

NEOPHRASEMICS IN THE CONTEXT OF LINGUO-COGNITIVE SYNERGETICS

N.F. Alefirenko¹, L.Yu. Kasyanova²

¹Belgorod National Research University, ²Astrakhan State University (RUSSIA)
E-mails: n-alefirenko@rambler.ru, kaslyudmila@yandex.ru

DOI: 10.7813/jil.2015/6-3/14

Received: 04 Jun, 2015

Accepted: 16 Jul, 2015

ABSTRACT

The processes of neophraseologization are considered from the viewpoint of a new scientific paradigm of the modern linguistics – linguo-cognitive synergetics that comprises mechanisms of (1) discursive pragmatics, because phrasemic semiosis is designated primarily to serve and express communicative-pragmatic intentions of communicators, and mechanisms (2) of linguo-creative mind that provide secondary semiosis with the core thing: the opportunity to extract knowledge and experience from the words, already encoded by the semantic system of a language, for them to be associative-notionally re-encoded into the signs of indirect derivative nomination.

Key words: neophraseme, linguo-cognitive science, concept, frame, cognitive-onomasiological processes, universal objective code, meaning

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the last third of the 20th century European languages have been a subject to the influence of such a strong “neogenic” factor that a new science – neology – emerged, and as a part of it (due to neophraseological boom of the beginning of 21st century) – phraseological neology² (Mokienko V.M., 2002: 63). Phraseological neology is to identify new phrasemes and their meanings, to analyze their usage in speech, as well as to structure phraseme-generating models and create phraseological neologies principles (Walter H., Mokienko V., 2001).

Phraseological innovations are diverse in their forms as well as in their meaning that results in certain difficulties in defining neophrasemes, in differentiating them from other various innovations, which traditionally create a marginal zone of phraseographical neology (among them there are *transformations*, *ocasionalisms*, *hapax legomena* – author’s individual word use, etc.). However, upon strengthening of discursive-cognitive paradigm position in the modern linguistics the distinction between core and marginal phrasemes is fading, because the origination of a new phraseme within the discourse marginal zone is as informative, as the phrasemes semiosis within the language onomasiological system.

Application of cognitive onomasiology principles and categories to phraseological neology will allow determining the regularities of formation of new knowledge representation structures, finding out cognitive factors that promote origination of new phrasemes, which become “the most important means of the world’s conceptual segmentation and viewing” (Kasyanova L.Yu., 2008: 99). Using this approach we should remember that (1) neophraseologization begins with **pragmatics** (within each constructional unit phrasemic semiosis represents an egocentrically-oriented mechanism that has a special designation: *to serve and express communicative-pragmatic intentions of communicators*); and (2) the main source of new phrasemes origination is **linguo-creative mind**, based on the knowledge and experience, encoded by the language semantic system and socially and historically attached to appropriate language signs in a long-term memory of each member of an ethno-lingual society. Therefore, linguo-cognitive synergetics principles, which in their nature correspond to the essence of the phenomenon, provide a comprehensive understanding of phrasemes origination regularities as if from the inside, from the starting point of a phraseme origination.

Phraseme-Generating Concepts: Factors of Their Occurrence

While searching for an ontological character of the concepts, which create new phrasemes, we rely on the understanding of the phrasemes communicative-pragmatic designation. Their designation is rather to express an evaluative-notional attitude towards the subjects than to nominate them (Alefirenko N.F., 2004: 70). Thus speakers choose the phrasemes in order to express adequately an evaluative- emotive meaning, projected by our verbal and cogitative intentions, in the context of the relevant discursive situation. The discourse is a kind of «a melting pot», where a concept – a cogitative configuration that creates a phraseme – is casting, and evaluative- emotive, or mode, semantics is the content of the “pot”. Consequently such a concept, resulting from a discursive activity for mode semantics presentation, needs not just a nondirect notation, but an indirect one. We call such an output of discursive mind as phrasemes-generating concepts of a discursive-synergetic nature.

One of the most important categorical features of the discourse is its ability to create a new meaning that is non-additive towards the semantics of its text components. This meaning-generating ability is determined by the fact that the discourse, unlike with an actual utterance, consists of the elements of the discourses expressed previously. Complicated semantic configurations, which are in need of various means of secondary notation, originate in the underlying layers of the discourse. It is there where under the necessary conditions the contradictions between the factors, which form the discourse structure, aggravate, and it results in the first sparks of linguo-creative stimulation of the indirect derivative semiosis processes.

Cognitive structures, which formed again in our consciousness and which we call the phraseme-generating concepts (among them there are the true concepts, frames, images and ideas), are the primary sources of phrasemes origination. The objective of a cognitive-onomasiological research on neophrasemics is determined by a reasonable necessity to trace the process (I) from the origination of a new cognitive structure in the course of learning blanks on the cognitive map or rethinking

and redrawing of some fragments of the current world-image (*extralinguistic* factors) up to (II) neophrasemics origination in a certain discursive space and its acceptance by the language system (*linguo-cognitive* factors themselves).

I. The main extralinguistic factors of new phrasemes origination include:

1) **socio-political events**: wars, rebellions, revolutions, «perestroika» in post-soviet period (Arhangelska A., 2002: 217) lead to moral decadence, in this context the position of criminals and influence of their morality strengthen, legal conscience acquires criminal character, crime rate increases, the styles mix, the language democratizes. Semantic neophraseologization occurs. Compare primary and secondary meanings of the neophrasemes: *горячая точка* (*literally a flash point*) – 1) 'the place of fierce armed conflicts' and 2) 'any acute conflict situation', *златая цепь на дубе том* (*literally oak with a gold chain bound*) – 1) the lines from A.S. Pushkn's poem «Ruslan and Ludmila» and 2) speaking about 'nouveau riche', *обвешать косяком*³ (*literally to hang with cock-ups*) – 1) *косяк* – 'guilt, a measure of «bad» affairs' and 2) 'to bring many indictments';

2) **urbanization** (spread of argotic expressions, their penetration into common national language are usually promoted by urban population increase; professional criminality centers in such criminogenic places as railroad stations, markets, restaurants, bars); compare: *кинуть на бабку* (*literally to scam in money affair*) – 'to get money by deceit', *кинуть по соточке* (*literally to cast a hundred*) – 'to drink 100 grams of alcohol', *кинуть тачку* (*literally scam a car*) – 'to leave a taxi without paying for it', *кинуть фишку* (*literally to toss a chip*) – 'to pull a stunt';

3) **legal and criminogenic** (in prisons people exchange the argotic phrasemes, unprofessional criminals learn them, and subsequently, they transfer them into conversational speech): *цграть на пианино* (*literally to play the piano*) – 'to have fingerprints scanned', *крошить батон, катить баллон* (*literally to crumb a French bread, to roll a balloon*) – 'to treat somebody aggressively';

3) **cultural and educational** (mass-media, actors, politicians demonstrate «a pyramid principle», when the argotic phrasemes are initially used at the top and then they lift down to the base and occur in use of people at large): *звездная болезнь* (*literally star sickness*) – 'superiority complex', *звездная пыль* (*literally star dust*) – a new TV-project about Bohemian life and moral, *перекрыть кислород* (*literally to shut off oxygen flow*) – polit. 'to limit access to livelihoods', *черная дыра* (*literally a black hole*) – 'the circumstances demanding enormous funds', *мыльная опера* (*literally a soap opera*) – 'cheerjack series';

4) **socio-psychic** (they are mostly linked with young people's perception of the argotic expressions, sometimes young people reach out for the things that are prohibited; the use of argotic expressions is promoted by a specific tendency to use or to imitate a criminal language; sometimes lack of education contributes to the argotic expressions transfer to colloquial language) (compare: Birih A., Mateshich J., 2002: 34): instead of *иди отсюда* (*literally get away*) people say *крути педали, пока не дали* (*literally spin the pedals while you are not whammed*); *иди в баню* (*literally go to sauna*) / *кактусы полоть* (*прореживать*) (*literally go to weed cactuses*) / *кури* (*literally go smoking*) / *луну расчесывай* (*literally brush the moon*) / *море асфальтируй* (*literally pave the sea with asphalt*) / *пасись* (*literally be at grass*) / *тайгу подметаю* (*literally sweep the taiga*) / *туда, где солнце всходит* (*literally go where the sun rises*) / *тусуйся* (*literally go and mess around*) / *упади* (*literally fall down*); *иди ты на художника учиться* (*literally go to learn to be an artist*); *иди пропылесось пустыню /иди тундру пылесось* (*literally go to vacuum clean a desert/ tundra*) – 'get out of the light, mind your own business'; *роза отсохла* (*literally horns withered*) – 'being tired of lessons'.

The neophrasemes of a slang origin are used as the means of expressive self-realization rather than the signs of social affiliation (*толкнуть телегу*⁴ (*literally to give a push to a horse vehicle*) – 'to inform', *фильтровать базар*⁵ (*literally to filter a bazaar*) – 'to watch one's speech, to mince words, to guard one's words'. For example: What do you say? **Watch your mouth** even for a little bit! ~ **Watch your mouth** and no hocks (Базар. 2001. No 9). In fact, the origination of the phrasemes of that kind is linked with the need in *fashionable neology*, the artificially high expression of which is usually made by a language game. Compare: *Клава, я валяюсь!* (*literally Klava, I'm lolling*) – 'the expression of admiration, amazedness'; *порвать как старую грелку* (*literally to tear somebody like an old hot water bag*) – 'to cause offence' *пролетела птица обломинго* (*literally an oblomingo⁶ flew over*) – speaking about 'a failed plan'. As the language metaphorically fades over time, slang neophrasemes are aimed to «refresh» the language. For example, as *баки*⁷ *эколачивать* (*literally to beat into tanks*), *вола*⁸ *вертеть* (*literally to twist an ox*) and etc. emerged in order to represent the concept «deceit».

The phrasemes, originated on the basis of argot, are even much more expressive. Argot-based neophrasemics is more often characterized by the use of cynical and rude euphemism, aimed to cover criminal actions by commonly used lexical units: *поцарапать пером*⁹ (*literally to scratch with a feather*) – 'to stab', *чистая работа* (*literally clean/nice job*) – 'a successful theft'. The cynicism of these neophrasemes, intrinsic to a criminal world, is usually at the back of the phrasemes argot. For example, the neophraseme *ботать*¹⁰ *по фене* (*literally to speak in criminals' argot*) that was primarily used in argot in neutral stylistic meaning (*по фене ботать* – 'to speak the language of ofeni – small traders') has undergone semantic neophraseologization and nowadays means 'to speak in criminals' argot'. Now the lexical component *феня* is also used out of the phraseme, describing the whole social drop-outs' lexis that is the basis of argot. Argot neophrasemes, transferring into slang, may lose a part of their discursive space. That way, the phraseme *дать по рогам* (*literally to beat on horns*) was used in argot discourse in three meanings – 1) 'to cast out from a professional criminal gang', 2) 'to prohibit to live in a certain place after release from the prison', 3) 'to beat'. In the common youth argotic discourse this phraseme is known only in its third meaning. Such phrasemes, originated in argot and transferred into slang, enrich the repertoire of conversational style (Alekseenko M.A., 2002: 23): *забивать стрелку*¹¹ (*literally to ram a pointer*) – 'to arrange the time and place to meet', *не переводить стрелку*¹² (*literally do not throw a switch*) – 'not to shift the blame'; *крыша поехала* (*literally the roof has gone*¹³) – 'to be out of one's mind'. In the context of conversational style they gain some syntagmatic freedom. Compare the variation of (a) verbal component in the phrasemes *крыша поехала* (*съехала, едет, поедет*) (*literally has gone, is going away, will go*), *течет* (*протекает, протекла*) (*literally is leaking, has a leak*), *едет* (*поехала, отъезжает*) (*literally is moving, leaving*), *улетает* (*слетает*) (*literally is flying away*); *крышу сносит* (*снесло, снесет*) (*literally is blown away*); (b) noun component *крыша* – *крышняк / крышак*¹⁴ *поехал, дымит* (*literally is leaving, smoking*).

On the cognitive-onomasiological ground the neophrasemes may be divided into four groups. Neophrasemes of the first group emerge in order to name realia and concepts, which have not existed in the people's life before. The second group neophrasemes are set up to name phenomena, which have already existed but have not got a name for whatever reasons, for example, due to ideological character. The third group includes the neophrasemes, defining realia, which do not exist in a real life, but are expected and may be dreamt about providing further scientific and technical development. The

forth group consists of the neophrasemes that duplicate the words with the same meaning. They may be full synonyms with equal meaning but with different expressive-stylistic connotations.

Cognitive-Onomasiological Stimuli of Neophraseologization

Lingvo-pragmatical analysis of neophrasemes presupposes identification of cognitive-onomasiological schemes, which stimulate the origination of words collocations on the basis of an appropriate associative-notional motivation (Kasyanova L.Yu., 2006: 97). The basis for such schemes is represented by the concepts, underlying phraseological nomination, because it is at the level of concepts where all the processes, linked with the formation of the whole unit meaning, run (E.S. Kubryakova). Therefore, the cognitive-onomasiological analysis of neophrasemics has its subject in defining the phraseme-generating concept and reconstructing a cognitive-onomasiological mechanism of indirect derivative nomination of a cognoscible or reconsidered object.

The information that is potentially-important from the viewpoint of communicative pragmatics and considered as the subject of sensuous experience, usually needs expressive figurative notation, which would transmit axiological attitude towards this information of the cognition actor, both personal and collective, rather than objective and impartial notation. The signs of direct nomination cannot meet this communicative-pragmatic challenge. With the help of associative mind the language consciousness searches for *new symbols* (Georgieva S., 2002: 117) of indirect derivative character.

Representation of the knowledge on a primary denotative situation, which needs a communicative-pragmatic adaptation, initially acquires a frame structure that can act as an independent cognitive substrate of a phraseological meaning, transform into a kind of superconcept, a idea or image. Frame is the most typical cognitive structure for phraseological semantics, because the knowledge concentrates around a certain concept, with which the core, typical and potentially-important information associates (T.A. van Dijk). In this case the neophraseme structure gains a field organization: its nucleus correlates with the concept in its genetic source, while its periphery correlates with the frame. The phraseological meaning nucleus, correlated with the concept, is an intensional meaning, and the periphery, correlated with the frame, is an implicational meaning.

Thus, the meaning nucleus of the neophraseme *железный занавес* (*literally an iron curtain*) – ‘the mask of inapproachability’ is the concept «impenetrability», generally representing a secondary denotative structure «to keep (to make) a straight face, concealing a person’s thoughts and mood». The implicational meaning (phraseological meaning periphery) – “deliberately conceal something through particular behavior or a straight face” – is genetically linked with the primary denotation. Two stable situations are its denotative correlates: a) “to build a strong, impenetrable barrier” and b) “an external policy of a closed society”. It is these denotative situations that serve as afferent associative sources of the first-order phraseological connotation: «the mask, veiling the face» that associates with a famous image of «an iron mask» etc. Then the second-order phraseological connotations develop on the basis of inherent associations: a) “a reserved person, who manage to conceal his or her thoughts, emotions and feelings”; b) “effective concealment”. Due to special notional connections (genetic, paradigmatic, epigrammatic) between the specified connotations they form a complicated implicational frame-typed structure.

The concept is a sense-generating source of the phraseological semantics, and the frame is a cognitive basis of the phraseological sign interpretant. Moreover, the concept and the frame correlate as the cognitive mechanisms of the neophrasemes *neologization* and *understanding*. Due to such a cognitive status they «have to» duplicate their structure in order to achieve common understanding, necessary for a communication.

Newly formed frame-structures, which are communicatively and pragmatically relevant, usually verbalize in phraseological neologisms. The neophraseme formed in this way is a verbal analogue of the frame that is usually based on a proposition or a complex of propositions. The frame structure consists of the complex of units and terminals, usually arranged in two levels. The frame-structure upper levels contain conceptual information of an intensional character, the lower levels (terminals) – variative information, confined to a certain communicative-pragmatic situation. The units, or the slots, as obligatory components are characterized by speech (contextual) dependence and, thus, can be expressed in the language in many ways. Compare the slots and the terminal of the frame «to deceive». 3 slots may be distinguished within its structure: a) **the source** – indication of the reason for deceit, b) **the event** – indication of the process itself and its characteristics (the way of deceit commitment, intensity, extension) and c) **the result** – indication of how the deceit influenced other people and the person who is subject to the deceit. These are obligatory components of the frame «to deceive». But as a rule, in a certain communicative-pragmatic situation they appear in different forms: *звать мулю* (*literally to drive lie*) – (1) to deceive, *забить мулю* – ‘to deceive (for once)’, *забить телегу* (*literally to ram/beat a horse vehicle*) – ‘to tell tall tales’, *загонять мулю*¹⁵ – ‘to deceive’; *кинуть на бабки* – to get money by deceit, *звать пургу* (*literally to make a snowstorm-the same as “to speak through one’s hat”*) – (2) to deceive; *ездить по ушам* (*literally to drive somebody’s ear off*) – to deceive and other.

The origination of neophrasemes in the language is connected with the structuring and integral composition of a «newly born meaning» that, according to G.G. Shpet, expresses the individual consciousness rooted in a personal existence of a human being (see: Zinchenko V.P., 1998: 70). Such a connection is necessary as linguistic signs, including the neophrasemes, link the personal consciousness, within which this new meaning emerged, with the social consciousness, the culture. In should be emphasized that our mind can make this link only with the help of a «living» sign such as the neophraseme. Only neophraseme, being a real living sign, is able to realize «living concepts» - the vision of a cognoscible object from the inside that was called «understanding of the people’s spirit» before – through verbal and cogitative activity. It determines the objectified natural connection between the thought and the culture – the cult of birth, transformation, rebirth and understanding of the spirit, enclosed in a living neophraseme that is sometimes rather a strange collocation. However, the infraction of a habitual notional distribution turns to be a cognitively-justified play on words that is aimed to associate *logic* and *sensuous* energies of the cognition actor. At this stage of the concept objectification every such word, considered to be a potential frame-generating element, acts as a cultural archetype, because its referent is a primary axiological perception of the cognoscible object. If a word as a primary nominate is a cultural archetype, then an interpreted living word, involved in the process of the phraseme-origination is a *genotype* – the complex of all the innate characters of the original concept – and at the same time a *phenotype*. In other words, the semantics of the phraseme-generating lexical unit is a complex of all the features and characters, developed during the verbalization process of the particular living knowledge (compare: Zinchenko V.P., 1998: 72) that needs to be objectified by a certain neophraseme. The living concept, objectified by the neophraseme, contains cognitive, operating and evaluative components – those creative constructs, which then will develop into an integral, although multilayered semantic content of the cultural concept that is the basis for the neophraseme semantics.

Thus, *neophraseme as a real living sign of our language consciousness is the means to condensate the verbalized concept multiplex notional energy*. If we rephrase P.A. Florenskiy's idea about the word, the neophraseme, concentrating the living concept energy, will become the lightning «that tears the sky apart from the east to the west, presenting a materialized essence»: as the philosopher said, in the neophraseme «the accumulated energies come to the balance and to the integrity» (Florenskiy P.A., 1990: 292). Such a balance between sensuous objective and logic aspects in the neophraseme meaning can be achieved with the help of its ability not only to create an image, but also to form a concept, penetrating into the essence of the reflected and cognoscible objects. By its external form acoustically the neophraseme evokes in a person's mind an ostensive and intuitive image of the referent. Subsequently, the neophraseme, although being the element of the second signal system, does not lose the link with the first signal system sensitive forms of thought. Condensation of an internal meaning (a signified sign) develops a vision. And in their asymmetrical dualism they (acoustical image and internal meaning) represent to our mind a concept as a cognitive category, naturally combining sensuous objective and everyday conceptual aspects. Particularly due to the neophraseme's ability to define both a gestalt and a cognitive structure depending on the communication conditions and objectives allows it being the universal means in human discursive activity, because the expressions of particular and abstractive things are not autonomous. They are two synergetic wings, providing blue-sky discursive thinking.

Thus, contrary to the units of other (not natural language) sign systems, neophraseme not only fulfills the functions of replacement or defining: neophraseme is a discursive, active substance that transforms into a thing (O. Mandelstam). Its origination is connected with sensuous experience of analyzed and generalized features, qualities and characteristics of the cognoscible reality designated fragment, and with their further being wrapped in a certain cognitive package (a concept, a gestalt or a frame). In this analytico-synthesizing activity of the language consciousness we can distinguish the features, which are the most relevant for a particular discursive situation, and that may result in the neophraseme polysemy: *раскидывать /раскинуть рамы*¹⁶ (to mix up something) – 1) 'to explain something, to sort out someone's relationship'; 2) 'to think, to reflect'; 3) 'to boast'; *парить мозги* (literally to stew someone's brain) – 1) 'to do a brainwork'; 2) 'to give too much information, to wear somebody down'. In accordance with L.S. Vygotskiy's conception, the language consciousness, which has numerous discursive characteristics, can be called a structural supersystem of the world image. Its accommodation and assimilation mechanisms help to finish the processing of sensuous perception of reality into a cognitive-pragmatic consciousness dominant. According to A.A. Uhtomskiy's neuropsychic doctrine, when our body reflects a certain fragment of the reality, a dominant excitation focus activates and takes the control over the whole system of the body's reactions. Dominant principle, as per A.A. Uhtomskiy, serves as physiological basis not only for attention, but also for objective mind. Therefore, each cognitive structure (a cultural concept, a vision or an idea) is the result of a dominant a person experienced once, and its aim is to distinguish *important, currently relevant* things and to inhibit secondary or even indifferent things. The dominants of that kind, standing between the ethnocultural consciousness and the world, project specific features of neophrasemes internal forms even in closely allied languages; these features, in their turn, determine the originality of the neophrasemes composition. A new image develops through the meanings accession (bleeding or combinatorics) around a presuppositional characteristic, which is more often objectified by a metaphor. It is it that is the neophraseme cognitive basis. Compare: *обломот пробежал* (literally *oblomot has passed by*) – (speaking about failure, using the contamination of the words *oblom* (a failure) and *begemot* (a hippo)) 'unfulfilled plans', *парикмахер Котоевского* (literally *Kotovskiy's hairdresser*) – humor. speaking 'about something non-existent' (the presuppositional characteristic: *Kotovskiy*, a Civil war hero, was bold).

The neophraseme initial cognitive substrate is a universal (representational) objective code (UOC). It is the neophraseme meaning structure objective framework, on the basis of which the neophraseme internal form emerges (more details: Alefirenko N.F., 2004: 75). UOC is a mediate scheme between the neophraseme and the subject of indirect derivative nomination; the objective framework is an amodal (impartial) image of some already occurred or a future objective action, a core element of a thought. In the course of discursive activity UOC and the objective framework transform into the neophraseme «living» internal form that gives rise to a significative (notional) nucleus and the new phraseme's meaning connotations. Subsequently, in the motion (development) of the meaning some new basic components of the neophraseme semantic structure form: UOC – the scheme, localized in internal language; the objective framework includes the amodal image of the action, a motor program, a virtual reality. The objective framework gets a certain discursive meaning through the neophraseme. The internal form, based on UOC and the objective framework, fill the neophraseme semantics with energy and personal drive to cognition, thus, providing a verbalized meaning with a «living» motion. Actually, UOC and the objective framework to a certain extent serve as the earth (objective) gravity, as a mooring that fix the neophraseme with its denotation, without which the meaning becomes as elusive as the Firebird. At the same time, they act as the springboard for further conceptualization (semantic development). Having cognized the essence of the nominated object through the phraseme-generation process, the consciousness matches a phraseological meaning with the relevant objective meaning, because particularly predicates form and distinguish significative meanings (N.D. Arutyunova, Yu.S. Stepanov). Using the springboard metaphor, G.G. Shpet writes: «Having pushed off from the springboard, the thought should not only overcome substantial resistance but also should use it as a supporting medium» (Shpet G.G., 1994: 397). It is the springboard of our emotional experience that actually gives rise to different neophraseme connotative meanings.

2. CONCLUSION

Since the neophrasemes generation is reasoned by the need in the signs of indirect derivative nomination, their formation, along with external factors, is under domination of the immanent laws of development, renewal, intrasystem transformation and language perfection, and among them there are main ones.

1. Generating function of synergetic opportunities *уа* the language system: (a) the actualization of the processes of dissipative structures self-formation, nonlinearity and instability of complicated dynamic systems evolution, (b) the application of bifurcation mechanisms (more details: Alefirenko N.F., 2007). The bifurcation (the main synergetic feature) activates a potential dynamics of spontaneous self-organization of complicated open unbalanced unstable linear systems through the interaction between the internal factors of language structures evolution, with the factors creating new structures in the course of macro-bifurcations: *летающая тарелка* (literally *a flying saucer*) – 'UFO'; *тряхнуть пыль с ушей* (literally *to shake off dust from one's ears*) – 'to cut a bumptious person down to size'. Unlike traditional paradigms, neologization synergetics presupposes to study neophrasemics not as an *accomplished* fact, but as *arising* one, in other words, it concentrates not on the neophraseme existence, but on its dynamics.

2. «Linguistic economy law», when in the context of cognitive-discursive activity the speakers create the expressive figurative units, which can efficiently replace the whole texts and laconically deliver eventive semantics. Compare: *черта бедности* (literally a poverty line) – ‘the standard of living that presupposes consumption of material values at the minimum level’; *включить печатный станок* (literally to turn on printing presses) – ‘to mint money, not provided with the commodity production’.

3. The application of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites within the language. On the one hand, the tendency towards generalization and syncretism (indivisibility) is a rudiment of mythological consciousness. It allows the neophraseme to represent a denotative situation as the gestalt with all its characteristics and functions, including its nomination. On the other hand, there is the tendency towards the semiosis of the signs of indirect derivative nomination in order to express *personal*, discourse-determined meanings: *дурнее пьяного ежика* (literally sillier than a drunk hedgehog) – ‘a very silly person’, *зреть арматурой* (literally to rattle reinforcing steel) – ‘to be very skinny’ (*кожа да кость* (literally skin and bones)).

4. The need of new *emotional and expressive* nominations for the phenomena of objective reality which already exist (see: Senko E.V., 2000: 24): *стоять на стреме* (to be on the watch) – ‘to guard, to watch over, to stay on alert’, *ловить кайф* (literally to catch kайf)¹⁷ – ‘to enjoy’.

Thus, the neophrasemes are units of indirect derivative nomination of complicated semantic. Due to their derivative character they implicitly keep the links and relations between the language consciousness conceptual topics and the world image. Each neophraseme part is backed by a certain concept, so its phraseme-originating structure allows to establish the connections between the frame conceptual units and to define their informative relevance. In our opinion, it determines heuristic potential of the phraseme-originating components in the linguistic reconstruction of the cognitive-synergetic mechanisms of neophraseme semiosis. The study of it is aimed at approaching to the still inconceivable mystery concerning the reflection of a renovated world’s image dynamics in our consciousness through the identification of the correlations between «living» conceptual structures and semantic organization of new phrasemics.

NOTES

¹ The work was carried out in the frameworks of realization of government order No. 241 of BelSU for the year 2015.

² Neophrasemes differ from neologisms both in stylistic connotation and field of use. While lexical neologisms usually, with rare exceptions (*клонировать* (to clone), *дилер*, (a dealer), *инаугурация* (an inauguration), *кикбоксинг* (kick-boxing)), are interstylistic, neophrasemes first of all refer to conversational (*вешать лапшу на уши* (literally put spaghetti on someone’s ears) – ‘to mislead’) and newspaper-publicistic styles (*отмывать грязные деньги* (literally to launder dirty money) – ‘to disguise illegal source of money through banking manipulations’). As for stylistic connotation the most of neologisms are stylistically neutral (with exception of such neologisms as *коммуняка* (scornful name for a member of a Communist party), *пирамидчик* (member of financial pyramid), *политтусовка* (political clubbing set); neophrasemes mostly have decreased connotation.

³ Косяк is a polysemantic word in Russian. One of its meanings in jargon is “mistake, failure, misfortune”.

⁴ Телера – in Russian jargon also “written complaint, pettifoggery, denunciation”

⁵ Базар – “chat” (in jargon).

⁶ Oblomingo is a combination of two Russian words *oblom* (a wienie) and a flamingo

⁷ Баки – in Russian jargon also “watches”, *вколачивать баки* – to deceive, mislead.

⁸ Вол – an honest person (jargon). *Вертеть вол* – to lie.

⁹ Перо – a knife.

¹⁰ Ботать – originally has lots of meanings, among them “to ring, to move up and down, to toss and turn, to knock”

¹¹ Стрелка (jargon) meeting.

¹² Originates from the railroad switch - a mechanical installation enabling railway trains to be guided from one track to another.

¹³ The same as “to have a bat in a belfry”.

¹⁴ The Russian language abounds with suffixes that add no meaning, but changes the register of the word.

¹⁵ Verbs can differ in aspect (perfective/imperfective) and presence/ absence of prefixes. *Муля* is a jargonism

¹⁶ Рамсы – name of a gamble. Another meaning is “information” in Russian criminals’ argot.

¹⁷ Ловить кайф – to get high.

REFERENCES

1. Alekseenko M. Reflection of urgent processes of synchronic dynamics of the language in contemporary phraseology // *Slowo. Tekst. Czas VI. Contemporary phraseology in modern Europe / executive editor M. Aleksieenki, W. Mokiienki, H. Waltera.* – Szczecin, 2002. – P. 23–33.
2. Alefirenko N.F. Ethnoideemic concept and inner form of linguistic sign // *Issues of cognitive linguistics.* – Moscow – Tambov, 2004. – No 1. – P. 70–81.
3. Alefirenko N.F. Linguistic synergetics: origin, approaches and subject-matter // *Studia Linguistica Cognitiva: Knowledge concepts both in a natural language and metalanguage of Linguistics.* – Irkutsk, 2007. – P. 61–78.
4. Arhangelska A. Фонові знання носіїв мови та фразеологічна неологіка пострадянської доби (на матеріалі української преси останнього десятиріччя) // *Slowo. Tekst. Czas VI. Contemporary phraseology in modern Europe / executive editor M. Aleksieenki, W. Mokiienki, H. Waltera.* – Szczecin, 2002. – P. 217–225.
5. Biriš A., Mateshich J. Phraseology in the Russian and Croatian substandards // *Ibid*, 2002. – P. 34–46.
6. Georgieva S. The role of new symbols in the formation of a phraseological pattern // *Ibid*, 2002. – P. 117–125.
7. Zinchenko V.P. Phraseological pedagogics. P. 1. *Zhivoe slovo. Vol 2.* – Samara, 1998. – P. 264.
8. Kasyanova L.Yu. Linguistic and cognitive mechanisms of neologization // *Word – consciousness – culture: Edited volume.* – M.: Flinta: Science, 2006. – P. 97–105.
9. Kasyanova L.Yu. Neophrasemics in the refreshable worldview // *Phraseology and Cognitive science: proceedings of the 1st International science conference: 2 vol. / executive editor N.F. Alefirenko.* – Belgorod: BelGU, 2008. – Vol. 1. *Idiomology and knowledge.* – P. 99–103.
10. Parsieva L.K., Gatsalova L.B. Special aspects of phraseological neologisms // *International journal of applied and fundamental researches.* – 2014. – No 9. – P. 171–172.

11. Malinski T. Appearance of new phraseological units // *Rusistika*. – Berlin. – 1992. – No 2. – P. 67–76.
12. Mazitova L.L. Revisited phraseological loan translation and features of phraseological loan translations // *Linguistic and aesthetic aspects of text analysis: proceedings of International science conference*. – Solikamsk, 2000. – P. 217–219.
13. Mokienko V.M. Problems of European phraseological neologics // *Slowo. Tekst. Czas VI. Contemporary phraseology in modern Europe / executive editor M. Aleksieenki, W. Mokiienki, H. Waltera*. – Szczecin, 2002. – P. 63–76.
14. Senko E.V. Neologization in the contemporary Russian language of the end of the 20th century: inter-level aspect: author's abstract ... PhD. – Volgograd, 2000. – 50 p.
15. Popko L.P. Some peculiar features of pragmatic overtone of neologisms // *Лінгвістика. Лінгвокультурологія*. – 2011: Збірник наукових праць. – Днепропетrovsk, 2012.
16. Florenskiy P.A. Icon and truth statement. – Moscow, 1990, Vol. 2. – 258 p.
17. Shpet G. G. Philosophical essays. – Moscow, 1994. – 229 p.
18. Onisko A. Anglicisms in German: from iniquitous to ubiquitous // *English Today* 77. – 2004. – Vol.20. – No 1. – P.59–64.
19. Verenich T.K., Kruglikova E.A. American and English Borrowings in Russian: Blurring Ethnosocial Boundaries Electronic resource. Available at: <http://elib.sfu-kras.ru/bitstream/2311/2834/1/1IVerenich.pdf>.
20. Walter H., Mokienko V. *Russisch-Deutsches Jargon-Wörterbuch*. Peter Lang GmbH, 2001.
21. Wright R. Latin and English as World Languages // *English Today* 80. 2004. – Vol. 20. – No 4. – P.3–13.
22. Pstyga A. Czytając rosyjską publicystykę: semantyka rozumienia, interpretacja, przekład i frazeografi a rosyjsko-polska // *Przegląd Rusycystyczny*, 2008. – No (124). – P. 58–69.
23. Bierich A. Zapożyczenia francuskie we frazeologii rosyjskiej XVIII wieku // *Przegląd Rusycystyczny*, 2008. – No (124). – P. 70–79.
24. Bolgova L., Adler I. *Aktueller Wortschatz der vernetzten Gesellschaft: neue Wörter, neue Bedeutungen. Wörterbuch Deutsch-Russisch mit einem Glossar Ruisch-Deutsch*. Shaker Verlag. – Aachen, 2005.