

Осьмачко С.А.

Teacher

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv

National University of

Economics, department

Of Pedagogics and

Foreign Languages

**ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGY AND IDIOMATICS IN HISTORICAL
DEVELOPMENT.**

Keywords: phraseological unit, synonym, lexical resources, language, philology, linguist.

Phraseological units fill lacunas in the lexical system of language, which cannot fully provide the name of the known (new) sides of reality, and in many cases are the only notations for objects, properties, states, situations, etc. it should be borne in mind that "the name itself is not only the process of denoting the denotation, but also the process of cognition." The formation of phraseological units weakens the contradiction between the needs of thinking and the limited lexical resources of the language. In the same cases, when phraseology has a lexical synonym, they usually differ in stylistic terms. Phraseology is a treasury of language. The history of the people, the uniqueness of its culture and way of life is reflected in this part language. Phraseological units are often of a national character. Along with English purely national phraseology, there are many international phraseological units. The English phraseological foundation is a

complex conglomerate of primordial and borrowed phraseological units with a clear predominance of the former ones. In some phraseological units archaic elements are preserved. They are representatives of previous eras.

In phrase formation the human factor plays a huge role, since the overwhelming majority of phraseological units are connected with a human, with various spheres of his activity, the addressee's factor is the most important element of communication. In addition, man seeks to impart human features to the objects of the external world, including inanimate ones. Still Ch. Bally asserted: "The eternal imperfection of the human mind is also manifested in the fact that man always strives to spiritualize everything that surrounds him. He cannot imagine that nature is dead and soulless; his imagination constantly gives life to inanimate objects, but that is not all: a man constantly attributes to all objects of the external world the features and aspirations peculiar to his personality." V.G. Gak makes a significant correction to the statement of Ch. Bally: "Since the focus of a person is himself, it is a reason of his constant desire to describe the surrounding world according to his image and likeness. Language anthropomorphism is not a remnant of primitive thinking, as some philosophers have argued, but the general law of development of nomination means in language." Linguistic anthropomorphism is usually understood as the endowment with human properties of objects and phenomena of inanimate nature, celestial bodies, animals and mythological beings.

Phraseological units are highly informative units of the language; they cannot be regarded as "decorations" or "excesses". A similar interpretation of phraseological units is found in some works and at the present time is obsolete. Phraseological units are one of the language universals, since there are no languages without phraseological units. English phraseology is very rich and it has a centuries-old history.

Phraseology is an extremely complex phenomenon, the study of which requires its own research method, as well as the use of data from other sciences -

lexicology, grammar, stylistics, phonetics, language history, history, philosophy, logic and geography.

The opinions of linguists on a number of problems of phraseology diverge, and this is quite natural.

The founder of the theory of phraseology is the Swiss linguist of French origin Charles Bally (1865-1947). Bally first systematized the combination of words in his books "Essay stylistics" and "French stylistics." Bally has included a chapter on phraseology in his books on stylistics. In the first book, he distinguished four groups of word combinations: 1) free word combinations (les groupements libres), i.e. combinations, devoid of stability, disintegrating after their formation;

2) the usual combinations (les groupements usuels), i.e. word combinations with a relatively loose connection of components, allowing some changes, for example, *une grave maladie* - a serious disease (*une dangereuse, serieuse maladie* - a dangerous serious disease);

3) phraseological series (les series phraseologiques), i.e. group of words. In which two rank-and-file concepts merge into almost one. The stability of these turns is fixed by primary usage, for example, *remporter une victoire* - to gain victory, (*courir un danger* - to be exposed to danger.) These combinations allow the rearrangement of components;

4) phraseological unities (les unites phraseologiques), i.e. combinations in which words have lost their meaning and express a single indivisible concept. Such combinations do not allow the rearrangement of components. Thus, Bally distinguishes combinations of words according to the degree of stability: a combination in which there is freedom of grouping of components, and combinations lacking such freedom. Bally only schematically outlined these groups, but did not give them any detailed description.

Charles Bally introduced the term phraseology as "a section of stylistics studying related phrases," but the term did not acquire the rights of citizenship in

the writings of Western European and American linguists and is used in three other meanings: 1) the choice of words, the form of expression, the wording; 2) language, style, style; 3) expressions, phrases. This is confirmed by the definitions of the word phraseology in English and American dictionaries:

The choice or arrangement of words and phrases in the expression of ideas; manner or style of expression; the particular form of speech or diction which characterizes a characterization of a writer, literary production, language, etc.

Choice of words; wording (Hornby, A.S., The Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English, London, 1974)

Manner of using and arranging words (Longman Modern English Dictionary, London, 1976).

1. Manner or style of verbal expression; characteristic language;

2. Expression, phrases (The Random House Dictionary on the English Language, New York, 1970).

Questions of phraseology in England and the United States are treated mainly in works on semantics and grammar, as well as in the forewords to phraseological dictionaries. There are a number of articles on idiomatic word combinations. Proverbs are studied in numerous works. The special magazine "Proverbium" (1965-1975) was published. The publication of this magazine is explained by the fact that paremiology (the doctrine of proverbs) is traditionally regarded as an integral part of folklore.

The question of phraseology as a linguistic discipline was first raised by the outstanding linguist Professor Y.D. Polivanov. Y.D. Polivanov repeatedly returned to this question and argued that vocabulary studies individual lexical meanings of words, morphology - formal meanings of words, syntax - formal meanings of word combinations. "And now there is a need for a special department that would be measurable with the syntax, but at the same time I did not mean the general types, but the individual meanings of individual phrases, just as the vocabulary deals with

the individual (lexical) meanings of individual words. This department of linguistics, as in the totality of the phenomena studied in it, I give the name of the phraseology (I will point out that another term, idiomatics, is proposed for this value).

Y.D. Polivanov believed that phraseology "will take a stand-alone and stable position (like phonetics, morphology, etc.) in the linguistic literature of the future." The question of phraseology as a linguistic discipline was put by V.V. Vinogradov, V.V. Vinogradov contributed to the emergence of numerous works on the phraseology of different languages. This accumulation of systematized facts is one of the prerequisites for the creation of phraseology as a linguistic discipline.

The equivalence theory of the phraseological unit to the word deserves special consideration. It goes back to the theory of identification of expressive facts developed by Ch. Bally, who pointed out that the most common sign of phraseological turnover, replacing all the others, is the possibility or the impossibility to substitute a simple word for this turnover. Ch. Bally called this word the word-identifier. Bally considered the presence of such a synonym as an internal sign of the integrity of phraseological units.

This view is objectionable. The semantic integrity of phraseology cannot be established in this way, since the word combinations can also have synonyms - words, for example, look fixedly = to stare; sufferings of mind or body = pain, etc. In addition, many phraseological units do not have identifier words, but can only be identified using variable word combinations, for example, drink like a fish = drink too much; in a small way.

It should also be borne in mind that proverbs and sayings, i.e. phraseological units with a sentence structure, can be identified only with the help of sentences, for example, birds of feather flock together - people who have the same interest, ideas, etc. are attracted to each and stay close together.

The semantic integrity of the phraseological units can be established by comparing its value with the value of its components as individual words, as well as by identifying the features of its use in context. The term "equivalent of the word" was created by L.V. Shcherba. He stressed that such a group of words denotes one concept and is a potential equivalent of a word. Indeed, a close group of words, if it is a word combination, can denote one concept.

The overwhelming majority of phraseological units does not have words - identifiers, i.e. lexical synonyms. There are accurate data only on the percentage of phraseological units and their lexical synonyms in French from 22 851 phraseology only 2867, i.e. 12.5%, have word-identifiers, in English there is a similar phenomenon.

Some adherents of the theory of equivalence consider phraseological units as lexical units that do not need a special, specific, classification-specific classification, and which should be classified in the same way as words are classified. Thus, all the specifics of phraseological units are nullified. The word, no matter how complicated it is in the semantic structure, does not belong to the field of phraseology, it is the object of lexicography and lexicology. Words and phraseology are brought into speech in ready-made form. This fact is cited as one of the arguments in favor of the theory of equivalence.

Putting into speech in ready-made form is a shaky basis for the equivalence of phraseology to a word, since reproduction in a finished form is a characteristic feature of all units of the language, and it is inappropriate to treat them as equivalent words. It is important only to take into account the characteristic features of reproducibility in the finished form, depending on the structural and semantic features of different units of the language. And in structural and semantic terms, phraseological units are a separately formed unit of language, much more complex than a word, and this affects its actualization in a written or oral context.

Equally shaky is the hypertrophy of the grammatical community of phraseological units and words. Indeed, a completely re-interpreted phraseological unit with the structure of a word combination performs the function of individual members of the sentence, i.e. phrasal subjects, phrasal predicates and phrase additions.

Partially reinterpreted revolutions such as verbal comparisons are syntactically termed. So, for example, in verbal comparisons like a horse – to eat a lot and greedily; fit like a glove - be of the right size, fully fit; smoke like a chimney - "smoke like a locomotive", a lot of smoking; swear like a trooper = to swear on what the light stands; swim like a fish. The first component is used in a literal sense, which is amplified by the adverbial part of the turnover. In the sentence he smokes a chimney he - subject, smokes - predicate, like a chimney - the circumstance of the mode of action.

The approach to the phraseological units as to the equivalents of words does not allow the inclusion of whole-predicative phrases in the phraseology. Of course, the meaning of the whole - predicative turnover, which is the main proposal or the main and subordinate clause and less commonly used as a member of the proposal, belongs to a different content plan than the meaning of a word or phrase. Despite this, phrases are the objects of the study of syntax, which in no way deprives it of its scientific character. The subject of syntax as a department of grammar is the study of ways of combining words in phrases and sentences, as well as studying the types of sentences, their structure, functions and conditions of use.

It is equally legitimate to study sentences of all types as objects of phraseology, if these sentences are not variable sentences or individual author turns that are used only as citations and are not units of language.

The subject of the study of syntax is variables, not stable sentences. Studying the semantic and stylistic features of stable sentences is one of the important tasks of phraseology.

The criterion of nominativity and communicativeness should not be used in determining phraseology because it leads to a paradoxical situation. The fact is that in modern English there is a significant number of verbal phraseological units, which we refer to the class of nominative communicative formations, which are phrases, i.e. units performing a nominative function with verbs in the active voice, and whole-predictive sentences, i.e. units performing a communicative function, with verbs in the passive voice, for example, break the ice - the ice is broken; cross (or pass) the Rubicon - the Rubicon is crossed (or passed), etc. Such formations do not possess the autonomy of proverbs, but they are self-employed no less than proverbs. Thus, if we consider nominateness as one of the criteria of idiomaticity, then such turns with verbs in the real are phraseological units and enter the system of language, and with verbs in the passive voice they are not part of the language system. Such a conclusion, as is quite obvious, is illegal.

When using the nomination criterion mentioned above, among the phraseological units there is also a significant number of all-preventive units of an unconditional type, for example, the fat is in the fire; that cat will not jump - this number will not work; what will Mrs. Grundy say? - What will people say? Being withdrawn from the phraseology, such turns essentially hang in the air and cease to be the object of linguistic research, since it is not known in which section of linguistics they should be studied. It should be noted that the terms "nominative" and "communicative" are not unambiguous and in addition to the values in which they are used above, they have other meanings. So "nominative" also means "call", and in this sense any phraseological unit is a nominative unit: "any language unit of any level remains a nominative unit because it records something known by a person in the corresponding object." the term "communicative" also means "relating to the communication process". Such a polysemy of terms is undesirable, but, unfortunately, it still exists.

The transfer of proverbs, which are stable units of language with a sentence structure, exclusively in the management of folklore cannot be considered correct.

Proverbs should be studied both in folklore and in phraseology, but from different points of view. In phraseology, they are studied as units of phraseological composition of the language, possessing peculiar semantic, stylistic and structural features. Of great importance for the phraseology of modern English is the study of proverbs as a source of phraseological derivation. Folklore is interested in proverbs mainly as a product of folk art, characterizing folk wisdom, folk customs, etc.

A.I. Smirnitsky stressed the possibility of entering sentences into the system of language: "It should be noted that proverbs, sayings, aphorisms and, in general, various sayings reproduced again and again as whole units. They act as units of language precisely in so far as they are reproduced, as a means for (more vivid, imaginative, sharp) expression of thought in the process of communication. Considered in themselves as works (of unknown or famous authors), they, in fact, do not yet have the character of units of language and belong to folklore and literature, being, of course, at the same time combinations of units of language, specific cases of application and manifestation of such units " .

This is a well-grounded opinion of A.I. Smirnitsky is a convincing refutation of the assertion that proverbs and whole-proverbial sayings do not enter into the system of language. Differences between phraseological units and words are so significant that the hypertrophy of their similar traits, so characteristic of the supporters of the theory of equivalence, makes it difficult to establish phraseology as a linguistic discipline. From all of the above, we can conclude that the theory of the equivalence of phraseology has become obsolete. This does not mean that phraseological units and words have nothing in common. Undoubtedly, they have, but this community should not obscure the specifics of phraseological units. Therefore, it is advisable not to use the word "equivalent" and replace the theory of the equivalence of phraseology with the theory of correlation of certain types of phraseological units and words, at the basis of which there are quite different principles. When considering the correlation of phraseological units with the structure of word combinations and words in a pragmatic sense, a complex

approach is necessary, in which the semantic, stylistic, structural, grammatical and accentological features of phraseological units and words are objectively taken into account, as well as their phrase-forming and word-building structures. At the same time, special attention is paid to words that are the dictionary identifiers of phraseological units. When analyzing the ratio of phraseological units and words in syntagmatics, it is important to take into account the occasional and occasional features of their functioning in context. An integrated approach makes it possible to establish a system of legitimate differences and common features. The semantic structure of phraseology and the semantic structure of a word are by no means exhausted only by their meanings. In addition to meaning, the most important elements of the semantic structure are the construction of the whole education as a whole, its grammatical form and systemic language connections. The mismatching of the semantic structure of phraseological and semantic structure of the word gives grounds to distinguish between phraseological and lexical meanings. Thus, the characteristic feature of most substantive phraseological units in modern English is the expression of concepts that cannot be expressed in separate words; these phraseological units data do not have lexical synonyms. To such phraseological units belong: apple-pie order - exemplary order; Dutch courage - drunk courage; Hobson's choice - no choice; a rough diamond-rough, but a good man; a white elephant - burdensome or ruinous property, burden; a gift from which you do not know how to get rid of; a wolf in sheep's clothing - and many others.

In those cases where the substantive phraseological units has a lexical synonym, it is usually the word of a neutral style, and the phraseological units is emotionally coloured. The following examples illustrate this situation: camel - the ship of the desert; jealousy the green-eyed monster; lion - the king of beasts; money - the sinews of war; rank, title - a handle to one s name; Shakespeare - the Swan of Avon; tea - a cup that cheers but not inebriates, etc.

The above phraseological units are paraphrases. Peripheral (or paraphrase) is a path consisting of replacing the single word denoter with a descriptive designation that emphasizes its sides, qualities that are significant when using this designation in certain contexts. The discrepancy between phraseological and lexical semantic structures can also be seen if we compare the phraseological and lexical synonyms in any lexical phraseological synonymic series. Thus, the phraseological synonyms of the verb to die are phraseological units go to the (great) majority, go the way of all flesh, go up the flume, etc. The verb to die is the dictionary identifier of these phraseological units.

Comparison of the elements of this synonymous series reveals significant systemic differences between the phraseological units and their lexical synonym.

1. The verb to die is polysemantic: 1) die; 2) (col.) To want to death (I am dying to see him); 3) to end, disappear, be forgotten (his fame will never die).

The Hornby dictionary records these three most common meanings of the verb to die. In the "Big Oxford Dictionary" 12 meanings of the verb to die are recorded.

2. Phraseological unit go to the (great) majority - a playful turn with figurative meaning to go to a better world. Phraseological unit go the way of all flesh - book circulation with figurative value to experience the lot of all earthly. Phraseological unit go up the flume - a common American phrase.

The meaning of the verb to die is not imaginative and stylistic neutral. The meaning of the above phraseological units is the result of a complete or partial reinterpretation, the lexical meaning can be either literal or reinterpreted.

3. Phraseological units are separately formed formations consisting of two or more components, and the verb to die is a whole-formed entity.

4. Phraseological units go to the (great) majority; go the way of all flesh and go up the flume cannot be combined with prepositios such as away, down, off, out. The verb to die is combined with it: die away - to die (about sound); quiet down

(about the wind); die down; die (about sound); to wither (about excitement)); die off - die, die one by one; die out; extinguish.

In general, the compatibility of the verb to die is much broader than that of its phraseological synonyms, which is explained by a much broader meaning of the verb. Examples are the phrases die a natural death; lie a violent death; die a hero's death and many other idioms with the so-called "cognate object".

5. Phraseological units which are synonyms for the verb to die, unlike this verb, do not take the form of a long form of present and past time (compare he is dying, he was dying). This is explained by the fact that the verb to die denotes both the action from the point of view relations to its internal limit, and without restrictions in its flow; it can mean both an instantaneous and a prolonged action.

Phraseological synonyms mean only instantaneous action and cannot denote a long-term action, i.e. are limiting in their meaning.

6. Phraseological synonyms of the verb to die can neither enter into the composition of phraseological units, nor in the composition of complex words.

The verb to die occurs as a component of a series of phraseological units: die a dog's death - to die like a dog; die in the last ditch - to stand to death; never say die - one should never despair, etc.

7. The verb to die is also included in complex words, for example: die - hard - conservative (formed by conversion from the phrase - slowly die, be tenacious).

8. Phraseological units, being separately formed entities, allow individual stylistic updates: The spare furniture has gone of the all superfluties (A. Huxley). This phraseological unit is used occasionally in relation to furniture, and the last component of phraseology - the word flesh - is replaced by the word superfluties. The verb to die cannot be applied to furniture and does not allow for any structural innovation.

9. The phraseological unit go to the (great) major breaks up into two quantitative variants: go over to the great majority and go over to the great majority. The verb to die has no option.

10. The verb has a word-building nest: dying; the dying - the dying; dyingly. Phraseological units which are synonyms for the verb to die are not substantivized and do not have a word-forming paradigm.

Naturally, the consideration of only one phraseological synonymic series cannot reveal all the features of the semantic structure of phraseological units and the semantic structure of the word. But even a brief examination of the three phraseological units and their lexical synonym as in a paradigmatic plan, i.e. irrespective of their functioning, and in terms of syntagmatic, i.e. when comparing the functioning of these units, shows that the semantic structure of the FE and the semantic structure of the synonymic word do not coincide with the basic quantitative and qualitative indicators.

N.N. Amosova, who for the first time questioned the equivalence theory of the phraseological unit to the word, rightly notes the relativity of the equivalence of the phraseological units to the word and the different degrees of even this relative equivalence, depending on the type of phraseological units. Equally true is the assertion of N. N. Amosova that, because of the relative nature of the equivalence of the phraseological units, the word should not be included in the general definition of the phraseological units as one of its reference points. The theory of the correlation of phraseological units with words is part of phraseology as a linguistic discipline.

The Phraseological Foundation of English is very large. Nevertheless, on the example of the phraseology examined, one can clearly imagine how diverse in terms of its semantics and expressiveness are the phraseological units of modern English. Thanks to the literary works of writers and poets, both the Great Britain and the various countries of the world, English now has a huge number of phraseological units. But, we should not forget that in the history and culture of

various countries in the world, a huge number of phraseological units also came to English. Only phraseological units borrowed from the literature of countries, one way or another, geographically close to Great Britain, became widespread. It should be noted that the number of borrowings from the bible is particularly high in the English language, this may be indicative of the religiosity of the English.

After all, phraseology is the treasury of language, and the phraseology in the language is wealth. Phraseology does not only reflect the culture and everyday life of a particular language, but also helps make speech more expressive and emotional.

Phraseology is an extremely complex phenomenon, the study of which requires its own research method, as well as the use of data from other sciences - lexicology, grammar, stylistics, phonetics, language history, history, philosophy, logic and geography.

Література

1. Амосова Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии. - Л.: Наука, 1989, 97 с.
2. Аничков И.Е. Труды по языкознанию. - СПб: Наука, 1997, 209 с.
3. Виноградов В.В. Об основных типах фразеологических единиц в русском языке. - М.: Наука, 1986, 179 с.
4. Захарова М.А. Стратегия речевого использования образных фразеологизмов английского языка. – М.: Инфра-М, 1999, 151 с.
5. Кунин А.В. Фразеология современного английского языка. - М.: Международные отношения, 1996, 183 с.
6. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. 3-е изд., стереотип. – М.: Русский язык, 2001, 264 с.
7. Литвинов П.П. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь с тематической классификацией. – М.: Яхонт, 2000, 302 с.
8. Литвинов П.П. Фразеология. – М.: Примстрой –М, 2001, 182 с.
9. Савицкий В.М. Английская фразеология: Проблемы моделирования. – Самара, 1993, 219 с.
10. Уорелл А.Дж. Английские идиоматические выражения. – М.: Художественная литература, 1999, 117 с.

11. Weinreich, U. Problems in the Analysis of Idioms: Substance and Structure of Language. – University of California Press, Berkley and Los Angeles, 1984, 208 c.