

THE EVOLUTION OF PHRASEOLOGY: FROM EARLY NOTIONS TO A DISTINCT DISCIPLINE

Gulchekhra Bakhtiyorovna Ataeva

Doctoral student, Foreign Languages Department, Tashkent State Transport University, Uzbekistan

E-mail: gulchexra.ataeva@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-8754-2168

ABSTRACT

This article delves into the world of phraseology and idioms, exploring their classification, cultural significance, and representation in dictionaries. Key concepts of the article are periphery, and dynamic areas of phraseology that are distinguished based on the regularity and composition of their components. Moreover, it classifies idioms based on their communicative function (e.g., qualifying, identifying) and compares to similar structures in other languages. The article stresses the importance of cultural connotation in phraseology. Phraseological units are seen as repositories of cultural knowledge, reflecting the historical, social, and symbolic experiences of a language community. Their figurative bases embody cultural concepts and stereotypes. Also, the article explores various approaches to presenting phraseological units and idioms in dictionaries. There's debate on whether to include them in separate entries or within entries for their component words. Different criteria for choosing the placement word within a phraseological unit are also discussed. Overall, the article provides a comprehensive overview of phraseology and idioms, highlighting their linguistic and cultural significance, along with the challenges of representing them in dictionaries.

Keywords: Phraseology, idioms, lexical-phraseological universals, cultural connotation, communicative function, lexicography.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье рассматривается мир фразеологии и идиом, исследуя их классификацию, культурное значение и представление в словарях. Ключевыми концепциями статьи являются периферия и динамические области фразеологии, которые выделяются на основе регулярности и состава их компонентов. Кроме того, она классифицирует идиомы на основе их коммуникативной функции (например, квалифицирующей, идентифицирующей) и сравнивает с аналогичными структурами в других языках. В статье подчеркивается важность культурной коннотации в фразеологии.



Фразеологические единицы рассматриваются как хранилища культурного знания, отражающие исторические, социальные и символические опыты языкового сообщества. Их образные основы воплощают культурные концепции и стереотипы. Кроме того, в статье исследуются различные подходы к представлению фразеологических единиц и идиом в словарях. Идет дискуссия о том, включать ли их в отдельные статьи или внутри статей для их компонентов. Также обсуждаются различные критерии выбора размещения слова внутри фразеологической единицы. В целом статья предоставляет всесторонний обзор фразеологии и идиом, подчеркивая их языковое и культурное значение, а также вызовы представления их в словарях.

Ключевые слова: Фразеология, идиомы, лексико-фразеологические универсалии, культурная коннотация, коммуникативная функция, лексикография.

1. INTRODUCTION

The premises of phraseology theory are discerned in the works of Russian scholars A.A. Potebnya, A.A. Shakhmatov, and F.F. Fortunatov. The development of phraseology has also been significantly influenced by the ideas of the French linguist Ch. Bally, who first formulated the characteristics of stable word combinations and the principles of their classification, and introduced the term 'phraseology' to denote "a branch of stylistics studying connected word combinations" [18, p. 9; 29, p. 12].

The question of studying stable word combinations and their semantic and grammatical features in a specialized branch of linguistics was raised in the 1920s to 1940s by E.D. Polivanov, S.I. Abakumov, B.A. Larin, and L.A. Bulakhovsky, however, phraseology as a separate linguistic discipline was formalized in the 1940s [29, p. 11; 36, p. 560].

The emergence of phraseology as an independent discipline is associated with the name of the Russian scholar V.V. Vinogradov, whose works formulated the basic concepts, scope, and tasks of phraseology [10].

One of the important points in Vinogradov's works was his attitude towards the role of figurative content in the meaning of phraseological units, i.e., motivatedness [29, p. 12]. Seeking to distinguish completely reinterpreted stable word combinations from word combinations freely formed at the moment of speech organization based on a strictly 'meaningful' criterion, Vinogradov used the previously known criterion of 'uninferrability' of the meaning of the whole from the meanings of the constituent words in their 'usual' meaning, but at the same time attributed special importance to the phenomenon of motivatedness, which

found reflection in his differentiation between 'phraseological combinations' and 'unities' [10].

Another important achievement of Vinogradov's phraseological concept is the introduction of the category of meaning connectedness [40, p. 213; 29, p. 13]. According to Vinogradov, connected "lexical meanings can only manifest themselves in connection with a strictly defined circle of concepts and their verbal designations" [10, p. 26]. Thus, meaning connectedness should be understood as the "ability of a word to be realized only with a strictly defined word or set of words" [30, p. 57].

For N.N. Amosova, the fundamental distinction lies between meaning connectedness with a single word and meaning connectedness with a set of words [40, p. 215]. Depending on which of these two abilities a word possesses in an expression, Amosova distinguished between 'phraseemes' (where the connected meaning must have a single determining unit – e.g., grind one's teeth) and 'phraseoids' (where the connected meaning has a series of determining units – e.g., pay one's respects/a compliment/court to someone). Amosova generally excluded the latter type of expressions from the scope of phraseology, as the determining minimum upon which the meaning of the verb 'pay' depends is not constant [2, pp. 68–71]. From early notions to a distinct discipline like in idiomatics, this corpus can be divided into a core, periphery, and dynamic 'area'.

In the subsequent years, phraseology underwent an intensive period of its classical development, associated with the activities of a whole galaxy of phraseologists who affiliated themselves with V.V. Vinogradov's school (V.P. Zhukov, A.V. Kunin, A.I. Smirnitsky, N.M. Shansky). The main task of this school was to identify lexical-syntactic differences between phraseological units and free word combinations, and to distinguish the meanings of phraseological units as nominative units of language from the meanings of words. On this structural-semantic basis, the identification and classification of phraseological units – all stably reproducible combinations of words in a 'ready-made' lexical-grammatical composition – were carried out.

2. METHODS

V.V. Vinogradov's typology, developed on the material of the Russian language, included three types of phraseological units:

- phraseological combinations, or idioms – unmotivated units that act as equivalents of words (literally, "down the sleeves," as if not so);
- phraseological units – motivated units with a unified integral meaning arising from the merging of meanings of lexical components (to swim shallow, the first pancake is lumpy), including terms (holiday home, question mark);

○ phraseological collocations – expressions in which one of the components has a phraseologically connected meaning, manifested only in connection with a strictly defined circle of concepts and their verbal designations (fear takes, laughter takes).

According to N.N. Amosova, in order for "the degree of motivatedness of a phraseological unit to serve as the basis for the typological division of phraseological units, it would be important ... to develop strict and precise objective criteria for its definition" [2, p. 9]. Otherwise, the inclusion of any phraseological unit in a particular category would be arbitrary. In addition, critical remarks about Vinogradov's concept arise from the "wide and diverse composition of the category of phraseological units, including technical and scientific terms, idiomatic expressions, ... proverbs and sayings" [18, p. 23]. Another significant shortcoming of Vinogradov's classification is the different basis for defining types of phraseological units: motivatedness for the I and II groups, limited word compatibility for the III group.

A.I. Smirnitsky's phraseological concept is valuable because he raised questions about the structural types of phraseological units, about the differences in the composition of their components, about the variety of their functional types. Structurally, Smirnitsky divides phraseological units into 'single-top' and 'double-top' (or 'multi-top'), that is, consisting of either the combination of two or more meaningful words [27]. Thus, according to N.N. Amosova, "very large differences in the syntactic structure of phraseological units" are recognized [2, p. 10].

A.V. Kunin divided English phraseology into several sections depending on the types of meanings of phraseological units (from more complex to less complex): idiomatics, idiomaphrasematics, and phraseomatics. Kunin's classification of phraseological units complements the well-known typology of Vinogradov, as English phraseology does not fit into the three classes identified by Vinogradov. Idiomaphrasematics and a number of groups included in phraseomatics were first distinguished [18, p. 26].

3. RESULTS

In the section on idiomatics, A.V. Kunin includes proper phraseological units, or idioms, which he defines as "stable combinations of lexemes with fully or partially reinterpreted meanings" and which differ in structural types and can be both motivated and unmotivated [18, pp. 26–27]. A.V. Kunin proposes the following categorization of this group of phraseological units: phraseological units (burn one's fingers, all is not gold that

glitters) and phraseological combinations (kick the bucket, send smb. to Coventry) [18, p. 53].

The section on idio-phasemantics includes idio-phasematism, that is, "stable word combinations, the first phrasematic variants of which have literal but complex meanings, and the second idiomatic variants have completely reinterpreted meanings, for example, chain reaction – 1) a scientific term; 2) a completely reinterpreted idiomatic variant. The second variant is a reinterpretation of the first, which serves as its prototype. The reinterpretation is metaphorical in nature" [18, p. 27].

In the phraseomatics section, A.V. Kunin includes phraseomatic units, or "phraseological units of a non-idiomatic nature but with a complex meaning" [18, p. 27]. This category is divided into the following groups:

Phrases with transformed meanings, whose semantic complexity lies in the fact that their meanings are not the sum of the meanings of their components but new meanings (good morning, good night).

- Phrases with additional-clarifying meanings (an affair of honor, first night).
- Phrases with additional-clarifying meanings indicating symbolic gestures or phraseological combinations (knit one's brows, nod one's head).
- Proverbs with literal meanings based on the identification or opposition of the meanings of the components (better late than never, a friend in need is a friend indeed).

Phrases with phraseomatically related meanings, where the meaning of the leading component can only be derived from the formations in which this component is used (to pay attention/heed/no mind, pay a call/a visit). This category tends to expand the compatibility of the leading element, so they approach variable word combinations [18, pp. 55–57].

A.V. Kunin does not include terms with terminological meanings (visual navigation, measuring instrument) in the phraseology, as well as phrases with a narrow meaning of the leading component (to launch a rocket). Both types of phrases are formed according to the generative model of variable word combinations [18, pp. 27–28].

In V.N. Telia's concept, the field of phraseology is also divided into several groups:

- PHRASEOLOGY 1 – a branch of linguistics that studies the idiomaticity of word combinations and their sign functions.
- PHRASEOLOGY 2 – a branch of linguistics that studies the category of meaning association (in its lexical and semantic, ... as well as lexical-grammatical aspects) and the sign functions of associated word meaning.

○ PHRASEOLOGY 3 – a branch of linguistics that studies the clichéd nature of speech.

○ PHRASEOLOGY 4 – a branch of linguistic stylistics that examines the characteristic ways of nomination for a particular direction, style, or individual author.

○ PHRASEOLOGY 5 – a branch of linguistics that studies proverbs.

○ PHRASEOLOGY 6 – a field of linguistics that collects aphorisms, maxims, or words perceived as "quotations" with the aim of creating encyclopedic dictionaries of winged words and expressions [29, p. 75]. Phraseology 1 and phraseology 2 constitute the main part of the total volume of phraseological units.

The central point in the process of idiom formation according to V.N. Telia is the involvement of word combinations in metaphor based on the similarity of the meaning underlying the nominative intent and what is denoted by the combination in its 'literal' meaning, and which is also included in a certain structure of knowledge about the world – a kind of 'scenario' or 'frame' [29, p. 60]. The typology of Russian phraseological units in V.N. Telia's view is based on the functional principle.

The core of phraseology 1, according to V.N. Telia, consists of idioms that are equivalent to words in performing both their and others' integral nominative functions (the ability of a name expressed by a combination of words to refer to an object correlated with a single denotation, ... none of whose features correlate with a separate name contained in the combination of words). For example, to beat around the bush, to poke one's nose in.

When considering idioms, it is necessary to focus separately on the category of idiomaticity and its components. The basic ideas of idiomaticity are 'reinterpretation' and 'opacity'. Reinterpreting one meaning of an expression as another meaning is an operation that transforms the first meaning into the second according to some principle. For example, the expression let the cat out of the bag is idiomatic based on the principle of reinterpretation, which involves a mechanism of metaphorization. Opacity should be understood as the property of a sign that prevents its value from being calculated due to the lack of a productive rule allowing it to be detected. For example, the expression to take the bull by the horns is opaque, because it can be considered that there are no standard rules allowing the actual meaning of the expression to be derived from the meanings of its components [8, pp. 52–55].

The blurred periphery of idiomatics consists of a group of phrases with residual and acquired lexical-semantic properties of individual components, which are called analytical, that is, one of the names in them always has an independent denotative correspondence, while the other indicates

its denotatum through this name. For example, to come to mind, on the fly [29, pp. 62–63].

Phraseology 2 includes phraseological combinations [10], or lexical collocations [38]. Under the influence of transformational grammar, the term restrictive combinations [40] began to be used. Despite the fact that in foreign linguistics the question of the association of meaning is ignored, V.N. Telia believes that it is essential for lexicography: collocations are formed by a narrow scope of meaning of one of the words or its 'association' [29, pp. 64–65].

The reasons for their reproducibility are as follows:

At least one of the components appears in a free meaning (primary or secondary) and performs the role of a semantic key, that is, it predetermines the semantic interpretation related to it in terms of both meaning and form of the other component(s) (e.g., "бурный восторг" = "общий и интенсивный восторг"). Semantically realized words allow for a sufficiently complete interpretation.

This interpretation is only possible for the semantically realized word when combined with this semantic key word.

These two features clearly distinguish lexical collocations with an analytical type of meaning from idioms and free word combinations [29, pp. 65–66]. As for the structural-semantic varieties, they are associated with the type of language and the type of meaning underlying them.

Like in idiomatics, this corpus can be divided into a core, periphery, and dynamic 'area'.

The core must possess both features and some other characteristics typical of analytism, such as nominative regularity in the face of irregular ways of fulfilling the nominative task. Nominal regularity, in V.N. Telia's work, refers to the ability, due to the 'related' meaning of the component word, to denote meanings that have a general categorical content, typical for aspectual and aspectual-temporal values, for meanings correlated with deep semantic 'cases' [32]. Irregularity is due to the use of lexical means not belonging to function words forming analytical forms, as well as to 'direct' ways of expressing evaluative or actant meanings [29, p. 66].

In a nominative approach to combinations in this area, analytical designations of elements of the 'subject series' should be included (generic-species and partial designations of existing objects, which are named according to specific features or the relationship between part and whole. For example, "белое вино" (white wine), "зелёный чай" (green tea), "носик чайника" (the spout of a teapot).

The periphery of the domain consists of combinations that tend towards proper analytical forms of the meaning of the key word (e.g., "оказать помощь" (to provide assistance), "большой

успех" (great success)); combinations in which the associated meanings tend to acquire their own denotation, that is, due to usage, they are still 'attached' to the semantic key word, but have already gained nominative 'specialization' (e.g., "приходить к решению" (to come to a decision), "поле деятельности" (field of activity)); combinations intermediate between idioms and analytical lexical collocations (e.g., "приходить в голову" (to come to mind), "выпустить в трубу" (to let out into the pipe)). Like idioms, all their components are completely reinterpreted, but together, the dominance of the nominal component is realized [29, p. 68].

The dynamic area of this class is represented by combinations (e.g., those that emerged during the period of restructuring) that are fully integrated into the regular nominative paradigm but are irregular in terms of the lexical expression of the meanings specified in the nominative 'matrix'. For example, "пирог власти" (the pie of power), "дитя застоя" (the child of stagnation), "коридоры власти" (the corridors of power).

Combinations included in the domain of phraseology 2, according to E.G. Borisova, are complemented by 'phraseems', which are a group of word combinations "one of whose components can only be used in combination with another component, which, in turn, is used quite freely..." For example, "щурить глаза" (to squint), "shrug shoulders" [9, p. 91].

D.O. Dobrovolsky's classification of idioms is based on a communicative-functional principle:

- Idioms in the qualifying (characterizing) function: "точить лясы" (to sharpen awls, denoting an action), "хоть пруд пруди" (in abundance, denoting a quantitative characteristic).

- Idioms in the identifying function: proper names ("Медный всадник" - "The Bronze Horseman"), terms ("адамово яблоко" - "Adam's apple"), object nominations ("чёрный ворон" - "black crow").

- Idioms in the function of modal operators: expressing evaluative meaning ("грешным делом" - "sinfully"), expressing emotional meaning ("Была не была!" - "Once upon a time!").

- Idioms in the function of utterances: "лёд тронулся" (the ice is broken), "жребий брошен" (the die is cast) [12, pp. 49–53].

R. Moon also considers English idioms from a functional aspect and distinguishes 5 groups based on their main functions: informational idioms (e.g., "to catch sight of something," "for sale," conveying information); evaluative idioms (e.g., "kid's stuff," "a different kettle of fish," conveying evaluation, the speaker's attitude); situational (e.g.,

"long time no see," "knock it off," reflecting context, responding to a situation); modalizing (e.g., "I kid you not," "you know what I mean," conveying true values); organizing (e.g., "by the way," "for instance," organizing text, denoting discourse construction) [37, pp. 496–497].

Polysemy in phraseology occurs when "the same unit, in the same sound structure and form, has meanings semantically related to its other meanings." For example, "odds and ends": 1) remnants, scraps; 2) bits of information, conversation [1, pp. 3–4, 131]. According to D.O. Dobrovolsky, "the following statistical regularity is noted: the wider the semantics of the phraseological unit, the less likely polysemy is to occur..." [11, p. 98].

An example of homonymy in phraseology is when "the meanings of the phraseological unit are incompatible." For example, "out of hand": 1) out of control; 2) immediately [1, p. 4, 120].

According to D.O. Dobrovolsky, phraseological synonymy (e.g., "play cards close to the vest" = "play cards close to the chest"; "put someone out to grass" = "put someone out to pasture") is much more common than lexical synonymy, to the extent of forming long chains of practically absolute phraseological synonyms, which in the domain of lexis is a rare exception [11, p. 98].

According to V.N. Telia, "cultural connotation is, in the most general sense, the interpretation of the denotative or metaphorically motivated, quasi-denotative, aspects of meaning in cultural categories. Applied to units of the phraseological composition of language as signs of secondary nomination, the characteristic feature of which is the figurative-situational motivation, which is directly related to the worldview of the people - the carriers of the language, the center of cultural connotation, its main nerve is this figurative basis" [29, p. 214]. Phraseological units emerge in national languages based on such a figurative representation of reality that reflects the everyday-empirical, historical, or spiritual experience of the language community, which is undoubtedly linked to its cultural traditions because the subject of nomination and speech activity is always a subject of national culture [30, p. 13].

The system of images fixed in the phraseological composition of the language serves as a kind of 'niche' for the accumulation of worldview and is somehow connected with the material, social, or spiritual culture of the given language community, and therefore can testify to its cultural-national experience and traditions. If language units have cultural-national specificity, then the latter must have its ways of reflecting it and means of correlating with it, that is, serve as a kind of 'link' connecting into a single chain the 'body of the sign' on the one hand, and concepts, stereotypes, benchmarks, symbols, mythologems, and other signs of culture on the other. The means

of embodying the cultural-national specificity of phraseological units is the figurative basis, and the way of indicating this specificity is the interpretation of the figurative basis in the sign cultural-national 'space' of the language community. Such an interpretation constitutes the content of cultural-national connotation [29, pp. 215–216].

The study of the cultural-national connotation of phraseological units should be conducted against the background of the problem of the relationship between language and culture as two semiotic systems [29, p. 228]. The system of language values correlates interpretatively with the cultural competence of language speakers [29, p. 230]. Only when the figurative content manifested in the 'literal' reading of phraseological units is correlated with the categories, concepts, mythologems, stereotypes, and benchmarks of national culture and interpreted in this space of material, social, or spiritual culture does the culturally significant meaning of the image itself open up [29, p. 231]. Against the background of this correlation, phraseological units themselves acquire the role of cultural stereotypes [29, p. 232].

Since the late 1970s, research in phraseology has paid special attention to more detailed aspects of the functioning of phraseological units: the phraseological activity of certain classes of words (e.g., nouns: [22]); the study of specific types of phraseological units (e.g., speech stereotypes and clichés: [48; 31]; paired phrases like "cake and ale," "neck and crop": [23]); the consideration of phraseological units in sentence structure [14] and their variability [26].

CONCLUSION

Phraseology is a rich and complex system within language, encompassing various types of units with distinct characteristics. These units can range from fully idiomatic expressions (like "to kick the bucket") to those with more literal meanings but complex structures (like "good morning"). Their figurative nature and historical grounding connect them to the cultural experiences of a language community.

The analysis of phraseology considers multiple dimensions. These include categorization based on meaning and structure, the concept of idiomaticity, the functional roles these units play in communication, and the underlying cultural knowledge they represent. Understanding these different aspects is crucial for appreciating the full significance of phraseology in language.

Future research in phraseology appears to be moving towards a more detailed examination of specific areas. This includes exploring the behavior of particular word classes within phraseology, investigating specific types of phraseological units, and analyzing how these units' function within sentences and how their forms might vary. Additionally,



the field continues to explore the best ways to represent phraseological units in dictionaries.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, R. J. (1992). Fixed Expressions, Idioms and Phraseology in Recent English Learner's Dictionaries. In H. Tommola et al. (Eds.), EURALEX'92 I-II. Proceedings (pp. I-II). Tampere.
2. Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, K. (1986). Lexicographic Description of English. Amsterdam-Philadelphia.
3. Botha, W. (1992). The Lemmatization of Expressions in Descriptive Dictionaries. In H. Tommola et al. (Eds.), EURALEX'92 I-II. Proceedings (pp. I-II). Tampere.
4. Cowie, A. P. (1998). Phraseological Dictionaries: Some East-West Comparisons. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications* (pp. XX-XX). Oxford.
5. Dobrovol'skij, D. (2000). Contrastive Idiom Analysis: Russian and German Idioms in Theory and in the Bilingual Dictionary. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 13(3).
6. Dobrovol'skij, D. (1994). Idioms in a Semantic Network: Towards a New Dictionary-Type. In W. Martin et al. (Eds.), EURALEX'94 I-II. Proceedings (pp. XX-XX). Amsterdam.
7. Gates, E. (1988). The Treatment of Multiword Lexemes in Some Current Dictionaries of English. In M. Snell-Hornby (Ed.), *ZüriLEX'86. Proceedings* (pp. XX-XX). Tübingen.
8. Heid, U. (1994). On the Ways Words Work Together – Topics in Lexical Combinatorics. In W. Martin et al. (Eds.), EURALEX'94 I-II. Proceedings (pp. XX-XX). Amsterdam.
9. Lorentzen, H. (1996). Lemmatization of Multiword Lexical Units: In which Entry? In M. Gellerstam et al. (Eds.), EURALEX'96 I-II. Proceedings (pp. XX-XX). Goteborg.
10. Lubensky, S. (1991). Approaches to a Russian-English Dictionary of Idioms. *Dictionaries*,
11. Moon, R. (1992). "There is Reason in the Roasting of Eggs": a Consideration of Fixed Expressions in Native-Speaker Dictionaries. In H. Tommola et al. (Eds.), EURALEX'92 I-II. Proceedings (pp. XX-XX). Tampere.
12. Nattinger, J. R. (1980). A Lexical Phrase Grammar for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(3).



13. Alëkhina, A. I. (1978). Semanticheskie gruppy vo frazeologii sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka [Semantic groups in the phraseology of modern English]. Minsk.
14. Amosova, N. N. (1963). Osnovy angliyskoy frazeologii [Fundamentals of English phraseology]. L.
15. Arnold, I. V. (1973). Leksikologiya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka [Lexicology of modern English]. M.
16. Ahmanova, O. S. (1957). Ocherki po obshchey i russkoy leksikologii [Essays on general and Russian lexicology]. M.
17. Babkin, A. M. (1979). Idiomatika (frazeologiya) v yazyke i slovare [Idioms (phraseology) in language and dictionary]. Sovremennaya russkaya leksikografiya: 1977. L.
18. Babkin, A. M. (1981). Idiomatika i grammatika v slovare [Idioms and grammar in the dictionary]. Sovremennaya russkaya leksikografiya, M.
19. Babkin, A. M. (1964). Leksikograficheskaya razrabotka russkoy frazeologii [Lexicographic development of Russian phraseology]. M.
20. Baranov, A. N., & Dobrovolskiy, D. O. (1996). Idiomatichnost i idiomy [Idiomaticity and idioms]. VY, 5.
21. Borisova, E. G. (1990). Tipologiya sostavlyayushchikh paketa "Ustoychivye slovosochetaniya" [Typology of components of the "Stable word combinations" package]. In V. N. Telya (Ed.), Frazeografiya v Mashinnom fonde russkogo yazyka. M.
22. Vinogradov, V. V. (1977). Izbrannye trudy: Leksikologiya i leksikografiya [Selected Works: Lexicology and lexicography]. M.
23. Dobrovolskiy, D. O. (1991). K probleme frazeologicheskikh universalii [On the problem of phraseological universals].
24. Dobrovolskiy, D. O. (1990). Tipologiya idiom [Typology of idioms]. In V. N. Telya (Ed.), Frazeografiya v Mashinnom fonde russkogo yazyka. M.
25. Dobrovolskiy, D. O. (1997). Natsional'no-kul'turnaya spetsifika vo frazeologii (I) [National-cultural specificity in phraseology (I)]. VY, 6.
26. Zhukov, V. P. (1978). Semantika frazeologicheskikh oborotov [Semantics of phraseological expressions]. M.
27. Zimin, V. I. (1977). O vazhnom komponente slovarnoy stat'i uchebnogo frazeologicheskogo slovarya [On the important component of the dictionary entry of an educational phraseological dictionary]. In V. A. Red'kin (Ed.), Aktual'nye problemy uchebnoy leksikografii. M.
28. Kasares, Kh. (1958). Vvedenie v sovremennuyu leksikografiyu [Introduction to modern lexicography]. M.



29. Kornev, A. I. (1981). Rol' ustoychivyykh sochetaniy v razvitii semantiki slova [The role of stable combinations in the development of word semantics]. In *Sovremennaya russkaya leksikografiya*: 1980. L.
30. Kunin, A. V. (1996). Kurs frazeologii angliyskogo yazyka: Uchebnik [Course of English phraseology: Textbook]. M.
31. Kunin, A. V. (2001). *Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar'* [English-Russian phraseological dictionary] (3rd ed., stereotype). M.
32. Malakhovskiy, L. V. (1984). Razmeshchenie frazeologizmov v slovare. Teoreticheskie soobrazheniya sostavitelya i interesy chitatelya [Placement of phraseological units in the dictionary. Theoretical considerations of the compiler and interests of the reader]. In *Teoriya i praktika sovremennoy leksikografii*. L.
33. Margulis, V. D. (1987). *Izuchenie znacheniya slovosochetaniya i semantiki teksta* [Studying the meaning of word combinations and text semantics]. Sverdlovsk.
34. Medvedeva, T. V. (1990). *Frazeologicheskaya aktivnost' suschestvitel'nogo v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke* [Phraseological activity of the noun in modern English] (Candidate dissertation). M.
35. Medvedeva, L. M., & Dayneko, V. V. (1989). *Parnye slovosochetaniya angliyskogo yazyka* [Pairing word combinations in the English language]. Kiev.
36. Mokienko, V. M. (1990). *Zagadki russkoy frazeologii* [Puzzles of Russian phraseology]. M.
37. Molotkov, A. N. (1977). *Osnovy frazeologii russkogo yazyka* [Basics of Russian phraseology]. L.
38. Nenina, R. N. (1986). O semanticheskom variirovanii frazeologicheskikh edinit v okkazional'nom upotreblenii [On the semantic variation of phraseological units in occasional use]. In *Semantika sintaksicheskikh edinit v germanskikh yazykakh: Mezhvuzovskiy tematicheskii sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Gorkiy.
39. Smirnit'skiy, A. I. (1956). *Leksikologiya angliyskogo yazyka* [Lexicology of the English language]. M.
40. Stupin, L. P. (1985). *Leksikografiya angliyskogo yazyka* [Lexicography of the English language]. M.

