Alla GUROCHKINA
Irina SHCHIROVA

PHRASEOLOGICAL MEANING-MAKING AND ITS INTERPRETATION IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF COGNITIVE PARADIGM AND AUTOPOESIS

Abstract. The article tackles the issue of solving the problem of phraseological meaning – making and its interpretation by means of harmonizing its methodological foundations with the methodological settings of cognitive-communicative paradigm.

The aim of research is to describe phraseological meaning from the standpoint of the biology of cognition, which postulates a close connection of linguistic phenomena, phraselogy among them, with the bodily experience of an individual as an Observer and a living system. The language is treated in the article not as a means of communication, implemented through a sign system, but as a biologically grounded, socially conditioned, cognitively and culturally determined joint activity of human beings. An individual is viewed as a biological organism, that acquires a priori forms of cognition in the process of evolution, these forms allowing him\her to adapt to the environment by interpreting it adequately. An individual starts the process of meaning-making by remembering how actual interaction was constrained by previous events, what kind of emergent affordances he observed in the environment, and his inter-inner-bodily dynamics.

Insisting on the significance of subjective experience for construal meaning, the authors determine phraseological meaning not as ready-made knowledge enclosed in recognizable sign forms and identified by an individual in the process of communication, but as a semantic potential in memory. Not the ready-made meanings of words, but this potential, acquired by an individual through his\her personal experience, is used by him\her to interpret phraseological units adequately. As the research shows, cognitive methods create promising opportunities not only for describing the mechanisms of phraseological meanings, but also for solving fundamental problems of language, cognition, experience and communication.

Keywords: phraseological units, cognition, language, languaging, meaning-making, autopoiesis, signals, environment, interpretation.

Problem statement. All languages have phrases that cannot be understood literally and, therefore, cannot be used with confidence. They are opaque or unpredictable because they don't have expected literal meaning. Even if you know the meaning of all the words in a phrase and understand all the grammar of the phrase completely, the meaning of the phrase may still be confusing. Phrases of this kind are studied in such branch of linguistics as phraseology.

Phraseology can be described as the most colorful and expressive part of a language's vocabulary. It represents a wide picture of the national customs, traditions and prejudices, memories of its past history, of folk songs and fairy-tales, quotations from great writers and poets as well as wisdom and witticisms of different nations.

In modern linguistics many overlapping terms are used to describe these phrases – phraseological collocations, phraseological units, set or fixed phrases, idioms, idiomatic expressions etc., but in spite of their different nominations all of them share such an essential feature as stability of the lexical components and are characterized by a double sense: the current meanings of constituent words build up a certain picture which has little or nothing to do with the actual setup of the world thus creating an entirely new image.

The word-groups, under consideration, present different binary phraseological units the components of which are: linked by coordinating conjunctions (*safe and sound, here and there, if and when, over and done with*), belong to the same or different parts of speech (*bread and games, fully and fairly, by and large, home and dry*), semantically either correlative or opposite as for example - *in and out, back and forth*. The latter come out as denotative antonyms nominating opposite objects of the world (*heaven and hell, horse and foot*), as significative antonyms expressing equipollent opposition (*out and home, neither dead nor alive*) or as converse antonyms denoting both bilateral and synchronous implication (*hither and thither, purchase and sale*).

Analysis of the previous research. In modern linguistics scientists differentiate types of phraseological units on the basis of their specific structural, lexical, grammatical features and specific mechanisms of their meaning-making [V.Vinogradov, V.Teliya, A.Kunin, V.Mokienko, A.Smirnitskiy, Makkai and others].

Research aim and objectives. The **aim** of research is to describe phraseological meaning from the standpoint of the biology of cognition, which postulates a close connection of linguistic phenomena, phraselogy among them, with the bodily experience of an individual as an Observer and a living system. The authors use a **descriptive method** and **cognitive** research methods in their study.

Material description. The principles on which the classification of coordinating phraseological units is based in this paper are two in number – phraseologicity and idiomaticity

The most important features of the notion phraseologicity are – stability and reproducibility of phraseological word-groups in speech as single in most cases unchangeable collocations.

The essential feature of the notion idiomaticity is based on semantic projection rule that at least one of the components of phraseological word-group demonstrates transferred (indirect, implicit) meaning.

Taking into consideration these criteria we distinguish two types of coordinating phraseological word-groups in English language:

1. Non-idiomatic coordinating phraseological word-groups (phraseomatic units);

2. idiomatic coordinating phraseological word-groups (idioms and phrasemes);

These two types present different degrees of stability and semantic motivation of their whole meaning.

The first type – phraseomatic units are characterized by stability of usage i.e. they are not created in speech but are reproduced ready-made. Their meaning can be deduced from the meanings of their constituents which to a certain extent preserve their cognitive (denotative) meaning while the meaning of the whole presents not just the sum of these meanings but new, transferred meaning [*cakes and ale* (merrymaking, good things), *hit and miss* (done carelessly), *take it or leave it* (allowing acceptance or rejection, etc.).

The most essential feature of the second type is idiomaticity. It includes: highly idiomatic set expressions – idioms the whole meaning of which has little or nothing to do with that of its constituents [*by and large* (in general), *neck or nothing* (either to succeed or to fail)]; phrasemes – one component of which is used in its direct meaning, while the other is used metaphorically[*fair and aboveboard* (honest and open), *cheap and easy* (to cost little and be of low quality)]; pseudo-phraseological units that include: a) fixed word-groups constituents of which are attributed to different semantic domain [*a fish and a half* (something that is very unusual or surprising), *would and all* (to emphasize that someone is talking about the whole of the group or thing)] and b) set word-groups one of the components of which is archaic and is rarely or not at all used in modern language [*kith and kin* (friends and relatives), *wrack and ruin* (fall to pieces)].

The process of birth of any phraseological unit is a chain of accidents. And in almost every case of this process is special. Some of them were introduced into the language by writers – *neither rhyme or reason* (W. Shakespeare), *prunes and prism* (Ch. Dickens), others found their roots in the Bible – *to serve God and Mammon, fire and brimstone*, some came from other languages such as French and Latin, for example. But whatever the history of their origin they present an essential element that enriches the language.

A large number of European and Russian scholars focused their attention on research of phraseological units and many results had been achieved [N. Amosova, V. Vinogradov, A. Koonin, V. Smirnitsky, et al.]. But a number of problems in this field are still waiting their solution.

It seems that it is the modern cognitive-communicative paradigm and its bio-cognitive trend that have explanatory and methodological potential to find solutions not only to some phraseological problems but also to some major linguistic issues that heretofore have evaded more or less comprehensible explanation in the framework of the traditional paradigm — such as the language/mind relationship, language acquisition, linguistic semiosis, cognition and others.

The most accepted definition of cognition in cognitive linguistics is – the ability of human beings to assimilate and process information that they receive from different sources (perception, learning, memory, etc.), acquire knowledge through experience and, due to their personal characteristics, integrate this information to evaluate and interpret their environment.

According to U. Maturana knowledge is dependent entirely on what an observer distinguishes or brings forth in language while the process of cognition, as sensory motor coordination, is made evident through his actual acting or behaving in the domain of interactions. Thus, «as a basic psychological and, hence, biological function, cognition guides [man's] handling of the universe» (Maturana 1970, c.1). This reflection may be extended by adding that, in the case of languaging human beings, cognition serves an organism in its active adaptation to the world of experiences, without which there may be no «handling of the universe».

The researchers working within the frames of modern cognitive linguistics distinguish two types of knowledge – phenomenological and structural based on the way how knowledge is distributed and shared among members of a certain society. Hence, phenomenological knowledge is presented as awareness or basic information of human experience based upon human perception and conceptualization of the world from a first person point of view. By structural knowledge is meant accumulated knowledge shared by members of the whole society stored in its rules, procedures, customs and norms which guide their problem-solving activities and patterns of interaction.

The manner in which human beings perceive, categorize and conceptualize the world is reflected at first in different cognitive structures and then in different linguistic units which means that linguistic units are direct reflex of cognition and that a particular linguistic expression is associated with particular way of conceptualizing a given situation.

In other words, modern paradigm assumes cognitive structures as a mental matter that acts as an intermediary between the linguistic signs and the reality

One of the main issues of cognitive linguistics among others is the study of linguistic signs meaning which is also of great importance in the field of phraseology. But this phenomena as well as other key notions such as language, knowledge, experience, communication adopted in traditional linguistics held strong for a long period of time though many scientists, in particular cognitive scientists, have been speaking of a necessity to revise them. It was suggested that a new epistemology was needed to overcome the outdated assumptions that language is an autonomous system, a 'thing' which

humans use just like they use other things, that it is a system of material signs (a code) in which every sign form expresses a certain meaning attached to it hence the function of language is to transfer meanings (thoughts) from head to head namely transmit chunks of "ready-made" information from one mind to another by means of such "containers" as verbal forms and that the transfer of thoughts by means of language lies at the core of human communication which main function is exchange of information (knowledge) between the sender and the receiver [Love 1998; Spurrett 2004; Kravchenko 2010].

Today, the view on language as an instrument for conveying meaning is rejected by many as inadequate [Gasparov 1996; Järvilehto 1998; Zlatev 2003; Cowley and Love 2006, Kravchenko 2007]. In cognitive linguistics natural language is viewed as constitutive of man's humanness, because as humans we «happen in language» [Maturana 1978]. Language and thought are co-determined [Vygotsky 1987]. As humans, we become what we are through joint activity with others, or communication, and the uniquely characteristic feature of this activity is linguistic behavior without which it is impossible to imagine our very existence. Language dynamics are processes of using and interpreting language as a person engages with the environment. These depend on the causal processes that constitute the cognitive dynamics occurring in and across several time domains — e.g., evolution, history, development, relationships, experiential time, various micro-domains [Cowley & Kravchenko 2006]. As argued by J. Zlatev meaning is a relationship between an organism and its physical and cultural environment determined by the value of aspects of the environment for the organism [Zlatev 2003]. Moreover, as organism and environment form a unity, stand in a relation of reciprocal causality then word meanings are largely determined by its environment. On such view, the function of languaging is to orient others (and oneself) in a consensual domain of interactions, whereby organisms become *in*-formed in the environment [Kravchenko 2007]. Orientation as adaptation always takes place in a specific environment (physical and cultural) and, because «everything said is said by an observer to another observer» [Maturana 1970], aspects of the environment inevitably affect languaging.

Actual communication begins under the circumstances when at least two human beings happen to be interlocked in a consensual domain of interactions. The speaker in this case transmits signals (word forms, gestures, intonation, body language, etc,) to be picked up and interpreted by hearer. With the flow of time couplings of events of languaging using these (and other) signals, on the one hand, and their occurrences in relevant contexts, on the other, are constantly recorded by memory becoming part of life experience. Once memorized, this knowledge remains relevant and is called for when needed. Recall of such events in the form of cog-

nitive structure (image) is reflected in changes of communicative behavior of languaging individuals which in its turn is the base of semiosis and, when observed by interlocutors, contribute to creating meaning.

So meaning in cognitive linguistics and the theory of autopoiesis is not something that exists «out there» waiting to be discovered, identified, and «harvested», it is not contained in linguistic signs, the meaning is a certain associative potential which is basically a person's memory of the previous uses of a particular sign [Allwood and Gärdenfors 1999], that is, the speaker/ hearer re-plays in his mind the previous episodes, and taking into consideration meaningful context of the actual situation, the physical and communicative behavior of a partner along with other affordances he conjures up anticipated meanings.

The nature of signals varies in a wide range. But most widely used and most important among them are acoustic and visual ones represented accordingly by natural speech and written texts. Traditionally writing and spoken language were viewed as analogous phenomena while cognitive linguistics builds its view on the assumption that they are ontologically different and belong to experiential domains of different dynamics. Languaging as a process occurs in space-time as participants monitor and respond to what happens [Linell 2005], by contrast, writing is a reflection of the writer's interaction with his own thoughts. As to the reader, he interacts with his own cognizing linguistic self trying to interpret the signals (word forms) he visually perceives. These graphic images devoid of cognitive meaning are the only signals the reader gets in contrast with spoken language so, as a result, his interpretations crucially depend on his structural knowledge.

So unlike languaging which is aimed at monitoring an organism's environment by modifying other organisms' behavior written texts serve to mediate relevant experience between generations and communities.

In interpreting texts people are often guided not so much by the meanings of words, but by their knowledge obtained in the course of their individual experiences as observers of the world in the spatio-temporal, geographical, historical, cultural, etc. medium of which language itself is a part.

Conclusions. Summing up, it is important to note that the described methodology of meaning-making can be applied to both types of coordinating phraseological word-groups. At the same time it is important to keep in mind that while dealing with the formation of meaning of non-idiomatic coordinating phraseological word-groups (phraseomatic units) a wide range of external signals as well as a cognitive meaning of one of its constituent should be taken into account. In contrast, the meaning of idiomatic coordinating phraseological word-groups (idioms and phrasemes) is not generated but is reconstructed on the base of speaker/hearer's structural knowledge.

REFERENCES

1. Allwood J. and P. Gärdenfors (eds.) (1999). Cognitive Semantics: Meaning and cognition. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 201 p. [in English].

2. Cowley S. and A. Kravchenko (2006) Dinamika kognitivnykh protsessov i nauki o yazyike [Cognitive dynamics and the language sciences]. *Voprosyi yazyikoznaniya*. № 6. S. 133–141 [in Russian].

3. Cowley S. and N. Love N. (2006). Language and cognition, or, how to avoid the conduit metaphor. Duszak A., Okulska U. (Eds.). Bridges and Walls in Metalinguistic Discourse. Frankfurt/Main, Peter Lang. P. 135–154 [in English].

4. Gasparov B. M. (1996). Yazyk, pamyat, obraz. Lingvistika yazykovogo sushchestvovaniya [Language, memory, image. Linguistics of linguistic existence]. Moskva: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie. 348 s. [in Russian].

5. Järvilehto T. (1998). The theory of the organism-environment system: I. Description of the theory. Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science 33. P. 317–330 [in English].

6. Kravchenko A. V. (2010). Native speakers, mother tongues, and other objects of wonder. *Language Sciences* 32 (6). P. 677–785 [in English].

7. Kravchenko A. V. (2007). Essential properties of language, or, why language is not a code. *Language Sciences,* 29 (5). P. 650–671[in English].

8. Kravchenko A. V. (2011). The semantics vs. pragmatics debate in the context of the orientational function of language, [in] A. Kiklewicz (red.). *Język poza granicami języka* II. Semantyka a pragmatyka: spór o pierwsze-ństwo. Uniwersytet Warminsko-Mazurski w Olsztyne, P. 11–23 [in English].

9. Linell P. (2005). The Written Language Bias in Linguistics. Routledge [in English].

10. Love N. (1998). The fixed-code theory. In: R. Harris and G. Wolfe (eds.), Integrational Linguistics: A first reader. Pergamon. P. 49–67 [in English].

11. Maturana H. (1970). Biology of cognition. BCL Report № 9.0. Urbana: University of Illinois. 58 p. [in English].

12. Maturana H. (1978). Biology of language: The epistemology of reality. In G. Miller and E. Lenneberg (Eds.), *Psychology and biology of language and thought,* 28–62. New York: Academic Press. P. 28–62 [in English].

13. Spurrett D. (2004) Distributed cognition and integrational linguistics. Language Sciences 26 (4). P. 497–501 [in English].

14. Vygotsky L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber and A. S. Carton (eds.), The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume 1: Problems of General Psychology. New York: Plenum. P. 39–285 [in English].

15. Zlatev J. (2003) Meaning = life (+ culture): An outline of a unified biocultural theory of meaning. Evolution of Communication 4: P.253–296 [in English].

ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОЕ СМЫСЛООБРАЗОВАНИЕ И ЕГО ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ С ТОЧКИ ЗРЕНИЯ КОГНИТИВНОЙ ПАРАДИГМЫ И АУТОПОЭЗА

Аннотация. Несмотря на общепризнанную значимость проблем фразеологии, многие из них с трудом поддаются традиционному лингвистическому описанию. Относится это и к сложной проблеме фразеологически связанного значения, успешное решение которой авторы статьи пытаются найти в согласовании методологических оснований описания фразеологических единиц с методологическими установками когнитивно-коммуникативной парадигмы.

Цель статьи – проанализировать и описать механизмы образования и интерпретации фразеологического значения с позиции биологии познания, постулирующей тесную связь языковых явлений с телесным опытом человека как Наблюдателя и живой системы.

Исходя из постулатов теории аутопоэза, авторы в качестве методологической основы для описания фразеологического значения рассматривают факторы, влияющие на эволюцию познавательных способностей человека. Язык характеризуется ими как биологическое явление, а человек – как биологический организм (Наблюдатель), обретающий в ходе эволюции априорные формы познания, позволяющие индивиду адаптироваться к окружающей среде с помощью адекватной оценки и интерпретации. Акцентуация значимости индивидуального и личностного опыта для реконструкции значения в сознании человека позволяет определить фразеологическое значение не как готовое знание, заключенное в узнаваемые знаковые формы и идентифицируемые индивидом в процессе коммуникации, а как смысловой потенциал, который формируется в его памяти в результате развития познавательных способностей. Этот потенциал, а не готовые значения слов используются человеком и для адекватной интерпретации фразеологизмов.

Когнитивные методы исследования формируют новые перспективы не только для описания фразеологического значения, но и для решения общих проблем развития и роли языка, знания и познания, опыта и коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: фразеологизмы, познание, язык, языковой, смыслообразование, аутопоэз, сигналы, среда, интерпретация.

ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНЕ СМИСЛОУТВОРЕННЯ І ЙОГО ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЯ З ТОЧКИ ЗОРУ КОГНІТИВНОЇ ПАРАДИГМИ Й АУТОПОЕЗА

Анотація. Незважаючи на загальновизнану важливість проблем фразеології, багато з них практично не піддаються традиційному лінгвістичному опису. Стосується це й складної проблеми фразеологічно зв'язаного значення, успішне вирішення якої автори статті намагаються знайти в узгодженні опису фразеологічних одиниць із методологічними настановами когнітивно-комунікативної парадигми.

Мета статті – проаналізувати й описати механізми утворення й інтерпретації фразеологічного значення з позиції біології пізнання, що постулює тісний зв'язок мовних явищ із тілесним досвідом людини як Спостерігача і живої системи.

Виходячи з постулатів теорії аутопоеза, автори як методологічну основу для опису фразеологічного значення розглядають чинники, що впливають на еволюцію пізнавальних здібностей людини. Мова характеризується ними як біологічне явище, а людина – як біологічний організм (Спостерігач), що відроджується в ході еволюції апріорних форм пізнання, які дають змогу індивіду адаптуватися до навколишнього середовища за допомогою адекватної оцінки й інтерпретації. Акцентуація значущості індивідуального та особистісного досвіду для реконструкції значення в свідомості людини уможливлює визначення фразеологічного значення не як готового знання, укладеного в впізнавані знакові форми та ідентифікуються індивідом в процесі комунікації, а як смисловий потенціал, який формується в його пам'яті внаслідок розвитку пізнавальних здібностей. Цей потенціал, а не готові значення слів використовується людиною і для адекватної інтерпретації фразеологізмів.

Когнітивні методи дослідження формують нові перспективи не тільки для опису фразеологічного значення, а й для вирішення спільних проблем розвитку і ролі мови, знання і пізнання, досвіду й комунікації.

Ключові слова: фразеологічні одиниці, пізнання, мова, мовний, створення смислу, аутопоез, сигнали, середовище, інтерпретація.

Алла Гурочкіна – кандидат філологічних наук, професор кафедри англійської філології державного педагогічного університету імені О. Герцена, Санкт-Петербург, Росія; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4808-3162

Alla Gurochkina – Candidate of Philology, full Professor, Professor of the English Philology Department, A. Herzen State Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg, Russia; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4808-3162

Ірина Щирова – доктор філологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри англійської філології державного педагогічного університету імені О. Герцена, Санкт-Петербург, Росія; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3378-8677

Irina Shchirova – Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the English Philology Department, A. Herzen State Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg, Russia; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3378-8677