

Ivan POLUZHYN
Natalia VENZHYNOVYCH

THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF THE STUDY OF ZOOPHRASES IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Філологія

Випуск 1 (47)

УДК 811.111'373.7+811.161.2'373.7

DOI: 10.24144/2663-6840/2022.1(47).216–224.

Poluzhyn I., Venzhynovych N. Theoretical Principles of the Study of Zoophrases in English and Ukrainian; кількість бібліографічних джерел – 28; мова англійська.

Abstract. The article deals with the description and analysis of the theoretical principles of the study of zoophrases in English and Ukrainian language. This research is supra-relevant, it have not yet been the subject of a special wreath from the equal aspect. The authors report on the classic practices of scientists, which laid the foundation for the latest achievements. The authors pay special attention to the description of the scientific achievements of V. Vinogradov, Sh. Balli, O. Koonin, M. Alefirenko, V. Mokienko and other famous linguists. Scientists considered their main task to identify and describe the lexical-semantic and syntactic features of phrases as nominative units of language, which were radically different from individual words and free phrases. On this structural-semantic basis, the selection and classification of phraseological units were carried out. The focus of this “classical” period in the development of phraseology was the delineation of its object as an independent linguistic discipline and finding criteria for distinguishing it from both words and free phrases.

The aim of the article – to describe most of the theoretical principles of the study of zoophrases in English and Ukrainian language. The main tasks of the article are: to describe the classic and new scientific achievements about the main principles of the study of zoophrases in English and Ukrainian languages; to analyze the most important classification of phrases; to describe and analyze the periods of follow-up phraseology; to analyze the basic criteria and understanding of phrasemic affiliation. As a result of the study, the authors conclude that zoophrases are a significant component of the phraseological world model. At the present stage, scientists use the classical achievements of phraseological science, as well as apply the latest research methods. The study of zoophrases of English and Ukrainian languages allowed us to conclude that in both languages the keywords-names of animals occupy an important place. We will deepen our research in the following articles, in which we will analyze in detail the mental characteristics of keywords-symbols in both languages.

Keywords: theoretical principles, zoophrases, English and Ukrainian Languages, phraseological world model, keywords-symbols.

Problem statement. The first mention of the need to include in dictionaries “phrasemes and idioms” was found in the works of M. Lomonosov [Lomonosov 1952]. However, as a separate branch of the science of language, phraseology has a short history compared to other sections of linguistics. The very term “phraseology” from the moment of its entry into scientific use served to denote a relatively new direction at that time in the development of linguistics, which later took shape into an independent linguistic discipline only in the middle of the twentieth century. One of the first attempts at in-depth study and systematization of phraseological units was the classification of Sh. Balli, whose theoretical views were based on the gradation of combining components of phrases into one inseparable whole. According to him, “phrases can represent different degrees of connection between the two extreme cases”, which gives good reason to distinguish between two main types of established phrases. The first of them includes a phraseological series or a habitual new combination, in which the connection between words is relatively free, and the second – phraseological unity with completely lost individual meaning of the component words [Balli 1961, p. 89–90]. Unlike phonology, morphology, lexicology and syntax, phraseology belongs to the branch of linguistics, the object of study of which is the phrasema (phraseology, phraseological unit) – the concept of “semantically related phrases and sentences” [Telia 1990, p. 559]. The subject of scientific re-

search in phraseology is the focus of the researcher on obtaining a set of knowledge about the nature, content and function of motivated behavior of each communicant who uses its units in the process of speech communication.

Research aim and objectives. The aim of the article – to describe most of the theoretical principles of the study of zoophrases in English and Ukrainian languages. The main tasks of the article are:

- to describe the classic and new scientific achievements about the main principles of study of zoophrases in English and Ukrainian languages;
- to analyze the most important classification of phrases;
- describe and analyze the periods of follow-up phraseology;
- to analyze the basic criteria and understanding of phrasemic affiliation.

Analysis of the previous research. The distinctive features of the phrases that their first researchers drew attention to were inhomogeneity (idiosyncrasy of two or more components), idiomaticity (expression of one concept in stable inversion) and stability (immutability, stability, constancy), enshrined in the standard expression. Scientists-phraseologists who belonged to the scientific school of V. Vinogradov: V. Arkhangel'sky, V. Zhukov, O. Koonin, O. Smirnytsky, V. Telia, N. Shansky and others considered their main task to identify and describe the lexical-semantic and syntac-

tic features of phrases as nominative units of language, which were radically different from individual words and free phrases. On this structural-semantic basis, the selection and classification of phraseological units were carried out. The focus of this “classical” period in the development of phraseology was the delineation of its object as an independent linguistic discipline and finding criteria for distinguishing it from both words and free phrases.

Therefore, the first “classical” period in the study of phraseology, covering the 40’s – mid 70’s of the last century was characterized by researchers’ attempts to justify the “place” of phraseology based on level stratification of its units, to describe their whole body as a series of phraseological subsystems, which was most pronounced nucleus idioms.

As for the development of theoretical foundations of phraseology, they largely reproduced the fundamental provisions of the concept of V. Vinogradov, taking into account its level interpretation and clarification of the classification base, in a broad or narrow volume, which included only idioms.

A characteristic feature of the postclassical period is a more detailed study of all types of phrases, including proverbs, sayings, catchphrases, aphorisms, etc., emphasizing their grammatical features. There are also attempts to attract new methods for describing the phraseological structure of language, although they remain within the lexicological level of description. The end of the postclassical period is marked by the realization of the insufficient capacity of the classification-system approach to the thorough study of phraseology. Ukrainian and foreign scientists draw attention to the peculiarities of learning and teaching English and other languages at our time [see, for example, Alefirenko 2000, Mokienko 1989, Venzhynovych 2012, Venzhynovych 2018a, 2018b, 2019a, 2019b, Venzhynovych, Poluzhyn, Banyoi, Kharkivska 2021, Poluzhyn 2019a, 2019b, 2020, etc.]. According to N. Venzhynovych, “The relevance of such issues is determined by the need, from the point of view of modern achievements, to study the patterns of figurative rethinking of reality along with establishing the reasons for the similarity and difference of figurative associations associated with analogous words in different languages” [Venzhynovych 2012, p. 596]. I. Poluzhyn writes that “animalistic idioms have not yet been the subject of research, it is important to report on the theoretical principles of their analysis and further develop such an analysis” [Poluzhyn 2020, p. 245].

Methods and methodology. Specific research objectives of the scientific article led to the choice of methods and techniques of analysis. The teachers use a set of generally philosophical and generally scientific methods. In particular, the researchers used empirical and analytical methods: the observation process allowed to summarize information about the features of distant learning at Uzhhorod National University. At the practical level, they used general procedures such as analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, abstraction, and generalization. The scholars also applied descriptive method to analyze and systematize the achievements of Ukrainian and foreign researchers

in the field of methods of teaching and learning foreign languages, including English in process of studying phrasemes, including zoophrases.

The statement of basic material. As a result of a critical review of different approaches to the composition and scope of phraseology, it was proposed to identify six basic classes of phrases, including all phrases, which are characterized by the following three main parameters: 1) belonging to the nominative inventory of language; 2) a sign of complete or partial idiomaticity; 3) the property of stability, which is manifested in the absolute or relative reproducibility of phrases in the finished form: 1) idioms representing the «core» of phraseological composition; 2) phraseological phrase with an analytical type of meaning, which due to the peculiarities of its structure directly interact with the units of the lexical-semantic system of language; 3) paremias (proverbs and sayings), endowed with both direct and allegorical (figuratively expressed) meaning; 4) speech stamps; 5) clichés; 6) winged expressions. Therefore, in a broad sense, phraseology in modern linguistics is considered to be everything that is reproduced in the finished form, not being one word.

From the mid – 1970s to the early 1980s, the main focus of phraseological research shifted to the identification and description of semantic and functional aspects inherent in each of the studied. This period is also connected with the obvious tendency of linguists to study phraseology not only as a set of individual formations, but also as adequate methods of their contextual description both in the text and in live oral communication.

Trying to distinguish completely reinterpreted established phrases, which Sh. Balli called idioms, from free, formed at the time of speech on the basis of semantic factor, V. Vinogradov proposed the criterion of «indistinguishability» of the meaning of the whole phrase from the meanings of its components, which can be traced in the distinction between phraseological «mergers» and «unity». In this period of studying phraseology, the method of comparing established and idiomatic formations with their analogues in the form of free phrases prevailed. An example of such a «comparative» approach to the analysis of the semantics of phrases is the method of identification proposed by Sh. Balli and further developed by O. Koonin (1972), as well as the method of application, ie superimposing the meaning of a free phrase on one endowed with idiomaticity and stability (Zhukov 1978). Here we must mention the concept of N. Amosova, the key point of which was the definition of idioms as units of a special type in a constant context, characterized by «traditional selectivity» of one word, which as the only possible «indicative minimum» for another related meaning [Amosova 1963, p. 58–59]. Phrases from this point of view began to be considered as «ready to use in speech» units.

A characteristic feature of this period was also the tendency to distinguish between research on idiomatics and the study of phraseologically related meanings of words. The direct expression of this tendency was the fact that the term «phraseology» began to be used without reservations to denote a set of phrases. Important

for phraseology then was the attempt of researchers to answer the question of what is the difference between the semantics of idioms from the meanings of words, and synonyms, antonyms, homonyms, along with the variability of lexical and grammatical composition. It was during this period that the classification paradigm of phraseology was reoriented to functional-semantic.

A significant amount of phrases was also found, their objective meaning was established along with a number of evaluative and expressive nuances in the stylistically colored meaning. It was then that the idea emerged that phrases are formed not to name any new objects or phenomena, actions or qualities, but to concretize and figuratively and emotionally evaluate what has already been called with the help of individual tokens of direct nomination. It is these frequently used phrases that have now acquired a phraseological character and perform an expressive function within monolingual associations of people, usually on the basis of a common attitude to lifestyle, goal achievement and socially important communicative functions.

The study of the method of organization of the internal form is one of the characteristic features of the postclassical period in the development of phraseology. This is evidenced by the works of the synchronously compared plan [see, eg, Reichstein 1980; Solodub 1985], which aims to study the phrases of different structural languages at the level of their identity or similarity, which underlie both their modern images and diachronic plan, mainly on the material of Slavic languages (Mokienko, 1989). In addition to the development of methods of structural and typological analysis of phrases, the study of their national identity, associated primarily with the characteristics of the images themselves in the «literal sense». However, although phraseology in the postclassical period accumulated new information about its object of study, it still remained outside the anthropological paradigm, which at the same time began to take shape in linguistics based on the identification and analysis of semantic structures in ethnogenic and interpersonal relations.

Scientific achievements of the last years of the twentieth century, launched a new perspective on the consideration of phraseological meaning – cognitive. The basic category of this perspective in cognitive semantics is a concept that can take the form of mental entities of different volume and functional purpose. Concepts, as we know, form the information basis of the picture of the world, playing a primary role in shaping the body of knowledge of the individual and the transfer of information. It is through concepts as stereotypes of consciousness that a person's mental activity is carried out, aimed not only at bringing its cognitive analogue, the conceptual structure of thought into conformity to each language form or knowledge, but also to explain the reason for choosing or creating a certain «packaging» for a particular content.

Based on the above, it should be noted that since the middle of the last century a new branch of linguistics has been in use and actively developing – phraseology, which has become the subject of numerous and diverse studies. This gave good reason to distinguish

three periods in the history of phraseological science: classical, postclassical and modern.

The classical period is characterized by an attempt to preserve the basic principles of the theoretical views of Sh. Balli and V. Vinogradov, whose priority areas were the problems associated with finding criteria for distinguishing phrases from words, phrases and sentences. In the postclassical period, the criteria of motivation and idiomaticity of established phrases are also determined, the information about which we find in scientific works on topical issues of phraseology. At this time, the compilation of parallel phraseological dictionaries involving different languages became widespread.

Questions that often arise within the theory of modern phraseology, to this day do not receive unambiguous answers due to the large amount of linguistic material, which researchers differently relate to the phraseological corpora of a language. This has led to a variety of judgments about the scope and limits of phraseology. In generalized form, they can be represented in the following seven different classes:

1) idioms – the «core» of phraseological composition, because only they, according to V. Telia, are equivalent to words in view of their performance of a holistic nominative function [Telia 1996, p. 60];

2) phraseological phrases – phrases with a similar type of meaning, which directly interact in their structure with the units of the lexical-semantic system of language;

3) paremias (proverbs and sayings) – end owed with both direct and figurative (allegorical) meaning;

4) speech stamps (accepted common patterns that inherit it without thinking, stencil, template);

5) various clichés (stated statements);

6) aphorisms (generalized thoughts, expressed concisely in a very expressive form);

7) winged expression (phrase) – an apt commonly used phrase or expression of literary origin, which concisely and figuratively conveys human thought.

The possibility of combining these types of language units is based on «multi-word» (various) reproducibility (ibid., p. 58). However, most researchers include in the scope of phraseology only the first three classes: idiom phrases, phraseological combinations of paremia on the basis of their inherent common differential and categorical features.

Narrow and broad approaches to the definition of phraseology are implemented depending on the structure of the features of disjoint formations. Thus, some scholars consider the object of phraseology only phrases, others – a wide range of phrases, including paremias (folk sayings – proverbs, sayings, which convey an elementary scene or the simplest dialogue), aphorisms, generalized thoughts, summarized in a very expressive form), winged expressions (apt phrases, expressions of literary origin, which concisely and figuratively convey the idea and have become commonplace). Depending on the scientific concept of researchers and the purpose of analysis of language material, the «narrowness» or «breadth» of the approach, phraseology can be considered as a branch of linguistics that studies fully or

partially rethought or reproduced (established) phrases and sentences. Although the separation of phraseology into a special section of linguistics has been relatively recent, there have long been various established and unstable expressions, various stereotypes, clichés, and reinterpreted formations, which have certainly been studied in other linguistic disciplines.

Linguists have repeatedly pointed this out, emphasizing, first of all, the close connection between phraseology and stylistics and lexicology, which is by no means accidental. It was within these sections of the science of language that the study of «phraseological material» began before the separation of phraseology into an independent linguistic discipline. Phraseology, even in its current state, has not lost its connection with stylistics and lexicology, which determine the importance of certain features of this section of linguistics. At the same time, different directions in phraseological research (lexicographic or stylistic) still give rise to differences in the views of phraseologists on the object and scope of phraseology as a linguistic discipline.

For a lexicographer or phraseographer, the universality of a phraseographic unit, its entry into the language system, is now of decisive importance, and for the researcher of expressive means of a work of art, the stylistic coloring of a non-singular linguistic or speech unit comes to the fore. Its absence, while its usuality, consistency in use, entry or non-entry into the language recede into the background.

Lexicographic and stylistic trends in phraseology can be correlated with two aspects of this linguistic discipline – language and speech, respectively. Linguistic approach to phraseology involves the study of phraseological formations in statics as units of the language system while speech in dynamics, in the process of their functioning in speech in general and speech acts in particular. Most linguists now focus primarily on “linguistic phraseology”, which aims to solve practical problems of lexicography and phraseography. However, we note that to this day in the phraseological literature questions about the ambiguity of phraseology are very rarely considered, although V. Vinogradov emphasized the need to use different methods to study “phraseology of language in general” and phraseology of “speech activity in particular” [Vinogradov 1977, p. 119].

The classification of phrases has been clarified and supplemented, which is based not only on the degree of association of components, but also the level of motivation of their meanings, proposed by V. Vinogradov in the following three types:

1) phraseological conjunctions or idioms that are absolutely indivisible and indecomposable, the meanings of which are completely independent of their lexical composition and meanings of components;

2) phraseological units, which are a special type of established, cohesive and syntactically indivisible phraseological groups with a single integrally motivated meaning, formed as a result of semantic combination of lexical components;

3) phraseological combinations of words, defined as “phraseological groups formed by the implementa-

tion of related meanings of words” [Vinogradov 1977, pp. 121, 131, 136].

In German studies, other classifications of phrases were proposed, which were based on the identification of different structural and semantic types in the English language: single-top, double- and multi-top. One-verbs began to include verb-adverbial phrases such as *ring wo, start back, turn away*, prepositional-noun (eg, *by heart, for good, as well as phrases such as be tired, be surprised*, etc.) and four types two- and multi-vertex formations: attributive-noun (eg: *black art, first night*), verb-noun (eg: *to take the floor*), adverbial (eg: *every other, every now and then*), as well as various phraseological repetitions, eg: *now or never, up and down*, etc. [Smirnitsky 1956, p. 215–223].

A more detailed structural classification taking into account the specifics of the functioning of phrases and their partial linguistic meaning can be found in the works of O. Koonin, who among other phrases distinguishes:

1) nominative, covering nouns (*crocodile tears – crocodile tears*), adjectival (*as swift as thought – lightning*), adverbial (*out of clear sky – like snow on the head, suddenly*) and verbs (*play with loaded dice – to lead*) dishonest play, cheating);

2) exclamation points (*by the Lord Harry – damn it*);

3) phrases with modal meaning (*at any price – at any price*);

4) communicative, to which he refers proverbs and sayings (*that is of another color – it's a different matter; there is no smoke without fire – there is no smoke without fire*). [Koonin 1972].

Structural and semantic types of phrases are also distinguished during systematization. Thus, V.M. Mokienko proposes his classification based on the concept of “phraseological model”, which means the structural-semantic invariant of a number of phrases, namely – the structural-semantic invariant of fixed combinations, which schematically reflect the relative stability of their form and semantics [Mokienko 1989, p. 53]. Structural and semantic modeling of phrases allows not only to identify the nuances of the semantics of phrases, but also to carry out comparative and typological analysis of phraseology of two or more languages.

This view of the textual nature of phrases leads to the fact that they acquire the status of special linguistic signs and explains their adaptation to the intention of the speaker or listener, which, according to modern phraseologists, are key to establishing the meaning of phraseological units. It is this nature of phraseological units and necessitates their study within anthropological paradigm, which is becoming widespread in modern humanities studies. It is based on the understanding of the phrase as a sign “with the most complete semantic set, codified in the form of macro-components, covering grammar, denotation, evaluation, motivation, emotionality and stylistic labeling” [Telia 1990, p. 32]. In this case, the main objects of study are not only the lexical and grammatical composition of the phrase, but also the relationship between it and the system of mutual understanding, characteristic of a particular ethnic

group. Thus, the anthropocentric paradigm has now become key in conducting phraseological research. It is realized in the transfer of scientific interests of the researcher from the objects of knowledge to the subject. In this case, the person in the language and the language in the person are analyzed. This led to the emergence of two directions within the study of phraseology – ethnolinguistic and linguocultural. Both of these areas try to identify and describe the ways in which the “language” of culture penetrates into the phraseological signs of natural language and the forms of presentation of culturally significant information. However, in contrast to ethnolinguistic orientation in the study of empirical material, which is aimed primarily at historically reconstructive plan to identify cultural strata in the formation of phraseology, linguocultural analysis aims to study the ability of phraseological signs to reflect modern cultural identity [Telia 1999, p. 14–15].

The anthropological factor present in the human mind is an indicator of his intellect, spiritual essence, motives and actions and the hierarchy of values traced in speech in the form of the most commonly used phrases and expressions, which include phraseological units. One of the modern directions of their anthropologically oriented research is to turn to the diverse study of their cultural specificity as such a linguistic layer, which is closely connected with the people, is its creator, user and custodian and feels a pressing need for comparative research. so remotely related languages. In this regard, we must also pay attention to the important place in the phraseological system of each language, which is occupied by standard images and in which the subject of comparison in different languages is endowed with certain qualities and the degree of mastery. Linguistic expressions of this type have a dual function: on the one hand, they serve as a means of realizing empirically known reality, and on the other – evaluation in the images-standards are directly related to specific living conditions of native speakers, their material and spiritual culture, customs, traditions and beliefs.

Thus, modern phraseology, based on the scientific achievements of the past, successfully continues its further development. To fulfill the pressing tasks, researchers widely use the data of related sciences – linguoculturology and comparative linguistics. Now there is every reason to argue about the formation of certain areas in phraseology – paremiology and cryptology. New searches performed in a discursive stream demonstrate the potential for studying comparative zoophrases in different languages.

The main and indisputable criteria of phrasal affiliation, researchers today, usually include: the diversity of the phrasal sign, stability, idiomaticity and reproducibility.

Unlike simple and complex words, which are characterized by integrity, phrases are divided units (cf., for example, English: *I fall in love, he falls in love, I fell in love*, etc.), which can be considered as peculiar, they are part of the language, and are not formed freely in speech. Therefore, the components of phraseological units are considered to be specifically used words.

The diversity of the phrasal sign implies the presence of a statement that consists not of one but several words-components and expresses a complete thought. According to O. Smyrnytsky, the diversity of phrases is their essential difference from integral formations [Smyrnytsky 1956, p. 207]. Stability is a measure of the degree of semantic fusion and indestructibility of components that are inextricably linked to idiomaticity. The higher the degree of semantic discrepancy between words of free use and the corresponding components of the phrase, the higher the stability, the more idiomatic such an inversion [Zhukov, Zhukov 2006, p. 6]. Stability can be investigated in each case by the method of correlation of the integral meaning of the phrase with the meaning of the free phrase of the same name. Some scholars consider it as the stability of use in the form of prefabricated structures [Arkhangelsky 1964; Mokienko 1990; Molotkov 1977], and others – as predictability of components. Different interpretations of these properties create significant differences in the views of linguists on the subject and scope of phraseology as a branch of linguistics that studies the established invars. This feature is most fully described in the works of O. Koonin in the form of the following five types of stability of phrases:

1) stability of use: a phrase is a unit of language, not an extralingual individual formation;

2) structural-semantic stability is that the phraseme consists of at least two words, is a divided formation and is not endowed with a typical meaning, ie can not serve as a model for the formation of similar phrases on the structural-semantic model;

3) semantic stability; ions of language, and leads to the formation of a unanimous opinion about the nature of the phrase;

4) lexical stability, complete immutability of components or the possibility of normative replacement of components only within the limits of phraseological variance or structural synonymy with the obligatory preservation of semantic and lexical variants;

5) syntactic stability, complete invariance of the order of components in phrasemes or change the sequence of components within the variance [Koonin 1972, p. 6–8].

However, when stating the stability of phrases, many researchers prefer to use the term «relative stability», because most phrases are characterized by some variability [Arkhangelsky, 1964; Koonin 1972; Mokienko 1989; Telia 1996]. According to these scientists, it is the nature of the relationship between the meaning of a sentence and the meaning of its elements that determines the difference between habitual (typical) and special sentences or idioms. He calls a common sentence, the meaning of which is an inevitable result, based on the sum of the meanings of individual words of which it consists. In contrast, the meaning of a special sentence or idiom can not be derived from the meanings of its elements. Subsequently, the criterion of idiomaticity, ie invisibility of the meaning of the whole from the sum of the meanings of its elements or unmotivated phraseological meaning was adopted by many phraseologists as one of the defining categorical fea-

tures of phrases [cf.: Smyrnytsky 1956; Crystal 1995 and others]. An essential feature of idioms is that their integral meaning is derived from the set of semantic components of idioms. There is also no unanimity in the understanding of the property of «idiomaticity» among scholars-phraseologists. Some of them believe that the combination of tokens is idiomatic when «the denoted sum is not equal to the sum of the denoted». Such invisibility of the meaning of a whole phrase from the meaning of its components leads to varying degrees of semantic indivisibility, integrity of a phrase or sentence is generated by processes of rethinking the meanings of components, «semantic shift in one or more matching tokens» their deviation from the basic meaning, from the «semantic code». In other words, after the interpretation of the meanings of the word, integral expressions are given and explained, which contain a certain word with such a meaning that differs from all the above.

Idiomaticity can extend to phrases or whole sentences, which can also be completely reinterpreted. In this case, their idiomaticity will be complete, and if only one component or a certain part of the components present in a free phrase is reinterpreted, then such idiomaticity is considered partial. On the other hand, the degree of idiomaticity of a phraseological unit is inversely proportional to the number of expressions formed with its participation. This property was the basis for differences of opinion among phraseologists in determining which formations belong to the category of phrases. Some linguists [eg, V. Zhukov and A. Molotkov] refer to the phraseological units of «pure», «semantically integral» indecomposable units (narrow approach), others [N. Amosova, V. Vinogradov, M. Kopylenko, A. Koonin, Z. Popova, Yu. Rubinchyk, V. Telia] – a large layer of both fully and partially rethought units (broad approach). Here you also need to pay attention to the ability of phraseological units to get along in the conventional sense (usuality) or unusual, rare (occasional).

It is also appropriate to narrow F. de Saussure's attention to the presence in the language of «fully prepared expressions», «turns that do not require improvisation», «transmitted in a ready form, by tradition» and at the same time acknowledged that «there is no clear phrase the distinction between the fact of language, enshrined in the collective tradition, and the fact of speech, which depends on individual freedom. He also wrote that «in many cases it is difficult to attribute here or there a certain combination of units, because in their creation involved both factors and in such proportions can not be determined» [Saussure 1977].

It should be noted that reproducibility in the finished form is not recognized as a relevant feature of the phraseological unit by those researchers who rightly believe that phrases can belong not only to language but also to speech. Thus, Yu.A. Gvozdev calls «author's original phraseological phrases» speech phrases,

pointing to their identity with phraseological units of language at the first stage of their formation [Gvozdev 1977, p. 60]. Researchers of phraseology of individual works of art usually abstract from the properties of the universality of phraseological formations, arguing that «stability of composition, structure and reproducibility of integral units» are not «decisive features of the phrase», because in stylistic study of phrases they speech as an expressive means.

Reproducibility is the regular repetition in speech of different units of complexity as ready-made superscript formations, engraved in the memory of members of a particular language group and easily realized by them in communication through their common usage and fame. This is the only common [Vinogradov 1947, p. 364] of feature for all types of phrases, consisting of two or more stressed components of the verbal character, integral in its meaning and established in its composition and structure [see: Mokienko 1989; Alefirenko, Zolotykh 2000]. Reproducibility also means the indisputable fact that phrases do not re-emerge in the communicative process, but are repeated many times as ready-made language units. V. Vinogradov wrote about this very clearly:

“The fact of stability and semantic limitations of phraseological combinations suggests that in live communication they are used as ready-made phraseological units, reproducible, not those that are reorganized in the process of speech (a certain language community [see: Telia 1996, p. 215].

The system of images enshrined in the phraseological structure of language serves as a kind of cumulation of worldview and in one way or another related to the material, social or spiritual culture of the language community and therefore may indicate its cultural and national experience of beliefs and traditions. Nowadays, the lack of attention of researchers to finding European parallels in the study of domestic phraseology against the background of closer interaction of cognitology with culturology, historical phraseology and comparative linguistics is becoming more and more obvious.

Conclusions. We have considered the most important views of scholars on the study of phraseology. We have described the most important theoretical principles of the study of phraseology. As a result of the study, we conclude that zoophrases are a significant component of the phraseological world model of English and Ukrainians. At the present stage, scientists use the classical achievements of phraseological science, as well as apply the latest research methods. The study of zoophrases of English and Ukrainian languages allowed us to conclude that in both languages the keywords-names of animals occupy an important place. We will deepen our research in the following articles, in which we will analyze in detail the mental characteristics of keywords-symbols in both languages.

Література

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф., Золотых Л.Г. Проблемы фразеологического значения. Астрахань: Издательский дом «Астраханский университет», 2004. 296 с.
2. Амосова Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии. Ленинград: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1963. 208 с.

3. Архангельский В.Л. Устойчивые фразы в современном русском языке: основы теории устойчивых фраз и проблемы общей фразеологии. Ростов-на-Дону: Изд. РГУ, 1964. 315 с.
4. Балли Ш. Французская стилистика. Москва: Изд-во Эдиториал УРС, 2001. 394 с.
5. Венжинович Н. Образные параллели и лакуны, характерные для фразеологических зоонимов в разных типах языков. *Когнитивное исследование языка. Теоретические аспекты языка в репрезентации*, 2012. Вып. 12. С. 595–602.
6. Венжинович Н. Лінгвоконцептуальні особливості фразеології. *Сучасні проблеми мовознавства та літературознавства*. Ужгород: Говерла, 2018а. Вип.23. С. 397–399.
7. Венжинович Н. Фраземіка української літературної мови в контексті когнітології та лінгвокультурології: монографія. Ужгород: ФОП Сабов, 2018b. 463 с.
8. Venzhynovych N.F. Basic Problems of Phrase Studies in Modern Linguistics. *Development trends of philological sciences: collective monograph*. Lviv-Toruń: Liha-Pres, 2019a. С. 274–295.
9. Венжинович Н. Про компонент-символ у мовних одиницях. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія Філологія*. Вип.1 (41), 2019б. С. 38–46.
10. Venzhynovych N., Poluzhyn M., Banyoi V., Kharkivska O. (2021) Means of Foreign Language Teaching during Covid-19 Pandemic in Ukraine. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Covid 19 Challenges (1)*, 2021. С. 95–106.
11. Виноградов В.В. Об основных типах фразеологических единиц в русском языке. *Академик Шахматов*. Москва–Ленинград, 1977. С. 5–32.
12. Crystal D. The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 489 с.
13. Гвоздарев Ю.А. Избранные произведения. Лексикология и лексикография. Москва: Наука, 1977. С.140–161.
14. Жуков В.П., Жуков А.В. Русская фразеология. Москва: Высшая школа, 2006. 408 с.
15. Кунин А.В. Фразеология современного английского языка. Москва: Изд-во Междунар. отношения, 1972. 289 с.
16. Ломоносов М.В. Труды по фразеологии. Москва–Ленинград: АН СССР, Т. 4. 1952. 152 с.
17. Мокиенко В.М. Славянская фразеология. Москва: Высшая школа, 1989. 298 с.
18. Молотков А.И. Основы фразеологии русского языка. Ленинград: Наука, 1977. 283 с.
19. Полюжин І. Універсальність та внутрішня форма фразеологічних моделей. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Філологія*, 2019а. Вип.1 (41). С. 96–99.
20. Полюжин І. Періодизація становлення фразеології як розділу мовознавства. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Філологія*, 2019б. Вип. 2 (42). С.86–90.
21. Полюжин І. Походження та значення англійських анімалістичних ідіом. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Філологія*, 2020. Вип. 1(43). С. 237–244.
22. Райхштейн А.Д. Сравнительный анализ немецкой и русской фразеологии. Москва: Высшая школа, 1980. 143 с.
23. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка. Москва: Изд-во литературы на иностранных языках, 1956. 260 с.
24. Солодуб Ю.П. Русская фразеология как объект сравнительного и структурно-типологического анализа. Москва, 1985. 238 с.
25. Соссюр Ф. де. Работы по языкознанию. Перевод с французского А.А. Холодовича. Москва: Прогресс, 1977. 695 с.
26. Телия В.Н. (1990) Что такое фразеология. Москва: Наука, 1990. 86 с.
27. Телия В.Н. (1996) Русская фразеология. Москва: Наука, 1996. 279 с.
28. Телия В.Н. (1999) Русская фразеология: семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. Москва: Наука, 1999. 288 с.

References

1. Alefirenko N.F., Zolotykh L.G. (2004) Problemy frazeologicheskogo znacheniya [Problems of phraseological meaning]. Astrakhan: Izdatelskiy dom «Astrakhanskiy universitet». 296 s. [in Russian].
2. Amosova N.N. (1963) Osnovy angliyskoy frazeologii [Fundamentals of English phraseology]. Leningrad: LSU Publishing House. 208 s. [in Russian].
3. Arkhangel'sky V.L. (1964) Ustoychivye frazy v sovremennom russkom yazyke: osnovy teorii ustoychivyh fraz i problemy obshey frazeologii [Stable phrases in modern Russian: basics theories of stable phrases and problems of general phraseology]. Rostov-na-Donu: Izd. RGU. 315 s. [in Russian].
4. Balli Sh. (2001) Francuzskaya stilistika [French style]. Moskva: Izd-vo Editorial URS. 394 s. [in Russian].
5. Venzhynovych N. (2012) Obraznye paralleli i lakuny, harakternye dlya frazeologicheskikh zoonimov v raznykh tipakh yazykov [Figurative parallels and gaps characteristic of phraseological zoonyms in different types of languages]. *Kognitivnoe issledovanie yazyka. Teoreticheskie aspekty yazyka v reprezentacii*. Вып.12. С. 595–602 [in Russian].

6. Venzhynovych N. (2018a) Linhvokontseptualni osoblyvosti frazeolohii [Linguo-conceptual features of phraseology]. *Suchasni problemy movoznavstva ta literaturoznavstva*. Uzhhorod: Hoverla. Вип. 23. С. 397–399 [in Ukrainian].
7. Venzhynovych N. (2018b) [Phrasemics of the Ukrainian literary language in the context of cognitology and linguoculturology]: monograph. Uzhhorod: FOP Sabov. 463 c. [in Ukrainian].
8. Venzhynovych N.F. (2019a) Basic Problems of Phrase Studies in Modern Linguistics. *Development trends of philological sciences: collective monograph*. Lviv-Toruń: Liha-Pres. С. 274–295 [in English].
9. Venzhynovych N. (2019b) Pro komponent-symvol u movnykh odyntsiakh [On the component-symbol in language units]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Serii Filolohiia*. Vyp. 1 (41). С. 38–46 [in Ukrainian].
10. Venzhynovych N., Poluzhyn M., Banyoi V., Kharkivska O. (2021) Means of Foreign Language Teaching during Covid-19 Pandemic in Ukraine. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Covid 19 Challenges (1)*. С. 95–106 [in English].
11. Vinogradov V.V. (1977) Ob osnovnykh tipakh frazeologicheskikh edinic v russkom yazyke [On the main types of phraseological units in the Russian language]. *Academician Shakhmatov*. Moskva–Leningrad. С. 5–32 [in Russian].
12. Crystal D. (1995) *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 489 c. [in English].
13. Gvozdarev Yu.A. (1977) Izbrannye proizvedeniya. Leksikologiya i leksikografiya [Selected works. Lexicology and lexicography]. Moskva: Hayka. С.140–161 [in Russian].
14. Zhukov V.P., Zhukov A.V. (2006) *Russkaya frazeologiya* [Russian phraseology]. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola. 408 c. [in Russian].
15. Kunin A.V. (1972) *Frazeologiya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka* [Phraseology of Modern English]. Moskva: Izd-vo Mezhdunar.otnosheniya. 289 c. [in Russian].
16. Lomonosov M.V. (1952) *Trudy po frazeologii* [Works on phraseology]. Moskva-Leningrad: AN SSSR. T. 4. 152 c. [in Russian].
17. Mokienko V.M. (1989) *Slavyanskaya frazeologiya* [Slavic phraseology]. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola. 298 c. [in Russian].
18. Molotov A.I. (1977) *Osnovy frazeologii russkogo yazyka* [Fundamentals of phraseology of the Russian language]. Leningrad: Nauka. 283 c. [in Russian].
19. Poluzhyn I. (2019a) Universalnist ta vnutrishnia forma frazeolohichnykh modelei [Universality and internal form of phraseological models]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Serii Filolohiia*. Vyp. 1 (41). С. 96–99 [in Ukrainian].
20. Poluzhyn I. (2019b) Periodyzatsiia stanovlennia frazeolohii yak rozdil movoznavstva [Periodization of the formation of phraseology as a branch of linguistics]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Serii Filolohiia*. Vyp. 2 (42). С. 86–90 [in Ukrainian].
21. Poluzhyn I. (2020) Pokhodzhennia ta znachennia anhliyskykh animalistychnykh idiom [The origin and meaning of English animalistic idioms]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Serii Filolohiia*. Vyp. 1(43). С. 237–244 [in Ukrainian].
22. Reichstein A.D. (1980) *Sravnitelnyi analiz nemeckoy i russkoy frazeologii* [Comparative analysis of German and Russian phraseology]. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola. 143 c. [in Russian].
23. Smirnitsky A.I. (1956) *Leksikologiya angliyskogo yazyka* [Lexicology of the English language]. Moskva: Izd-vo literatury na inostrannykh yazykakh. 260 c. [in Russian].
24. Solodub Yu.P. (1985) *Russkaya frazeologiya kak obekt sravnitel'nogo i strukturno-tipologicheskogo analiza* [Russian phraseology as an object of comparative and structural typological analysis]. Moskva. 238 s. [in Russian].
25. Saussure F. de. (1977) *Raboty po yazykoznaniiu* [Works on linguistics. Translated from French A.A. Kholodovich]. Moskva: Progress. 695 c. [in Russian].
26. Teliya V.N. (1990) *Chto takoe frazeologiya* [What is phraseology]. Moskva: Nauka. 86 c. [in Russian].
27. Teliya V.N. (1996) *Russkaya frazeologiya* [Russian phraseology]. Moskva: Nauka. 279 c. [in Russian].
28. Teliya V.N. (1999) *Russkaya frazeologiya: semanticheskii, pragmaticheskii i lingvokulturologicheskii aspekty* [Russian phraseology: semantic, pragmatic and linguistic and cultural aspects]. Moskva: Nauka. 288 c. [in Russian].

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ЗАСАДИ ВИВЧЕННЯ ЗООФРАЗЕМ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ МОВАХ

Анотація. Стаття присвячена опису та аналізу теоретичних засад вивчення зоофразем в англійській та українській мовах. Це дослідження є надзвичайно актуальним, оскільки воно ще не було предметом спеціального наукового розгляду. Автори представляють класичні напрацювання вчених, які заклали основи новітніх досліджень. Особливу увагу приділено опису наукового доробку В. Виноградова, Ш. Баллі, О. Куніна, М. Алефіренка, В. Мокієнка та інших відомих мовознавців. Своїм головним завданням вчені вважали виявлення й опис лексико-семантичних і синтаксичних особливостей словосполучень як номінативних одиниць мови, які кардинально відрізнялися від окремих слів і вільних словосполучень. На цій структурно-семантичній основі здійснено виділення та класифікацію фразеологізмів.

У центрі уваги цього «класичного» періоду розвитку фразеології було окреслено її об'єкт як самостійної лінгвістичної дисципліни та пошук критеріїв її відмежування як від слів, так і від вільних словосполучень.

Мета статті – описати основні теоретичні засади дослідження зоофразем в англійській та українській мовах. Основними завданнями статті є: репрезентувати класичні та нові наукові досягнення щодо основних принципів вивчення зоофразем англійської та української мов; представити найважливіші класифікації фразеосполучень; описати та проаналізувати періоди розвитку фразеології; проаналізувати основні критерії та розуміння фразеологічної одиниці. У статті зроблено висновок, що зоофраземи є вагомим компонентом фразеологічної картини світу. На сучасному етапі вчені використовують класичні досягнення фразеологічної науки, а також застосовують новітні методи дослідження. Студіювання зоофразем англійської та української мов уможливило з'ясувати, що в обох мовах важливе місце посідають ключові слова-назви тварин. У наступних наукових розвідках заплановано поглибити наше дослідження, в якому докладно розглянемо ментальні особливості ключових слів-символів в обох мовах.

Ключові слова: теоретичні засади, зоофраземи, англійська та українська мови, фразеологічна картина світу, ключові слова-символи.

© Полюжин І., 2022 р.

© Венжинович Н., 2022 р.

Ivan Poluzhyn – a graduate student, Lecturer at the Applied Linguistics Department, Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine; poluzhyn.ivan@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2167-8526>

Іван Полюжин – аспірант, викладач кафедри прикладної лінгвістики Ужгородського національного університету, м. Ужгород, Україна; poluzhyn.ivan@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2167-8526>

Natalia Venzhynovych – Doctor of Philology, the Head of the Ukrainian Language Department, Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine; vennata2017@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0230-4118>

Наталія Венжинович – доктор філологічних наук, завідувач кафедри української мови Ужгородського національного університету, Ужгород, Україна; vennata2017@gmail.com; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0230-4118>