

2. Волков Ю. Г., Поликарпов В. С. Человек как космопланетарный феномен. Ростов-на-Дону: Издательство Ростовского университета, 1993. 192 с.
3. Кант И. Критика способности суждения. Киев: Азбука, 2019. 448 с.
4. Карасев Л. В. Философия смеха. Москва: Рос. гуманит. ун-т, 1996. 224 с.
5. Кожемякина О. Н. Доверие смеху в контексте современной трактовки проблемы культуры смеха. *Studia Culture*, 2011. Вып. 12. С. 176–183.
6. Пропп В. Я. Роблемы комизма и смеха. Москва: Лабиринт, 2002. 192 с.
7. Рюміна М. Т. Эстетика смеха. Смех как виртуальная реальность. Изд. 3-е. Москва : Книжный дом «Либроком», 2010. 320 с.
8. Хренов Н. А. Введение. Эстетика и теория искусства XX века: альтернативные типы дискурсивности в контексте трансформации культуры. *Эстетика и теория искусства XX века*. Москва: Прогресс-Традиция, 2008. С. 7–84.
9. Шопенгауер А. Полное собрание сочинений в 6 томах. Харьков: Книжный клуб «Терра», 1999–2001. 864 с.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-588-90-7-52>

PATTERNS OF SEMANTIC VARIATION IN PHRASEOLOGY

Kozlova T. O.

*Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Professor at the English Philology Department
Zaporizhzhia National University*

Polyezhayev Yu. G.

*Candidate of Sciences in Social Communications, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages for
Professional Communication
"Zaporizhzhia Polytechnic" National University
Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine*

Introduction. Interest in the studies of phraseology has been steadily growing over the past fifty years. Theoretical and practical concerns go beyond the discussion of the issues related to the definition and typology of set

expressions. The current interdisciplinary trend can be described as embracing comparative, cultural, cognitive, and language teaching dimensions.

Being opposed to free expressions, phraseologisms are commonly recognized as conventionalised, structurally stable and semantically indivisible units. However, they exhibit significant flexibility in structure and meaning. Many attempts have been made to examine factors of linguistic creativity, variability constraints and cognitive mechanisms of phraseological innovation [1; 2; 3, p. 175-286; 4]. In spite of that the problem of phraseological polysemy leading to the relatedness of meanings out of context remains unresolved.

The *purpose* of this study is to approach the mechanisms of semantic modifications in phraseologisms by analyzing differences between their lexico-semantic variants from a traditional semantics perspective. The semantic structure of phraseological units is treated as a polysemic unity embracing primary (i.e. initial) and secondary (i.e. derived) constituents. It is argued that semantic variation of phraseologisms follows particular patterns designed by means of substitution, deletion, addition, and reverse of semes, the smallest units of meanings.

Material and method. The method consisted of carrying out a search of polysemic phraseologisms in English, Russian and Ukrainian explanatory and historical dictionaries. The meanings of the retrieved instanced (250 in total) were then used as the empirical base for the componential analysis to discover constituents of primary lexico-semantic variants and reveal features distinguishing them from secondary senses.

Results and discussion. Semantic substitution leads to a shift which occurs due to the replacement of one or more components in the primary meaning of a phraseological unit. It can be exemplified by the Australian English idiom to draw the crabs “to attract enemy fire” ([‘stimulate’ + ‘unwanted’ + ‘act/ion’]) developing into “to attract unwanted attention” ([‘stimulate’ + ‘unwanted’ + ‘interest’]).

Semantic deletion deals with the loss of a seme and results in generalization of meaning. For instance, the semantic variation in the Australian English phrase to big note “to display or boast one’s wealth; to exaggerate one’s own importance, achievements” is achieved by removing the ‘financial’ seme: ([‘make’ + ‘seem’ + ‘lager’ + ‘importance’ + ‘financial’] > [‘make’ + ‘seem’ + ‘lager’ + ‘importance’]).

Semantic addition leads to the inclusion of another seme into the content (to make it “to succeed; to be successful” > “to succeed (in having a sexual intercourse)”) and results in the specialization of meaning ([‘any kind’ + ‘activity’] > [‘particular’ + ‘activity’]).

Semantic reverse is based on opposition of senses and requires the involvement of an antonymic seme in the derived lexico-semantic variant. The Russian *ne promakh* is a bisemic phraseologism that attracts different evaluative connotations depending on context. The sense “nobody’s fool, i.e. intelligent and experienced enough not to be tricked by other people” stimulates approval whereas the second sense “good at tricking or cheating people” suggests negative judgements.

The development of polysemy can be shaped by a pattern combining semantic addition and reverse. The meanings of daddy’s girl “a child or an adult female with a stronger bond to her father than the bond to her mother” ([‘female’ + ‘support’ + ‘male parent’]) may additionally infer “indulged by her father” ([‘spoiled’]).

Conclusions. Semantic variation in phraseology is not necessarily contextually conditioned. It can manifest due to numerous reasons that interplay and realise the natural tendency in language towards variation. From a cognitive perspective, phraseological meaning variation is determined by speakers’ desire to generalize or detalise information about the category membership and make a more elaborate reference to entities, actions, events, etc. in speech and writing.

The results have implications for general linguistics and call for further research aimed to explain semantic alternations as well as give a fresh insight into regularity of their occurrence, pragmatic value, contextual appropriateness, purposes of linguistic creativity and encoding conceptualisations.

References:

1. Džanić N. D., and Berberović S. Conceptual Integration Theory in Idiom Modifications. València: Universitat de València, 2019. 128 p.
2. Jaki S. Phraseological Substitutions in Newspaper Headlines: “More Than Meats the Eye”. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2014. 243 p.
3. Langlotz A. Idiomatic Creativity: A Cognitive-linguistic Model of Idiom-representation and Idiom-variation in English. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2006. 325 p.
4. Omazić M. Processing of idioms and idiom modifications: A view from cognitive linguistics. *Phraseology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Granger S., Meunier, F. (Eds.). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co, 2008. P. 67-80.