting them to free word-groups**

Structural invariability of phraseological units finds expression in a number of restrictions.

First of all, restriction in substitution. As a rule, no word can be substituted for any meaningful component of a phraseological unit without destroying its sense. The idiom *to give somebody the cold shoulder* means "to treat somebody coldly, to ignore or cut him", but a *warm shoulder* or *a cold elbow* make no sense at all. The meaning of *a bee in smb's bonnet* was explained above, but *a bee in his hat* or *cap* would sound a silly error in choice of words.

At the same time, in free word-groups substitution does not present any dangers and does not lead to any serious consequences. In *The cargo ship is carrying coal to Liverpool* all the components can be changed:

*The ship/vessel/boat carries/transports/takes/brings coal to (any port).*

The second type of restriction is the restriction in introducing any additional components into the structure of a phraseological unit.

In a free word-group such changes can be made without affecting the general meaning of the utterance: *This big ship is carrying a large cargo of coal to the port of Liverpool.*

In the phraseological unit *to carry coals to Newcastle* no additional components can be introduced. Nor can one speak about *the big white elephant* (when using *the white elephant* in its phraseological sense) or about somebody *having his heart in his brown boots.*

The third type of structural restrictions in phraseological units is grammatical invariability. A typical mistake with students of English is to use the plural form of *fault* in the phraseological unit to *find fault with somebody* (e. g. *The teacher always found faults with the boy).* Though the plural form in this context is logically well-founded, it is a mistake in terms of the grammatical invariability of phraseological units *>.* A similar typical mistake often occurs in the unit *from head to foot* (e. g. *From head to foot he was immaculately dressed).* Students are apt to use the plural form of *foot .*

**Debatable points in P. as for the structural and semantic criteria**

The current definition of phraseological units as *highly idiomatic word-groups which cannot be freely made up in speech, but are reproduced as ready-made units* has been subject to criticism by linguists of different schools of thought. The main objections and debatable points may be briefly outlined as follows:

1. The definition is felt to be inadequate as the concept r e a d y - m a d e u n i t s seems to be rather vague. In fact this term can be applied to a variety of heterogeneous linguistic phenomena ranging from word-groups to sentences (e.g. proverbs, sayings) and also quotations from poems, novels or scientific treatises all of which can be described as readymade units.

2. Frequent discussions have also led to questioning this approach to phraseology from a purely semantic point of view as t h e c r i t e r i o n of i d i o m a t i c i t y is found to be an inadequate guide in singling out phraseological units from other word-groups. Borderline cases between idiomatic and non-idiomatic word-groups are so numerous and confusing that the final decision seems to depend largely on one’s “feeling of the language". This can be proved by the fact that the same word-groups are treated by some linguists as idiomatic phrases and by others as free word-groups. For example, such word-groups as take the chair — ‘preside at a meeting’, take one’s chance — ‘trust to luck or fortune’, take trouble (to do smth) — ‘to make efforts’ and others are marked in some of the English dictionaries as idioms or phrases, whereas in others they are found as free word-groups illustrating one of the meanings of the verb to take or the nouns combined with this verb.

3. T h e c r i t e r i o n of s t a b i l i t y is also criticised as not very reliable in distinguishing phraseological units from other word-groups habitually referred to as phraseology.

We observe regular substitution of at least one of the lexical components. In to cast smth in smb’s teeth, e.g. the verb cast may be replaced by fling; to take a decision is found alongside with to make a decision; not to care a twopenny is just one of the possible v a r i a n t s o f t h e p h r a s e , whereas in others the noun twopenny may be replaced by a number of other nouns, e.g. farthing, button, pin, sixpence, fig, etc. It is also argued that stability of lexical components does not presuppose lack of motivation. The word-group shrug one’s shoulders, e.g., does not allow of the substitution of either shrug or shoulders; the meaning of the word-group, however, is easily deducible from the meanings of the member-words, hence the word-group is completely motivated, though stable. Idiomatic word-groups may be variable as far as their lexical components are concerned, or stable. It was observed that, e.g., to cast smth in smb’s teeth is a highly idiomatic but variable word-group as the constituent member cast may be replaced by fling or throw; the word-group red tape is both highly idiomatic and stable.

**The criterion of a function**

This approach assumes that phraseological units may be defined as specify word-groups functioning as word-equivalents. The fundamental features of phraseological units thus understood are their semantic and grammatical inseparability which are regarded as distinguishing features of isolated words.

It will be recalled that when we compare a free word-group, e.g, heavy weight, and a phraseological unit, e.g. heavy father, we observe that in the case of the free wordgroup each of the member-words has its own denotational meaning. So the lexical meaning of the word-group can be adequately described as the combined lexical meaning of its constituents.2 In the case of the phraseological unit, however, the denotational meaning belongs to the word-group as a single semantically inseparable unit. The individual member-words do not seem to possess any lexical meaning outside the meaning of the group. The meanings of the member-words heavy and father taken in isolation are in no way connected with the meaning of the phrase heavy father — ’serious or solemn part in a theatrical play’. The same is true of the stylistic reference and emotive charge of phraseological units. In free word-groups each of the components preserves as a rule its own stylistic reference. This can be readily observed in the stylistic effect produced by free word-groups made up of words of widely different stylistic value, e.g. to commence to scrub, valiant chap and the like. A certain humorous effect is attained because one of the memberwords (commence, valiant) is felt as belonging to the bookish stylistic layer, whereas the other (scrub, chap) is felt as stylistically neutral or colloquial. When we say, however, that kick the bucket is highly colloquial or heavy father is a professional term, we do not refer to the stylistic value of the component words of these phraseological units kick, bucket, heavy or father, but the stylistic value of the word-group as a single whole. Taken in isolation the words are stylistically neutral. It follows that phraseological units are characterised by a single stylistic reference irrespective of the number and nature of their component words.

Semantic inseparability of phraseological units is viewed as one of the aspects of idiomaticity which enables us to regard them as semantically equivalent to single words.

The term **g r a m m a t i c a l i n s e p a r a b i l i t y** implies that the grammatical meaning or, to be more exact, the part-of-speech meaning of phraseological units is felt as belonging to the word-group as a whole irrespective of the part-of-speech meaning of the component words. Comparing the free word-group, e.g. a long day, and the phraseological unit, e.g. in the long run, we observe that in the free word-group the noun day and the adjective long preserve the part-of-speech meaning proper to these words taken in isolation. The whole group is viewed as composed of two independent units (adjective and noun). In the phraseological unit in the long run the part-of-speech meaning belongs to the group as a single whole. In the long run is grammatically equivalent to single adverbs, e.g. finally, ultimately, firstly, etc. In the case of the phraseological unit under discussion there is no connection between the part-of-speech meaning of the member-words (in — preposition, long — adjective, run — noun) and the part-of-speech meaning of the whole word-group. Grammatical inseparability of phraseological units viewed as one of the aspects of idiomaticity enables us to regard them as grammatically equivalent to single words.

Proceeding from the assumption that phraseological units are nonmotivated word-groups functioning as word-equivalents by virtue of their semantic and grammatical inseparability, we may classify them into noun equivalents (e.g. heavy father), verb equivalents (e.g. take place, break the news), adverb equivalents (e.g. in the long run), etc.

**The criterion of context**

Proceeding from the assumption that individual meanings of polysemantic words can be observed in certain contexts and may be viewed as dependent on those contexts, it is argued that phraseological units are to be defined through specific types of context. Free word-groups make up variable contexts whereas the essential feature of phraseological units is a non-variable or f i x e d context.‘ Non-variability is understood as the stability of the word-group. In variable contexts which include polysemantic words substitution of one of the components is possible within the limits of the lexical valency of the word under consideration. It is observed, e.g., that in such word-groups as a small town the word town may be substituted for by a number of other nouns, e.g. room, audience, etc., the adjective small by a number of other adjectives, e.g. large, big, etc. The substitution of nouns does not change the meaning of small which denotes in all word-groups -'not large’. The substitution of adjectives does not likewise affect the meaning of town. Thus variability of the lexical components is the distinguishing feature of the so-called free word-groups. In other word-groups such as small business, a small farmer the variable members serve as a clue to the meaning of the adjective small. It may be observed that when combined with the words town, room, etc. a small denotes ‘not large’, whereas it is only in combination with the nouns business, farmer, etc. that small denotes ‘of limited size’ or ‘having limited capital’. Word-groups of this type are sometimes described as t r a d i t i o n a l c o l l o c a t i o n s .

Unlike word-groups with variable members phraseological units allow of no substitution. For example, in the phraseological unit small hours — ‘the early hours of the morning from about 1 a.m. to 4 a.m.' there is no variable member as small denotes ‘early’ only in collocation with hours. In the phraseological unit small beer small has the meaning ‘weak’ only in this fixed non-variable context. As can be seen from the above, a non-variable context is indicative of a specialised meaning of one of the member-words.

It follows that specialised meaning and stability of lexical components are regarded as interdependent features of phraseological units. The two criteria of phraseological units — specialised meaning of the components and non-variability of context — display unilateral dependence. Specialised meaning presupposes complete stability of the lexical components, as specialised meaning of the member-words or idiomatic meaning of the whole word-group is never observed outside fixed contexts.

Phraseological units may be subdivided into **p h r a s e m e s** and **i d i o m s** according to whether or not one of the components of the whole word-group possesses specialised meaning.

P h r a s e m e s are, as a rule, two-member word-groups in which one of the members has specialised meaning dependent on the second component as, e.g., in small hours; the second component (hours) serves as the only clue to this particular meaning of the first component as it is found only in the given context (small hours). The word that serves as the clue to the specialised meaning of one of the components is habitually used in its central meaning (cf., for example, small hours, and three hours, pleasant hours, etc.).

I d i o m s are distinguished from p h r a s e m e s by the idiomaticity of the whole word-group (e.g. red tape — ‘bureaucratic methods’) and the impossibility of attaching meaning to the members of the group taken in isolation. Idioms are semantically and grammatically inseparable units. They may comprise unusual combinations of words which when understood in their literal meaning are normally unallocable as, e.g. mare’s nest (a mare — ‘a female horse’, a mare’s nest — ‘a hoax, a discovery which proves false or worthless’). Unusualness of collocability, or logical incompatibility of member-words is indicative of the idiomaticity of the phrase.

The approaches discussed above (structure, semantic, functional, and contextual) create ground to conclude that they have very much in common as the main criteria of phraseological units appear to be essentially the same, i.e. stability and idiomaticity or lack of motivation.

The final criterion in the semantic approach is idiomaticity whereas in the functional approach syntactic inseparability is viewed as the final test, and in the contextual approach it is stability of context combined with idiomaticity of word-groups.

**Phraseological stability** may be called **macrostability**, which is made up of several **microstabilities**: stability of use; stability of meaning; lexical stability.

**S t a b i l i t y** **of use** means that PU are:

* reproduced ready-made and not created in speech;
* registered in dictionaries as language units;
* handed down from generation to generation,
* public property, not private. They are not elements of individual style of speech but language units.

**The stability of meaning** of phraseological units means either transference of meaning (full or partial) or complexity of meaning.

**Full transference of meaning** occurs when the meaning is non motivated, figurative, not equal to the literal meaning of every component. The main types of full transference of meaning are:

***metaphor***, which is a hidden comparison based on different types of similarity:

a) similarity of position, eg, like a fish out of water, a bull in a China shop, etc

b) similarity of action, eg, to wash one's dirty linen in public, to pay through the nose

c) similarity of shape and/or function, eg, a rising star, a blue stocking,

**→metonymy,** which is more realistic, it is based on contiguity of meaning, eg, Tom, Dick and Harry, Wall Street, to be all ears, to count by the noses, a blind hand, Jack Ketch 'hangman', Tom Pepper 'great liar', Tom Tailor tailor', Tom Thumb 'a small man, a Lilliputian', Nosy Parker людина, що втручається/суне ніс не в свої справи, etc.

**hyperbole,** which is often present in metaphors because it has the elements of exaggeration, e.g, a sea of troubles, to make a mountain out of mole-hill, to drop in ocean, ocean of time**.**

**Partial transference** occurs when at least one of the components has a literal meaning, this happens in similes, e.g., as brave as a lion, to drink like a fish, to sleep like a log, to eat like a horse, as sly as a fox, as old as hills, like a dog with two tails.

Stability of meaning of phraseological units does not mean that the meaning of phraseological units doesn't change, e.g., to give up the ghost 'to die', now it means 'to stop functioning' being applied to inanimate things, such as trains, cars, etc.

**L e x i c a l s t a b i l i t y** means that the components of set expressions are either irreplaceable (e.g. red tape, mare’s nest to pay through the nose 'to pay a very large sum of money', Tomy Atkins "American soldier', a bloody Mary 'a drink', calf love дитяче коxання', stuff and nonsense) or partly replaceable within the bounds of phraseological or phraseomatic variance: lexical (e.g. a skeleton in the cupboard — a skeleton in the closet), grammatical (e.g. to be in deep water — to be in deep waters), positional (e.g. head over ears — over head and ears), quantitative (e.g. to lead smb a dance — to lead smb a pretty dance), mixed variants (e.g. raise (stir up) a hornets’ nest about one’s ears — arouse (stir up) the nest of hornets).

**S e m a n t i c s t a b i l i t y** is based on the lexical stability of set expressions. Even when occasional changes ‘are introduced the meaning of set expression is preserved. It may only be specified, made more precise, weakened or strengthened. In other words in spite of all occasional changes phraseological and phraseomatic units, as distinguished from free phrases, remain semantically invariant or are destroyed.

**Structural separability**, the term introduced by A. Smirnitsky (1957) means that one of the elements is subjected to morphological change. This problem has been also investigated by N. Amosova (1963) and here are some of her examples, where a skeleton in the cupboard means 'a family secret' : *It must be rather fun having a skeleton in the cupboard*. *I have skeletons in the cupboard*

Structural separability characterizes phraseological units which are made up of words in the grammatical forms. The markers of structural separability are:

**morphological**, which are realized in:

a) changes of the verb, e.g, to burn one's finger (burnt, has burnt, will burn).

b) changes of the noun, eg, he is pulling my leg (our legs),

c) changes of the adjective, e.g, he is poorer than a church mouse,

**morphological and syntactic**, eg, the formation of the Passive Voice: Don't you see that our legs are being pulled?

**syntactic**, when the structure of the phraseological unit as a whole is different from that of a compound word, eg, my God! good Heavens! "Слава Богу!

It goes without saying that the possibility of a morphological change cannot regularly serve as a distinctive feature because it may take place only in a limited number of set expressions.

**PU and idioms.**

An attempt is also made to distinguish phraseological units as word equivalents from i d i o m s proper, i.e. idiomatic units such as that’s where the shoe pinches, the cat is out of the bag, what will Mrs Grundy say?, etc. Unlike phraseological units, proverbs, sayings and quotations do not always function as word-equivalents. They exist as readymade expressions with a specialised meaning of their own which cannot be inferred from the meaning of their components taken singly. Due to this the linguists who rely mainly on the criterion of idiomaticity classify proverbs and sayings as phraseological units. The proponents of the functional criterion argue that proverbs and sayings lie outside the province of phraseology. It is pointed out, firstly, that the lack of motivation in such linguistic units is of an essentially different nature. Idioms are mostly based on metaphors which makes the transferred meaning of the whole expression more or less transparent. If we analyse such idioms, as, e.g., to carry coals to Newcastle, to fall between two stools, or fine feathers make fine birds, we observe that though their meaning cannot be inferred from the literal meaning of the member-words making up these expressions, they are still metaphorically motivated as the literal meaning of the whole expression readily suggests its meaning as an idiom, i.e. ‘to do something that is absurdly superfluous’, ‘fail through taking an intermediate course’ and ‘to be well dressed to give one an impressive appearance’ respectively.1 The meaning of the phraseological units, e.g. red tape, heavy father, in the long run, etc., cannot be deduced either from the meaning of the component words or from the metaphorical meaning of the word-group as a whole. Secondly, the bulk of idioms never function in speech as wordequivalents which is a proof of their semantic and grammatical separability. It is also suggested that idioms in general have very much in common with quotations from literary sources, some of which also exist as idiomatic ready-made units with a specialised meaning of their own. Such quotations which have acquired specialised meaning and idiomatic value, as, e.g., to be or not to be (Shakespeare), to cleanse the Augean stables (mythology), a voice crying out in the wilderness (the Bible), etc. differ little from proverbs and sayings which may also be regarded as quotations from English folklore and are part of this particular branch of literary studies.

**Different approaches to the classification of phraseological units.**

**a) thematic**

The traditional and oldest principle of classification of phraseological units is “thematic” (L. P. Smith). On this principle, idioms are classified according to their sources of origin - sphere of human activity, life of nature. L. P. Smith gives groups of idioms used by sailors, fishermen, soldiers, hunters or in other words idioms associated with their occupation. Smith points out that word-groups associated with the sea and the life of seamen are especially numerous in English vocabulary. Most of them have long since developed metaphorical meanings which have no longer any association with the sea or sailors. In his classification one can find idioms associated with domestic and wild animals, agriculture, cooking, sports, arts and so on. L. P. Smith points out that idioms associated with the sea and the life of seamen are especially numerous in English vocabulary. Here are some examples: to be all at sea — to be unable to understand; to be in a state of ignorance or bewilderment about something; to sink or swim — to fail or succeed; in deep water — in trouble or danger; to weather (to ride out) the storm — to overcome difficulties; to have courageously stood against misfortunes; to bow to the storm — to give in, to acknowledge one's defeat; three sheets in(to) the wind (sl.) — very drunk; Half seas over (sl.) – drunk. The thematic principle of classifying phraseological units has real merit but it does not take into account the linguistic characteristic features of the phraseological units.

**b) semantic**

Vinogradov's classification system is founded on the degree of semantic cohesion between the components of a phraseological unit. Accordingly, Vinogradov classifies phraseological units into three classes: *phraseological combinations, unities and fusions* (R. *фразеологические сочетания, единства и сращения).*

***Phraseological fusions***are word-groups with a completely changed meaning but, in contrast to the unities, they are demotivated, that is, their meaning cannot be deduced from the meanings of the constituent parts; the metaphor, on which the shift of meaning was based, has lost its clarity and is obscure.

E. g. *to come a cropper* (to come to disaster);

*neck and crop* (entirely, altogether, thoroughly, as in: *He was thrown out neck and crop. at sixes and sevens* (in confusion or in disagreement);

*to set one's cap at smb.* (to try and attract a man; spoken about girls and women. The image, which is now obscure, may have been either that of a child trying to catch a butterfly with his cap or of a girl putting on a pretty cap so as to attract a certain person. In *Vanity Fair: "Be careful, Joe, that girl is setting her cap at you.");*

*to leave smb. in the lurch* (to abandon a friend when he is in trouble);

*to show the white feather* (to betray one's cowardice. The allusion was originally to cock fighting. A white feather in a cock's plumage denoted a bad fighter);

*Phraseological unities* are word-groups with a completely changed meaning, that is, the meaning of the unit does not correspond to the meanings of its constituent parts.

E. g. *to stick to one's guns* (*~* to be true to one's views or convictions.

*to catch/clutch at a straw/straws (~* when in extreme danger, avail oneself of even the slightest chance of rescue)

*to lose one's head (~* to be at a loss what to do; to be out of one's mind);

*to lose one's heart to smb.* (*~* to fall in love);

*to lock the stable door after the horse is stolen* (*~* to take precautions too late, when the mischief is done);

*to look a gift horse in the mouth (=* to examine a present too critically; to find fault with something one gained without effort); *to ride the high horse (~ to* behave in a superior, haughty, overbearing way. The image is that of a person mounted on a horse so high that he looks down on others);

*the last drop/straw* (the final culminating circumstance that makes a situation unendurable);

*a big bug/pot,* sl. (a person of importance);

*a fish out of water* (a person situated uncomfortably outside his usual or proper environment).

*Phraseological combinations* are word-groups with a partially changed meaning. They may be said to be clearly motivated, that is, the meaning of the unit can be easily deduced from the meanings of its constituents. E. g. *to be at one's wits' end, to be good at something, to be a good hand at something, to have a bite, to come to a sticky end* (coll.), *to take something for granted, to stick to one's word, gospel truth, bosom friends.*

So, according to the degree of idiomaticity phraseological units can be classified into three big groups

1. Phraseological fusions are word-groups with a completely changed meaning. Their meaning cannot be guessed from the meanings of separate words (tit for tat), to come a cropper).

2. Phraseological unities are word-groups with completely changed meaning. But the meaning of the unit can be understood from the parts of the unit (to lose one’s head, to lose one’s heart, to lock the stable door after the horse is stolen, to look a given horse in the mouth).

3. Phraseological combinations are word-groups with partially changed meaning (to be a good hand at something, to take something for granted, gospel truth, bosom friend).

Having preserved the three main classes of phraseological units, M.M. Shanskii singles out the fourth class – phraseological expressions – semantically divisible phraseological units whose components have a free meaning. Those phraseological expressions are: proverbs, cf.: friend in need is a friend indeed vs. друзі пізнаються в біді; під лежачий камінь вода не тече and nothing ventured, nothing gained, sayings, cf.: tighten one’s belt vs. затягти пояс (покласти зуби на полицю); чорним по білому vs. in black and white, aphorisms and catch-phrases, cf.: перейти Рубікон vs. cross the Rubicon (Caesar); facts are stubborn things vs. факти – уперта річ (Eliot); (eternal) love triangle vs. любовний трикутник (e.g. Ibsen); обітована земля vs. the promised land (Bible)

**c) structural**

***The structural principle of classifying***phraseological units is based on their ability to perform the same syntactical functions as words. In the traditional structural approach, the following principal groups of phraseological units are distinguishable.

1). substantive: • one's (or the) ace of trumps (козырной туз), black diamonds, a hand -to- mouth existence; a smart Aleck; a dark horse;

2) adjectival: • dead and buried; more dead than alive; quick on the trigger; (as) pretty as a picture; 3) adverbial: • at last; by leaps and bounds; as the devil; lock, stock and barrel; as quick as a flash;

4) verbal: • blow hot and cold, catch a shadow and let go a substance; kick the bucket; kill two birds with one stone.

5). prepositional: • in the face of smth; in (the) light of smth.

6). interjectional: • by George!; hear, hear!

7) parenthetical: • after all as a matter of fact • in any case

a). sayings: • all one's geese are swans; • the answer's a lemon; • does your mother know you're out?

b). proverbs: • birds of a feather flock together – tukli qushlar bir joyga to’planishadi • every cloud has a (or its) silver lining

**d) Structural-and-semantic principle**

Professor A.I. Smirnitsky offered a classification system for English phraseological units which is interesting as an attempt to combine **the structural and the semantic principles**. Phraseological units in this classification system are grouped according to the number and semantic significance of their constituent parts.

Accordingly two large groups are established:

A. one-summit units, which have one meaningful constituent (e. g. to give up, to make out, to pull out, to be tired, to be surprised);

B. two-summit and multi-summit units which have two or more meaningful constituents (e. g. black art, first night, common sense, to fish in troubled waters).

Within each of these large groups the phraseological units are classified according to the category of parts of speech of the summit constituent.

So, one-summit units are subdivided into: a) verbal-adverbial units equivalent to verbs in which the semantic and the grammatical centers coincide in the first constituent (e. g. to give up); b) units equivalent to verbs which have their semantic centre in the second constituent and their grammatical centre in the first (e. g. to be tired); c) prepositional-substantive units equivalent either to adverbs or to copulas and having their semantic centre in the substantive constituent and no grammatical centre (e. g. by heart, by means of).

Two-summit and multi-summit phraseological units are classified into: a) attributive-substantive two-summit units equivalent to nouns (e. g. black art); b) verbal-substantive two-summit units equivalent to verbs (e. g. to take the floor), c) phraseological repetitions equivalent to adverbs (e. g. now or never); d) adverbial multi-summit units (e. g. every other day). Professor Smirnitsky also distinguishes proper phraseological units which, in his classification system, are units with non-figurative meanings, and idioms, that is, units with transferred meanings based on a metaphor.

**e) functional**

The classification system of phraseological units suggested by Professor A. V. Koonin is the latest outstanding achievement in the Russian theory of phraseology. The classification is based on the combined **structural-semantic** principle and it also considers the quotient of stability of phraseological units.

Phraseological units are subdivided into the following four classes according to **their function** in communication determined by their structural-semantic characteristics.

1. **Nominative** phraseological units are represented by word-groups, including the ones with one meaningful word, and coordinative phrases of the type wear and tear, well and good. The first class also includes word-groups with a predicative structure, such as as the crow flies, and, also, predicative phrases of the type see how the land lies, ships that pass in the night.

2.**Nominative-communicative** phraseological units include word-groups of the type to break the ice – the ice is broken, that is, verbal word-groups which are transformed into a sentence when the verb is used in the Passive Voice.

3. Phraseological units which are **neither nominative nor communicative** include interjectional word-groups.

4. **Communicative** phraseological units are represented by proverbs and sayings.

**Diachrony of PU**

**The principles of PU development**

The diachronic aspect of phraseology has scarcely been investigated. Just a few points of interest may be briefly reviewed in connection with the origin of phraseological units and the ways they appear in language.

It is assumed that almost all phrases can be traced back to free word-groups which in the course of the historical development of the English language have acquired semantic and grammatical inseparability. It is observed that free word-groups may undergo the process of grammaticalisation or lexicalisation. Cases of **g r a m m a t i c a l i s a t i o n** may be illustrated by the transformation of free word-groups composed of the verb have, a noun (pronoun) and Participle II of some other verb (e.g. OE. hē haefde hine zeslaegenne) into the grammatical form — the Present Perfect in Modern English. The degree of semantic and grammatical inseparability in this analytical word-form is so high that the component have seems to possess no lexical meaning of its own.

The term **l e x i c a l i s a t i o n** implies that the word-group under discussion develops into a word-equivalent, i.e. a phraseological unit or a compound word. These two parallel lines of lexicalisation of free word-groups can be illustrated by the diachronic analysis of, e.g., the compound word *instead* and the phraseological unit *in spite (of)*. Both of them can be traced back to structurally identical free phrases. (Cf. OE. in stede and ME. in despit.)

There are some grounds to suppose that there exists a kind of interdependence between these two ways of lexicalisation of free word-groups which makes them mutually exclusive. It is observed, for example, that compounds are more abundant in certain parts of speech, whereas phraseological units are numerically predominant in others. Thus, e.g., phraseological units are found in great numbers as verb-equivalents whereas compound verbs are comparatively few. This leads us to assume that lexicalisation of free word-groups and their transformation into words or phraseological units is governed by the general line of interdependence peculiar to each individual part of speech, i.e. the more compounds we find in a certain part of speech the fewer phraseological units we are likely to encounter in this class of words.

This problem may be viewed in terms of the degree of motivation. We may safely assume that a free word-group is transformed into a phraseological unit when it acquires semantic inseparability and becomes synchronically non-motivated.

The following may be perceived as the main causes accounting for the loss of motivation of **free word-groups**:

a) When one of the components of a word-group becomes archaic or drops out of the language altogether the whole word-group may become completely or partially non-motivated. For example, lack of motivation in the word-group *kith and kin* may be accounted for by the fact that the member-word *kith* (OE. cÿth) dropped out of the language altogether except as the component of the phraseological unit under discussion. This is also observed in the phraseological unit *to and fro*.

b) When as a result of a change in the semantic structure of a polysemantic word some of its meanings disappear and can be found only in certain collocations. The noun mind, e.g., once meant ‘purpose’ or ‘intention’ and this meaning survives in the phrases to have a mind to do smth., to change one’s mind, etc.

c) When a free word-group used in professional speech penetrates into general literary usage, it is often felt as non-motivated. *To pull (the) strings (wires)*, e.g., was originally used as a free word-group in its direct meaning by professional actors in puppet shows. In Modern English, however, it has lost all connection with puppet-shows and therefore cannot be described as metaphorically motivated. Lack of motivation can also be observed in the phraseological unit to stick to one’s guns which can be traced back to military English, etc. Sometimes extra-linguistic factors may account for the loss of motivation, to show the white feather — ‘to act as a coward’, e.g., can be traced back to the days when cock-fighting was popular. A white feather in a gamecock’s plumage denoted bad breeding and was regarded as a sign of cowardice. Now that cock-fighting is no longer a popular sport, the phrase is felt as non-motivated.

d) When a word-group making up part of a proverb or saying begins to be used as a self-contained unit it may gradually become non-motivated if its connection with the corresponding proverb or saying is not clearly perceived. *A new broom*, e.g., originates as a component of the saying *new brooms sweep clean*. *New broom* as a phraseological unit may be viewed as non-motivated because the meaning of the whole is not deducible from the meaning of the components. Moreover, it seems grammatically and functionally self-contained and inseparable too. In the saying the noun broom is always used in the plural; as a member- word of the phraseological unit it is mostly used in the singular. The phraseological unit a new broom is characterized by functional inseparability. In the saying *new brooms sweep clean* the adjective *new* functions as an attribute to the noun brooms, in the phraseological unit a new broom (e.g. Well, he is a new broom!) the whole word-group is functionally inseparable.

e) When part of a quotation from literary sources, mythology or the Bible begins to be used as a self-contained unit, it may also lose all connection with the original context and as a result of this become non- motivated. The phraseological unit the green-eyed monster (jealousy) is a part of the quotation from Shakespeare “*It is the green-eyed monster which doth mock the meat it feeds on*” (Othello, II, i. 165). In Modern English, however, it functions as a non-motivated self-contained phraseological unit and is also used to denote the T.V. set. *Achilles heel* — ‘the weak spot in a man’s circumstances or character’ can be traced back to mythology, but it seems that in Modern English this word-group functions as a phraseological unit largely because most English speakers do not connect it with the myth from which it was extracted.

**Etymology**

**Etymology** is actually derived from the Greek word ‘etumologia’, ‘original meaning’. Etymology is a branch of linguistics that studies the history and evolution of each word. Etymology defines the basis of the origin of words and phrases, phraseology discusses the fixed constructions, phrases with portable meanings in the vocabulary of the language. Each word, phraseological unit also has its own origin. has the etymology of history.

The sources of phraseological units are numerous and may dominate mostly in one language or the other. They are related with

historical events: cut the Gordian knot, pay through the nose, to burn one’s boats,

folklore:

==a peeping Tom (The earliest extant source for the story is the Chronica (under the year 1057) of Roger of Wendover (d. 1236). He recounts that her husband, in exasperation over her ceaseless imploring that he reduce Coventry’s heavy taxes, declared he would do so if she rode naked through the crowded marketplace. She did so, her hair covering all of her body except her legs. Ranulf Higden (d. 1364), in his Polychronicon, says that as a result Leofric freed the town from all tolls save those on horses. An inquiry made in the reign of Edward I shows that at that time no tolls were paid in Coventry except on horses. A later chronicle asserts that Godiva required the townsmen to remain indoors at the time fixed for her ride. Peeping Tom, a citizen who looked out his window, apparently became a part of the legend in the 17th century. In most accounts he was struck blind or dead.).

==pull devil, pull baker! The first meaning is “валяй, шквар, давай, а ну ще!” to encourage the contesters, the second meaning is “fierce competition” with a negative accent. The source is an old story staged at puppet shows with the episodes of the fight of the baker against the devil. While fighting they moved back and forth. The next meanings that developed were to reject lies and to fight with a changeable fate.

ancient mythology: open Pandora’s box, a Trojan horse, the Achille’s heel;

traditions and customs: to sit above the salt, tie the knot ;

bible: fallen angel ; Promised Land.

professional activity: agriculture-to break ground; industry: a blue-collar worker;

fishing: to fish for compliments; in deep water;

military sphere: fall into line;

sports: keep the ball rolling;

music: play the first fiddle;

painting: the dark side of the picture;

business: bring to account

phoning someone: to phone someone up;

buying and selling: to bring something under the hammer;

playing cards and gambling: throw good money after bad banking.

PU can come from other languages. Phraseological units which are called borrowings, or foreign phrases; they have entered the English language as formulas and as having an international character. However, they are used in specific field and belong to a specific stylistic use. These phraseological units are mostly from the Latin or neo-Latin languages like: casus belli, status quo, persona non grata, de facto, de jure, alter ego, ad hoc.

Another type of phraseological units is called calques are those which are translated literally, word by word from a foreign language into English: *rest in peace* – comes from the Latin language *requiescat in pace*, *devil’s advocate* – comes from the Latin language *advocatus diaboli*, referring to an official appointed to present arguments against a proposed canonization in the Catholic Church.

**Ways of forming phraseologisms**

Phraseological units can be classified according to the ways they are formed, according to the degree of the motivation of their meaning, according to their structure and according to their part-of-speech meaning.

A.V. Koonin classified phraseological units according to the way they are formed, pointing out primary and secondary ways of forming phraseological units.

**Primary ways** of forming phraseological units are those when a unit is formed on the basis of a free word-group:

a) Most productive in Modern English is the formation of PU by means of transferring the meaning of terminological word-groups (e.g. launching pad, to link up);

b) A large group of phraseological units was formed from free word-groups by transforming their meaning (e.g. granny farm, Troyan horse);

c) Phraseological units can be formed by means of alliteration (e.g. a sad sack, culture vulture, fudge and nudge);

d) They can be formed by means of expressiveness, especially it is characteristic for forming interjections (My aunt! Hear, hear!);

e) By means of distorting a word group (e.g. odds and ends);

f) By using archaisms (e.g. in brown study);

g) By using a sentence in a different sphere of life (e.g. that cock won’t fight);

h) By using some unreal image (e.g. to have butterflies in the stomach, to have green fingers);

i) By using expressions of writers or politicians in everyday life (e.g. corridors of power, American dream, the winds of change).

**Secondary ways** of forming phraseological units are those when a phraseological unit is formed on the basis of another phraseological unit.

They are:

a) conversion: to vote with one’s feet → vote with one’s feet;

b) changing the grammar form: make hay while the sun shines → to make hay while the sun shines; c) analogy: curiosity killed the cat → care killed the cat;

d) contrast: acute surgery → cold surgery;

e) shortening of proverbs and sayings: you can’t make a silk purse out of a sow’s ear → a sow’s ear;

f) borrowing phraseological units from other languages, either as translation loans: living space (German), to take the bull by the horns (Latin); or by means of phonetic borrowings: sotto voce (Italian), corpse d’elite (French).

**Proverbs**

Proverbs are different from those phraseological units.

The first distinctive feature is the obvious structural dissimilarity. Phraseological units are a kind of ready-made blocks which fit into the structure of a sentence performing a certain syntactical function, more or less as words do (e.g. a) George liked her for she never put on airs (predicate). b) Big bugs like him care nothing about small fry like ourselves, (a) subject, b) prepositional object)). Proverbs, if viewed in their structural aspect, are sentences, and so cannot be used in the way in which phraseological units are used.

In the semantic aspect, proverbs sum up the collective experience of the community. They moralize (Hell is paved with good intentions), give advice (Don't judge a tree by its bark), give warning (You sing before breakfast, you will cry before night), admonish (Liars should have good memories), criticize (Everyone calls his own geese swans). No phraseological unit ever does any of these things. They do not stand for whole statements as proverbs do but for a single concept. Their function in speech is purely nominative (i. e. they denote an object, an act, etc.). The function of proverbs in speech, though, is communicative (i. e. they impart certain information).

The question of whether or not proverbs should be regarded as a subtype of phraseological units and studied together with the phraseology of a language is a controversial one. Professor A. V. Koonin includes proverbs in his classification of phraseological units and labels them communicative phraseological units. From his point of view, one of the main criteria of a PU is its stability. If the quotient of phraseological stability in a word-group is not below the minimum, it means that we are dealing with a phraseological unit. The structural type – that is, whether the unit is a combination of words or a sentence – is irrelevant.

The criterion of nomination and communication cannot be applied here either, says Professor A.V. Koonin, because there are a considerable number of verbal phraseological units which are word-groups (i. e. nominative units) when the verb is used in the Active Voice, and sentences (i. e. communicative units) when the verb is used in the Passive Voice. E. g. to cross (pass) the Rubicon – the Rubicon is crossed {passed); to shed crocodile tears – crocodile tears are shed. Hence, if one accepts nomination as a criterion of referring or not referring this or that unit to phraseology, one is faced with the absurd conclusion that such word-groups, when with verbs in the Active Voice, are phraseological units and belong to the system of the language, and when with verbs in the Passive Voice, are non-phraseological word-groups and do not belong to the system of the language.

One more argument in support of this concept is that there does not seem to exist any rigid border-line between proverbs and phraseological units as the latter rather frequently originate from the former (e.g. the phraseological unit *the last straw* originated from the proverb *The last straw breaks the camel's back*; *birds of a feather* from the proverb *Birds of a feather flock together*, *to catch at a straw* (*straws*) from *A drowning man catches at straws*.

Besides, some proverbs are easily transformed into phraseological units, e.g*. Don't put all your eggs in one basket > to put all one's eggs in one basket*; *don't cast pearls before swine > to cast pearls before swine*.

**Paradigmatic relations in phraseology**

**Paradigmatic relation** is a different type of sematic relations between words that can be substituted with another word in the same categories. Thesauri and synonymic dictionaries are generally built based on paradigmatic relations.

**Synonymy**

Lexical stability of phraseological units means that their componential structure is fixed, i.e. not any word within a phraseological unit can be replaced into synonym, hyponym, or antonym. Lexically fixed phraseological units may have:

**1. no lexical replacement possible**, eg, to pay through the nose 'to pay a very large sum of money', Tomy Atkins "American soldier', a bloody Mary 'a drink', calf love дитяче коxання', stuff and nonsense

**2. certain, limited replacements possible**, eg, close/ near at hand, not to stir / raise / lift/ turn a finger, to close / shut one's eyes to smth. These are phraseological variants (not synonyms), which are also fixed in the dictionaries.

If after the substitution the inner form of PU changes radically, then these are two synonyms, e.g. tailor`s dummy [8, с. 908] і hairdressers` dummy (“вилощений молодий чоловік”) [8, с. 446], if the substitution doesn’t ruin the integral semantics of PU then it is the variability of the PU, e.g. bad sailor / poor sailor (“людина, що погано переносить морську качку”) [8, с. 60], the bishop has put the foot in it / the bishop has set the foot in it (“страва підгоріла”).

Synonymic PU create synonymic rows, e.g.

1) the SR with the integral seme “to move away secretly, without notice”: to take French leave, to make oneself scarce, to give smb. the slip [5, с. 406, 653, 915]; or with “to move along by foot”: to pad (to beat) the hoof, to ride Shank’s mare, to ride in the marrow-bone coach, to ride the shoe leather express, to foot it, to leg it, to hoof it [5, с. 348]; “to depart secretly or without notice”: to take French leave, to make oneself scarce, to give smb. the slip; “to depart at night without paying the rent”: to shoot the moon, to shoot (to fly) the pit; “very black”: **as black as a crow – as black as crow’s wing – as black as a sloe, as ink, as coal, as ebony, as jet, as soot**

2) with the synonymic dominant of non-phraseological character, e.g. to go to bed as a head of the to go to camp, to hit the hay; to flee, e.g. to cut and run, to take flight, to take wing, to show the heels, to cut one’s lucky, to flee, to bolt;

3) ~ phraseological character, e.g. ***to keep pace with***, to keep step with, to keep abreast of.

**Polysemy**

Polysemy is the result of accumulation of the meanings within the boundaries of one lexical unit stipulated by its multiple interpretation. For example, a lexeme *smart*: smart person - розумна людина, smart clothes – охайний одяг, smart fellow – винахідливий хлопець, smart answer – зухвала відповідь, smart move – швидкий крок, smart baby – спритна дитина.

Polysemantic relations in phraseology are less developed than in words because, firstly, PU are the signs of secondary nominations which means they are the result of reinterpretation, and secondly, they have less contextual mobility as they cannot lexically and grammatically collocate with the other words, thirdly, the inner form of many PU is lost and it is the inner form that determines its collocability.

So, PU can have one meaning an early bath (швидке виведення гравця з гри (гравці завжди приймають ванну після закінчення матчу/гри) or several meanings, e.g. make a clean sweep (1) позбутися небажаних людей або речей для того, щоб розпочати все спочатку; (2) здобути першість у серії змагань чи матчів [36, c. 55]; limp wrist (1). milksop, (2). gay.

The polysemantic structure of PU contains primary figurative meaning and secondary figurative meaning, which appears due to metaphorization or/and metonimization. The number of meanings show the stages of the PU reinterpretation. For example, as blind as a bat (1) сліпий, (2) неуважна людина; as cold as charity (1) відчуття холоду, (2) байдужість; in low water, on the rocks — in strained financial circumstances; to be in the same boat with somebody — to be in a situation in which people share the same difficulties and dangers; to sail under false colors – to pretend to be what one is not; to pose as a friend and, at the same time, have hostile intentions; to show one's colors — to betray one's real character or intentions; to strike one's colors — to surrender, give in, admit one is beaten; to kiss the hare’s foot: To be late or too late for dinner

**Antonymy**

O.V. Kunin believes PU are the units which belong to the same grammatical class, coincide totally or partially in their lexical composition, possess the same semantic component in the polar meanings of PUA and are characterized by the same or different stylistic loading, e.g. англ. good sailor [8, с. 424] – bad sailor [8, с. 60] (“людина, що добре – погано переносить морську качку”); (as) sober as a judge (або a parson) [8, с. 873] – (as) mad as a hatter / as a weaver [8, c. 634] (“розсудливий – божевільний”); англ. a square shooter [8, с. 883] – knight of fortune (“чесна, порядна людина – авантюрист”); (as) fit as a pudding for a friar`s mouth – as much use for it as the Queen has for a yeld-hook (“те, що треба – щось непотрібне”); curb (або kerb) merchant [8, с. 250] – merchant prince [8, с. 671] (“дрібний – великий торговець”).

The antonymy of the first type is based on the value of constituents of PU that didn’t lose their semantic connections with the lexemes used in free speech. These units differ in the identity of syntactical structure and lexical composition excluding one element англ. have a good nose [312, с. 205] – have a bаd nose, to «хороший / поганий нюх». The antonymy of the first type is predetermined by that that the PU don’t coincide in their composition and inner form, e.g. (as) cold as (a) stone – (as) hot as flame [298, с. 506]; голодувати / обжиратися: stay one’s stomach [297, с. 724], – make a feast, to [298, с. 636]; холод / спека: be chilled to the bone [297, с. 147] – be roaster alive [297, с. 637].

So the PU can be synonymic and antonymic to each other, e.g. to put a spoke in wheels (negative stylistic connotation) (to spoil someone else’s plans and stop them from doing something): to harm, to injure, to throw a wrench in the works vs (to favour, to help, to give green light, to give a hand).

One and the same PU that has several meanings can belong to different antonymic pairs, e.g. (as) sober as a judge (або a parson) in the meaning “розсудливий” is contrasted to the set-expression (as) mad as a hatter / as a weaver, while in the meaning of “зовсім тверезий” to the expression (as) drunk as a fiddler / as a piper / as a lord / as a potter.

**Homonymy**

Two or more words identical in sound and spelling but different in meaning, distribution and origin are called homonyms. The term is derived from Greek (homos-“similar”, onoma-“name”)». For example, heart, n. – seat of life ↔ hart,n. – animal. elude, v. – to escape from ↔ illude – to deceive. made, adj. – created ↔ maid, adj. – unmarried woman.

Homonymous PU are characterized by the fact that a transferred meaning can co-exist simultaneously with the direct meaning, e.g. *a hard nut to crack* – міцний горішок; *to see daylight*  – бачити вихід із становища; *to skate on thin ice* – бути в делікатному становищі; *to take root* – пускати коріння, swim against the current, etc.

Idioms made up of words brought together in free speech are homonymous with the corresponding variable word-groups, e.g. to let the cat out of the bag — ‘to divulge a secret’, and the clue to the idiomatic meaning is to be found in a wider context outside the phrase itself.

The same can be told about PU *to burn one’s fingers* має значення *1) обпалити пальці і 2) обпектися на чому-небудь, помилитися; to be narrow in the shoulders може мати прямий сенс (бути вузькоплечим) і значення фразеологізму (не* *розуміти гумору).* *«Don’t mention it» може значити: «Не нагадуй мені про* *це», або «Не варте подяки, будь ласка», «to throw the book at smb».* означає *«засудити кого-небудь до максимального терміну ув’язнення», etc.*

**Enantiosemy**

Enantiosemy is the polarity in the lexical structure of the same unit, e.g. story teller – 1. liar (negative connotation). 2. a good narrator (positive connotation).

Английский фразеологизм story teller – 1. Лгун (пейоративная коннотация). I don’t want to interfere but you’d better check all his words. Story teller and nothing else. Liar of all times (T. Morrison. Sula). – Не хочу вмешиваться, но лучше бы тебе самому проверить всё, что он говорит. Брехун он. Лжец, каких свет не видывал (перевод – С.Л.). 2. Хороший рассказчик историй, человек с хорошей фантазией (положительная коннотация).

Розглядаючи явище синонімії, ми стикаємося з проблемою розмежування синонімічних виразів і варіантів тієї самої фразеологічної одиниці. Синонімічними вважаються такі фраземи, які характеризуються близькими чи тотожними цілісними фразеологічними значеннями, розрізняючись, однак, внутрішньою формою, етимологічними образами і експресивно-емоційними властивостями [1, с. 70]. Фразеологічними варіантами слід вважати ті видозміни фразем, які характеризуються відносною тотожністю фразеологічного значення і етимологічного образу, розрізняються окремими компонентами плану вираження, що надає їм певну експресивно-стилістичну своєрідність.

Домінантою фразеологічного синонімічного ряду може бути стійке словосполучення нефразеологічного характеру. Наприклад, у синонімічному ряді to go to camp, to hit the hay, to go to bed [5, с. 431, 496] домінантою-фразеологізмом є to go to bed. Зазвичай у ряді to keep pace with, to keep step with, to keep abreast of [5, с. 572, 573] домінантою є фразеологічна одиниця to keep pace with. Для визначення загального значення синонімічного ряду звичайно доводиться звертатися до способу описання. Так, загальне значення фразеологічних синонімів to take French leave, to make oneself scarce, to give smb. the slip [9, с. 176, 298, 440] можна передати лише описово: “to depart secretly or without notice”; загальне значення синонімічних фразеологічних одиниць to shoot the moon, to shoot (to fly) the pit [5, с. 858] – “to depart at night without paying the rent”. to cut and run, to take flight, to take wing, to show the heels, to cut one’s lucky, to flee, to bolt [5, с. 75, 275], домінанта to flee.

А у синонімічному ряді as black as a crow – as black as crow’s wing – as black as a sloe, as ink, as coal, as ebony, as jet, as soot фразеологізми мають домінантне значення "дуже чорний".

Cинонімами аналізованого фразеологізму виступають такі слова та словосполучення: to economize, to cut down costs; to stretch a dollar; to tighten one’s belt; to run tight ship; to keep within means, to pinch pennies, to meet one’s budget, антонімами є одиниці to spend money, to squander. З

нім. Meister Fips і Meister Zwirn (“кравець”) [10, с. 50]), то перед нами синоніми, і, навпаки, якщо заміна компонентів не порушує цілісної семантики фразеологізму, ані призводить до зміни образної уяви (внутрішньої форми), то в таких випадках спостерігаємо варіантність фразеологізму. англ. bad sailor і poor sailor (“людина, що погано переносить морську качку”) [8, с. 60], the bishop has put the foot in it і the bishop has set the foot in it (“страва підгоріла”)

Синонімічні фразеологічні одиниці утворюють синонімічні ряди.

Наприклад, синонімічний ряд зі спільною семантичною моделлю “to move away secretly, without notice”: to take French leave, to make oneself scarce, to give smb. the slip [5, с. 406, 653, 915]; синонімічний ряд фразеологічних одиниць зі спільною семантичною моделлю “to move along by foot”: to pad (to beat) the hoof, to ride Shank’s mare, to ride in the marrow-bone coach, to ride the shoe leather express, to foot it, to leg it, to hoof it [5, с. 348].

Антонімічність першого типу засновується на значимості конституентів ФО, які не втратили своїх семантичних зв’язків з лексемами в їхньому вільному вживанні. Такі сполуки відрізняються ідентичністю синтаксичної структури й лексичного складу за винятком одного антонімічного компоненту. До цього типу віднесені такі фразеологізми: англ. have a good nose [312, с. 205] – have a bаd nose, to «хороший / поганий нюх»

semantic connections До другого типу фразеологічних антонімів, які практично не збігаються за компонентним складом і, відповідно, образною внутрішньою формою, в англійській мові – зі значенням «холодний / гарячий»: (as) cold as (a) stone – (as) hot as flame [298, с. 506]; голодувати / обжиратися: stay one’s stomach [297, с. 724], – make a feast, to [298, с. 636]; холод / спека: be chilled to the bone [297, с. 147] – be roaster alive [297, с. 637];

У наведеному фрагменті дискурсу використаний фразеологізм to put a spoke in wheels, значення якого не випливає із значення його компонентів, хоча є чyidddово мотивованим ними: to spoil someone else’s plans and stop them from doing something [87, c. 381]. Дефініція фразеологічної єдності, контекст її використання, її синоніми (to harm, to injure, to throw a wrench in the works) та антоніми (to favour, to help, to give green light, to give a hand) вказують на її образність та негативно-оцінну конотацію.

На думку О. В. Куніна, фразеологічні антоніми – це кореферентні фразеологізми, які відносяться до одного граматичного класу, частково або повністю співпадають за лексичним складом, мають семантичний компонент за наявності полярних значень і відрізняються або збігаються за стилістичним відношенням [129, с. 70].

За наявності кількох значень в однієї фраземи, вона може належати до різних антонімічних пар. Приміром, англійський компаративний зворот

по-третє, у багатьох ФО втрачена внутрішня форма, яка здебільшого визначає і разом з тим стримує сполучуваність [96, с. 193–194]. Фразеологи [94, с. 124; 258, с. 72; 208, с. 194] розрізняють у смисловій структурі полісемантичних ФО первинно-образне і вторинно-образне значення, які виникають унаслідок метафоризації. Перший тип значення виникає внаслідок метафоризації вільного словосполучення, на основі якого виникає вторинно-образне. В. П. Жуков зазначає, скільки розрізняється значень ФО, стільки й стадій переосмислення в кожному зі своїх значень він і проходить [96, с. 199–201].

За характером залежності лексико-семантичних варіантів у багатозначній одиниці виокремлюємо три основні різновиди полісемії: радіальну, ланцюжкову й радіально-ланцюжкову.

Домінують двозначні сполуки з компаративною будовою: as blind as a bat [297, с. 89; 298, с. 144; 312, с. 69; 349, с. 28], де первинно-образне значення фразеологізму сліпий, вторинно-образне – неуважна людина; as cold as charity [297, с. 142; 298, с. 222; 349, с. 58] – 1) відчуття холоду, 2) байдужість. Такі сполуки належать до ланцюжкової багатозначності, де кожне наступне значення утворюється від найближчого попереднього, умотивовується ним і вмотивовує наступне.

Фразеологічні одиниці можуть бути однозначними, наприклад, an early bath – швидке виведення гравця з гри (авторський переклад). Алюзія побудована на тому, що гравці завжди приймають ванну після закінчення матчу/гри [36, c. 17]. Інший тип – це полісемантичні фразеологізми, наприклад, make a clean sweep. Цей вираз має два значення: позбутися небажаних людей або речей для того, щоб розпочати все спочатку; здобути першість у серії змагань чи матчів [36, c. 55].

limp wrist , выделен смысл «гендерное несоответствие» – 1. Баба, тряпка, кисейная барышня (о мужчине). Nobody will have business with you. You are limp wrist. And all your behaviors prove this. My partner should be strict and firm and not like you. Don’t even try … (D. Ebershoff. The 19th Wife). – Никто не захочет иметь с тобой совместный бизнес. Ты тряпка и размазня. Все твои поступки это доказывают. Мой партнёр должен быть твёрдым, как кремень, а не таким, как ты (перевод – ABBYY Lingvo 10). 2. Гомосексуалист.

Phraseology resembles a picturesque gallery comprising the samples of eternal and marvelous customs and traditions of a nation, historical memorials, fairy tales and songs.