

PHRASEOLOGICAL COMPOUNDS IN THE UKRAINIAN ETHNOCULTURE: FRAME MODEL

Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Філологія.

Випуск 2 (54)

УДК 811.161.2'

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.24.144/2663-6840/2025.2\(54\).53-57](https://doi.org/10.24.144/2663-6840/2025.2(54).53-57)

Кочерга Г. Phraseological Compounds in the Ukrainian Ethnoculture: Frame Model; кількість бібліографічних джерел – 11; мова англійська.

Abstract. The article characterizes the motivational processes of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language, which are based on the stereotyping of the Ukrainian ethnic group's ideas about the world and their determination by cultural and psychomental factors. The patterns of symbolic reinterpretation of phraseological units of the Ukrainian language in the network of cultural meanings of ethnic consciousness are revealed, which reflect the peculiarities of the national conceptual system, ethnic interiorization of reality in connection with the culture, traditions, customs, and myths of the people. The purpose of the study is to clarify the motivational mechanism of phraseological units that form a nomination model based on the conceptual relations of the speaker's synergistic system of ethnic consciousness. The purpose of the study is implemented in the task - to describe the nominative mechanisms of phraseological compounds with the structure of ethnoconsciousness, meaning-generating processes in the projection onto the cultural grounds of the ethnic community, its internal reflexive experience, denoted by a phraseological segment. It is determined that the meaning of the motivator of such nominatives is already metaphorically motivated, but in the minds of speakers these words are fixed in the composition of phraseological turns, which makes possible the compression, univerbation of the latter, that is, their contraction, which explicitly and implicitly carry the corresponding interpretation of the world, intentionally directing its very thought and cognitive orientation. The motivational connection of universal words and stable expressions is explained by imagery, as the collapse of a descriptive syntagma preceding the creation of a word, by reducing the plan of expression of the original value and involving the semantics of the reduced members in the derived word. It is the process of compression in the Ukrainian language that provides the phraseological variety of associative-terminal motivation.

The generation of a model of nominative phraseological units, which have a deep explanatory capacity, is characterized, since on its basis motivation processes are investigated, the structure of knowledge about the signified is reconstructed, the logical-informative content of phraseological units, embodied in denotative-significative components of semantics, is in close connection with emotional-evaluative, figurative-expressive stylistic and cultural-national factors, the interaction of various cognitive mechanisms of ethnoconsciousness and collective unconscious is made evident. It has been established that nominative units are metaphorical by mechanism, since experiential knowledge is used to denote processes, verbalized in stable phraseological combinations that have the ability to express something more than the simple sum of the meanings of their components. For the most part, the motivator of the phraseological segment is a grammatically dependent component of the phraseological structure - verbosity, which transfers the semantics of the phrase as a whole to the motivated one in view of the phraseological valence, which determines greater recognition properties. We see the prospect of further research in the description of the pameiologial component of Ukrainian culture in the projection onto certain cognitive-semiotic models.

Keywords: a phraseological compound, a conceptualization, a cultural code, an associative-terminal motivation, a mental-psychonetic complex.

Problem formulation. We consider the phraseological array of language primarily as a culturally conditioned symbolic representation of the world internalized by ethnoconsciousness with its inherent categorization, subcategorization, differentiation, and integration, because the world in consciousness passes through a network of conceptual models and is accordingly transformed, categorized, and interpreted by the mental lexicon. The study of phraseological units through the prism of the mental-psychological complex is due to the need to explain and test the multidimensional concept of conceptual analysis of the phraseological fund of the Ukrainian language within the framework of traditional semantic and etymological research, which served the relevance of our investigation.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Phraseologisms as nominative units of language are a product of the cultural-epistemological ability of an ethnic group to record as a stereotypical its own anthropometric attitude to the objective world, which over time turns into a prototypical one in ethnic consciousness. Phraseologisms are a kind of ethnocultural reflection of the speaker in a communicative situation, because he

consciously or subconsciously correlates his own emotional-evaluative attitude and value orientation with the content of the sign. Phraseological signs bring to the communicative process a whole world of meanings, special imagery, expressiveness, expressiveness, axiologicality, which is based on a complex of sensations, feelings, ideas of the people, intersemiotic scenarios of the culture of a certain ethnic group. The theoretical basis of our research was the scientific work of N. Venzhynovich, Zh. Krasnobaeva-Chorna, L. Skrypnyk, L. Kolomiets, N. Babych, V. Uzhchenko, D. Uzhchenko, I. Vykhovants. O. Taranenko, O. Potebnia, D. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky, W. von Humboldt, Sh. Balli, and others. **The purpose** of the study is to clarify the motivational mechanism of phraseological units that form a nomination model based on the conceptual relations of the speaker's synergistic system of ethnic consciousness. The purpose of the study is implemented in the task of characterizing the nominative mechanisms of phraseological compounds with the structure of ethnic consciousness, meaning-generating processes in the projection onto the cultural spheres of the ethnic community, its internal reflexive experience, denoted by a phraseological segment.

Presentation of the main research material. The model of the generation of nominative units is based on the concept of the connection of thought and word by O. Potebnia, as well as on the postulates of modern cognitive semantics regarding meaning as a conventional result of categorization and conceptualization of the world by representatives of a certain ethnic group and culture, which reflects the experience, knowledge, and feelings of a person, which may not correspond to the actual state of affairs. The model of the mental-psychonetic complex, which we use in our study of the phraseological segment, takes into account the position on the integration of conscious and unconscious archetypes in cognitive activity. Unlike the propositional-dictum, the associative-terminal motivation is aimed at using in the process of naming a fragment of untrue (non-objective, non-trivial) knowledge about the signified, which correlates accordingly with certain dictum positions, which in this case are signally zero. This false knowledge in the structure of the concept (mental-psychonetic complex) is represented in the associative-terminal part, which is also associated with certain mental functions, in particular sensations, mainly visual, and images (gestalts) that arise in the consciousness of the nominators and contribute to synesthesia or simulation (analogization) with other images and mental structures. Scientists characterize the associative-terminal type of motivation as the selection of the motivator of the derived name on the basis of association with the dictum part of the cognitive model of other concepts, which forms the terminal components in such a model [Кочерга 2003].

Terminals in modern cognitive linguistics are components of frames, the core of which is a sentence, and reproduce the lower levels of the frame, which can be filled by deepening information about the situation. Terminals are the result of association with other concepts or conceptual spheres by similarity, similarity, analogy. The cognitive basis of such an association is the cognitive ability of a person to perceive and understand one conceptual sphere in terms of another [Lakoff at al 1980, p. 5], which is the basis of any metaphor. It is believed that any metaphor in language has a cognitive basis and uses this specific cognitive ability of speakers. Metaphorical analogization is considered as an anthropometric activity mechanism in modern semantic and cognitive research. Metaphor, immersed in discourse, which is a certain filter of metaphorical meanings, implements various cultural codes, creating a new "gestalt" from reduced prototypes, forming on its basis a new epistemological image and synthesizing in it the features of heterogeneous entities - this is an explanation of the metaphorical mechanism.

The activity of a metaphorical operation based on the cognitive-epistemological connection of concepts and conceptual spheres is the main principle of the widely known concept of metaphor by J. Lakoff and M. Johnson. Metaphor, according to these researchers, is an everyday operation of human thinking and is used to structure the surrounding world, governs human intellectual activity and behavior [Lakoff at al 1980, pp. 5–14].

Cognitively, metaphorization is the operation of acquiring a new terminal in a non-propositional domain by a frame through the creation of an interframe con-

nection (attraction) of slots or concepts themselves, depending on which contextual space the original concept receives, thanks to a set of ontological correspondences [Кочерга 2003]. Metaphor is a connection of two conceptual domains: donor and recipient, source and target domains [Lipka 1990]. Only some metaphors, which are called structural, form certain related concepts based on the connection of the donor and recipient spheres. The presence of such related concepts was noted in the three-term mechanistic theory of metaphor. In cognitive linguistics, the related concept has acquired the status of a certain zone of combination of the target and source spheres, which is terminologically designated as a conceptual correlate, or the basis of the metaphor (cross-mapping) [Lipka 1990, p. 96]. Such a zone can contain only one concept, which is characteristic of structural metaphors, a certain complex of associations or a scenario according to which the combination of concepts occurs, which characterizes ontological metaphors [Lakoff at al, p. 13]. At the semantic level itself, the mechanism of metaphor is based on seme dynamics: the elimination of the integral seme (archiseme) and the actualization in the derivative of the peripheral (potential) seme, its transition to the nuclear one.

Unlike existing classifications of transferable motivation, cognitive-onomasiological is aimed at the main criterion – the place of the motivator in the structure of the concept of the denoted phenomenon. The choice of a fragment of the associative-terminal component, its relations with other components of the mental-psychonetic complex as a whole determines the associative-terminal type of motivation, which in turn can have a different nature of the analogization of the donor and recipient zones.

Нести свій хрест – нести (носити) / донести [свій (важкий, тяжкий)] хрест. – 'to patiently overcome difficulties, disagreements, all that has become inevitable in one's life'. Йому навіть приемно було уявити себе убогим, забутим, стертим великим процесом. Він мученик і добровільно несе свій хрест (М. Коцюбинський) [PhDUL, B.2, p. 548]. «...і не пимаю, чи тяжкий мій хрест» (V. Stus). The poet directly speaks of the «cross» as a symbol of personal suffering, the burden of fate, but at the same time he does not ask whether this cross is heavy - that is, he accepts it. This is a classic artistic use of phraseology «нести свій хрест». «— Я гаряче вірю ѹ хрест терпляче Вік нести аж до гробу свій буду.» (I. Manzhura). «— Я відчуваю: сповні твої мук, але знай, не лише ти одна носиш хрест, його носить кожний у житті.» (O. Kobylanska). Phraseologisms are used in an artistic context with a very strong emotional and symbolic load. Phraseologism «Нести свій хрест» ... means submission to fate; the torment that a person endures in the name of an idea. This is not just a physical burden, but fate, suffering, self-sacrifice, responsibility. *Нести свій хрест* – this phraseologism originates from the Holy Scriptures, it is said that the cross on which Christ was to be crucified was prepared in advance, and to the place of crucifixion – Mount Golgotha – it was first carried by a peasant, and then by Jesus Christ, because the Jews decided that everyone should carry their own cross. For Jesus, this was truly a redemptive feat for the salvation of all man-

kind. His cross of suffering became the cross of victory over sin and death. With his cross, Christ taught us: everyone, without anger and complaints, must carry his cross to the place where it should be installed: to his own Golgotha [Венжинович 2017, p. 356].

Все на світі, intensifier – ‘absolutely everything’. *Про все на світі забув Федір* (Panas Myrnyi). – *Тепер, хто жонатий, забудь про жінку і дітей, хто не жонатий, залиши батьків і матір, забудь все на світі...* *Треба Переходити, товариші, треба перемогти!* (Dovzhenko). *О, якби вона [Земля] відповіла! Якби ожлив його пошматованій кабель, його рідний, живий нерв! Все на світі повернулося до Маковея...* (Oles Honchar) [PhDUL, B.1., p. 152]. *«І все на світі треба пережити, бо кожен фініш – це, по суті, старт»* (L. Kostenko). Phraseologism «*все на світі треба пережити*» – used in the sense of «to withstand all the trials of life.»

«*Вона горіла, як свіча, віддаючи все тепло своїм дітям*» (D. Bezverkhny). «*Дідусь догорів, як свіча, – тихо, спокійно, без нарікань*» (M. Kotsiubynskyi). «*Він горів двома свічками – і як поет, і як борець*» (D. Pavlychko). «*Та справа не варта свічок – ‘марна тратма сил’*» Comes from the phrase *гра не варта свічок* (from a French proverb about playing by candle-light). «*Леся Українка світила, як свічка в темряві, своєю мужністю й словом*» (From newspaper)

«*І свічки мирної не варта та країна, що в боротьбі її не засвітила!*» (I. Kocherha), the candle is used metaphorically – as a symbol of peace and spiritual light. «*Палахкомить ясніше... / ...До свічки наше серце є подібне*» (I. Kocherha). «*Свічка пам'яті темряву крає... / ...Лишє в полутиї свічка жевріє Час який у минуле пішов*» (I. Kocherha). «*...Самітня свічка блимає зо скучи... / I тухне, ѹ знов палахкомить ясніше... / До свічки наше серце є подібне*» (Bogdan-Ihor Antonych). «*Запали, мамо, свічку, постав на столі, Нехай я подивлюся, чи пара мени. Запалила мати свічку, неясно горить, Не з тим сіла, що хоміла, серденько болить*».

«*стояти, як свіча*» – ‘means quiet, dignified stability’. «*І стоїть Україна, як свіча у руці Бога...*» – symbol of the invincibility of the nation. Image «*свічечка букві ‘ї’*» (I. Malkovych) as a symbol of language, nation, educational mission. “A phrase, in essence, is a means of transmitting information, as well as an instrument of thought and an accumulator of culture. From this point of view, a phraseological combination turns into a reliable repository of the history, thought and culture of the people. And although the idea of the accumulative property of a phrase has arisen a long time ago, the question of what is included in the concept of “cultural memory” of a word, which is the mechanism of ethnocultural accumulation, has not yet been resolved. The very existence of phraseology is informative, since they are the result of the comprehension of the world by the mind through the naming of phenomena of material, spiritual and artistic culture” [Венжинович 2018, p. 302–303].

The phraseological variety uses a symbolic representation of the associative-terminal part, since by their cognitive nature, phraseological units, which are the forming bases of derivatives or composites, represent

false non-objective knowledge with one or two components. For the first time, I.I. Sreznevsky expressed his own observations about the regularities of word formation from stable expressions in an article in 1873. Traditionally, it is believed that the semantics of phraseological derivatives is a consequence of the interaction of the meanings of the forming base and the corresponding derivational affix. But the forming basis of phraseological units usually does not lie in the content of one component, but in the semantics and meaning of the entire phrase and the associations associated with it. «*Stable expressions, due to their meaning and expressive and emotional properties, provide not only an aesthetic assessment of reality, but also perform the function of creating humor and satire, conveying the internal qualities of a person, portrait characteristics, and depicting appearance. Their multifunctionality, originality, and expressiveness cause increased interest in the study of these unique linguistic pearls in language*» [Венжинович 2016, p. 61].

For a small number of noun derivatives in the Ukrainian language, motivators are components of phraseological turns that create a certain phraseological semantics of derived words. Phraseological semantics of words is considered as the ability of a word to express something more than what is contained in the set of meanings of its components. Such phraseologicality follows from the distributional features of the word that is a motivator in phraseology. For the most part, a motivator is a grammatically dependent component of the verb of the phrase structure, which transfers the semantics of the turn as a whole to the motivated one, since it has greater recognition capabilities [Кочерга 2003]: *байдикувати* – “to do nothing” [DUL, 1, 89] from *бити байдики* – “1) to be idle, to have fun; 2) to do nothing, to waste time; to be lazy” [PhDUL, 1, 24]: “...*Анатолій наскільки був заклопотаний допомогою матері в наведенні порядку в хаті і на подвір’ї, що йому просто ніколи було байдикувати на вулиці*” (B. Pedchenko, Zagrava, 21);

тавити – “to miss an opportunity, to overlook” [DUL, 1, 691] від *ловити тави, тав* – “1) to waste time, to do nothing; to idle away; 2) to look around with excessive curiosity; 3) to be inattentive; 4) not to use an opportunity, to miss a good opportunity” [PhDUL, 1, 444–445];

зляцити – “to slap someone in the face” [DPD, 39] from *дати/давати ляця* – “1) to slap someone in the face” [PhDUL, 1, 221] (It is interesting that in the “Dictionary of Poltava Dialects” *зляцити* has another meaning – “2) to knock out a pillow”, which is metaphorically motivated by the first). Such phraseologically motivated verbs mostly choose one of the meanings of creative phraseologisms. Nominative phraseologically motivated can also be considered nominatives, the motivators of which are substantive components of phrases that are not used separately and do not have free distribution: *спантеличити* from *збити з пантелику* – “1) To get confused, to make a mistake; 2) To lose one’s mind, to behave foolishly, recklessly” [PhDUL, 1, 324]; *теревенити* from *городити (правити) теревені* – “1) To talk stupid things, nonsense; 2) To talk about something secondary, insignificant, trivial, wasting time” [PhDUL, 2, 687]; *баляндрястити* from

правити баландряси – “To talk stupid things, nonsense” [PhDUL, 2, 687].

Sometimes the semantics of the nominative is adjusted by the phraseological polyvalence of the motivator. Thus, the verb *костити* – “to scold a lot” [DUL, 4, 307], in our opinion, formed by a certain contamination of the valences of the motivator in phraseological units: *перемивати кістки* – “to gossip, to slander someone” [PhDUL, 2, 619] and *ногамати кістки* – “to beat someone badly” [PhDUL, 2, 668], which generates intensity, negative connotation of the meaning of the verbal derivative and the general semantics of speech activity. In addition, the phrase *перемивати кістки* comes from the Slavic rite of the second burial, which was performed several years later, after the first burial, to cleanse the body of sins and remove the curse from the deceased.

A small number of phraseologically motivated noun verbs are grammatically motivated by the stem component of the entire phrase: *замілювати* – “to deliberately hide shortcomings, to create the impression that the situation is much better than it actually is; to fool, to deceive, to deceive, to deceive, to deceive, to obscure” [DUL, 2, 78] from *замілювати очі* – “to deceive someone, to trick; to hide faults, shortcomings” [PhDUL, 1, 312]; similar – *заморочити (голову)*; *затуманити, замакітрити (голову)* etc. The meaning of the motivator of such nominal terms is already metaphorically motivated, but in the minds of speakers these words are fixed in the composition of phraseological turns, which makes possible the compression, univerbation of the latter, that is, their reduction to one word. “Linguocultural nominal terms, which explicitly and implicitly carry the corresponding interpretation of the world, give the ethnophore, even at the early stage of enculturation, an orientation in the meaningful

world, intentionally directing his very thought and cognitive orientation” [Кісів 2002]. O. Potebnya explained the motivational connection of univerb words and stable expressions by imagery, as the folding of the descriptive syntagma that precedes the creation of a word, by reducing the plan of expression of the original value and involving the semantics of the reduced members in the derived word. It is the process of compression in the Ukrainian language that provides the phraseological variety of associative-terminal motivation.

Conclusions. Thus, the generation of the model of nominative phraseological units has a deep explanatory capacity, since on its basis the processes of motivation are investigated, the structure of knowledge about the signified is reconstructed, «the logical-informative content of phraseological units, embodied in the denotative-significative components of semantics, is in close connection with emotional-evaluative, figurative-expressive stylistic and cultural-national factors» [Венжинович 2018], the interaction of various cognitive mechanisms of ethnic consciousness and the collective unconscious becomes evident. Nominative units are metaphorical by mechanism, since experiential knowledge, verbalized in stable phraseological combinations, which have the ability to express something more than a simple sum of the meanings of their components, is used to denote processes. For the most part, the motivator of the phraseological segment is a grammatically dependent component of the phraseological structure - verbosity, which transfers the semantics of the phrase as a whole to the motivated one, taking into account the phraseological valence, which determines greater recognition properties. We see the prospect of further research in the description of the paremiological component of Ukrainian culture in the projection onto syncretic cognitive-semiotic models.

Література

1. Білоноженко В.М., Винник В.О., Гнатюк І.С. Фразеологічний словник української мови. Київ: Нauкова думка, 1999.
2. Ващенко В. Словник полтавських говірок: Харків: Держуніверситет. Вип. I., 1960. 107 с.
3. Венжинович Н.Ф. Фразеологія української літературної мови: когнітивний та лінгвокультурологічний аспекти : дис. ... докт. філол. наук: 10.02.01 – українська мова. Інститут української мови НАН України, Київ, 2018. 503 с.
4. Венжинович Н.Ф. Фразеологізми у Святому Письмі: етнолінгвістичний аспект. Українська мова на осі часу. В.В. Німчукові. Ін-т укр. мови НАН України: упоряд.: Г.В. Воронич, Н.В. Пуряєва. Київ: КММ, 2017. 520 с.
5. Венжинович Н.Ф. Фраземіка у повісті І. Нечуй-Левицького «Кайдашева сім'я» як джерело відтворення ментальних рис українців / О. І. Нечуй-Левицький у повісті «Кайдашева сім'я». Мовознавчий вісник: зб. наук. праць. Черкаси: Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, 2016. С. 61–66.
6. Кісів Р. Мова, думка і культурна реальність (від О. Потебні до гіпотези мовного релятивізму). Львів: Літопис, 2002. 304 с.
7. Кочерга Г.В. Мотивація відіменникових дієслів у сучасній українській мові (конітивно-ономасіологічний аспект): дис. ... канд. філол. наук. 10.02.01, Одеса, 2003.
8. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: CUP, 1980. 242р.
9. Lipka L. An Outline of English Lexicology. Tübingen: Univ. Press., 1990. 122 р.
10. Словник української мови (1970–1980) : В 11 т. Київ: Наукова думка, Т. 1–11.
11. Яременко В., Сліпушко О. Новий тлумачний словник української мови: У 4-х т. Київ: Вид-во “АкоНіт”, Т. 1–4, 1999.

References

1. Bilonozhenko V.M., Vynnyk V.O., Hnatiuk I.S. (1999) Frazeolohichnyi slovnyk ukrainskoj movy [Phraseological dictionary of the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
2. Vashchenko V. (1960) Slovnyk poltavskykh hovirok [Dictionary of Poltava dialects] Kharkiv: Derzhuniversitet, Vyp. I. 107 c. [in Ukrainian].

3. Venzhynovych N.F. (2018) *Frazemika ukrainskoj literaturnoj movy: kohnityvnyi ta linhvokulturolozhchini aspekty* [Phraseology of the Ukrainian literary language: cognitive and linguocultural aspects]: dys. ... dokt. filol. nauk: 10.02.01 – ukrainska mova. Instytut ukrainskoj movy NAN Ukrayny, Kyiv, 503 s. [in Ukrainian].

4. Venzhynovych N.F. (2017) *Frazeolohizmy u Sviatomu Pysmi: etnolinhvistichnyi aspekt* [Phraseologisms in the Holy Scriptures: an ethnolinguistic aspect]. Ukrainska mova na osi chasu. V.V. Nimchukovi / In-t ukr. movy NAN Ukrayny: uporiad.: H. V. Voronych, N.V. Puriaieva. Kyiv: KMM, 520 s. [in Ukrainian].

5. Venzhynovych N.F. (2016) *Frazemika u povisti I. Nechuya-Levytskoho «Kaidasheva simya» yak dzhereo vidtvorennia mentalnykh rys ukrainitsiv* [Phraseology in I. Nechuy-Levytsky's story «Kaydash's Family» as a source of reproducing the mental traits of Ukrainians]. Movochnavchyi visnyk: zb. nauk. prats. Cherkasy: Cherkaskyi natsionalnyi universytet imeni Bohdana Khmelnytskoho. C. 61–66 [in Ukrainian].

6. Kis R. (2002) *Mova, dumka i kulturna realnist* (vid O. Potebni do hipotezy movnoho reliatyvizmu) [Language, thought and cultural reality (from O. Potebnia to the hypothesis of linguistic relativism)]. Lviv: Litopys/ 304 s. [in Ukrainian].

7. Kocherha H.V. (2003) *Motyvatsiia vidimennykovykh diiesliv u suchasni ukrainskii movi* (kohnityvno-onomasiolohichnyi aspekt). [Motivation of the denominative verbs in the modern Ukrainian language (cognitive-onomasiological aspect)]. Dys. na zdob. nauk. stup. kand-ta filol. nauk. 10.02.01, Odesa [in Ukrainian].

8. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: CUP, 1980. 242p. [in English].

9. Lipka L. *An Outline of English Lexicology*. Tübingen: Univ. Press., 1990. 122 p. [in English].

10. Slovnyk ukrainskoj movy (1970–1980) [Ukrainian language dictionary]: V 11 t. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. T. 1–11 [in Ukrainian].

11. Yaremenko V., Slipushko O. (1999) *Novyi tlumachnyi slovnyk ukrainskoj movy* [New Explanatory Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]: V 4-kh t. Kyiv.: Vyd-vo “Akzonit”, T. 1–4 [in Ukrainian].

ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНІ СПОЛУКИ В УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ ЕТНОКУЛЬТУРІ: ФРЕЙМОВА МОДЕЛЬ

Анотація. У статті схарактеризовано мотиваційні процеси фразеологічних одиниць української мови, в основі яких закладена стереотипізація уявлень українського етносу про світ і їхня детермінація культурними та психоментальними чинниками. Оприявлено закономірності знакової переінтерпретації фразеологічних сполук української мови у мережі культурних смислів етносвідомості, що відображають особливості національної концептуальної системи, етнічної інтеріоризації дійсності у зв'язку з культурою, традиціями, звичаями, міфами народу. Мета дослідження – з'ясувати мотиваційний механізм фразеологічних одиниць, що формує модель номінації, оперту на концептуальні реляції синергетичної системи етносвідомості мовця. Мета дослідження імплементується у завдання – описати номінаційні механізми фразеологічних сполук із структурою етносвідомості, смислопороджувальними процесами в проекції на культурні куди етнічної спільноти, її внутрішній рефлексивний досвід, позначеній фразеологічним сегментом. Визначено, що значення мотиватора таких номінативів уже є метафорично мотивованим, але в свідомості мовців ці слова зафіксовані в складі фразеологічних зворотів, що уможливлює компресію, універбацию останніх, тобто їхнє стягнення, які експліцитно й імпліцитно несуть у собі відповідну інтерпретацію світу, інтенціонально спрямовуючи саму його думку та пізнавальну спрямованість. Мотиваційний зв'язок слів-універбів та стійких висловлювань пояснюється образністю, як згортання описової синтагми, що передує створенню слова, шляхом редукції плану вираження вихідної величини та залучення до похідного слова семантики редукованих членів. Саме процес компресії в українській мові забезпечує фразеологічний різновид асоціативно-термінальної мотивації

Схарактеризовано породження моделі номінативних фразеологічних одиниць, що мають глибоку пояснювальну спроможність, оскільки на її підставі досліджуються процеси мотивації, здійснюється реконструкція структури знань про позначуване, логіко-інформативний зміст фразеологічних одиниць, утілений у денотативно-сигніфікативних компонентах семантики, знаходиться в тісному зв'язку з емотивно-оцінними, образно-експресивними стилістичними й культурно-національними чинниками, вочевидно взаємодію різних пізнавальних механізмів етносвідомості та колективного позасвідомого. Установлено, що номінативні одиниці за механізмом є метафоричними, оскільки на позначення процесів використовуються досвідні знання, вербалізовані у стійких фразеологічних сполученнях, що мають здатність виражати дещо більше, ніж проста сума значень їхніх складників. Здебільшого мотиватором фразеологічного сегменту є граматично залежний компонент фразеоструктури – дієслівність, що переносить на мотивоване семантику звороту в цілому з огляду на фразеологічну валентність, яка зумовлює більші розпізнавальні властивості. Перспективу подальших досліджень убачаємо в описі пареміологічної складової української культури у проекції на певні когнітивно-семіотичні моделі.

Ключові слова: фразеологічна сполука, концептуалізація, культурний код, асоціативно-термінальна мотивація, ментально-психонетичний комплекс.

© Кочерга Г., 2025 р.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 28.09.2025
Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 24.10.2025
Дата публікації: 30.12.2025

Галина Кочерга – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри українського мовознавства і прикладної лінгвістики Черкаського національного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького (Черкаси, Україна); e-mail: kocherga_galina@ukr.net; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1000-3427>

Halyna Kocherha – Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi Cherkasy National University (Cherkasy, Ukraine); e-mail: kocherga_galina@ukr.net; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1000-3427>