

General questions relating to both linguistics and literature. Philology (UDC 80)

DOI: 10.18454/RULB.5.05

Алефиренко Н.Ф.

Белгородский государственный национальный исследовательский университет

ЭТНОКУЛЬТУРНАЯ СПЕЦИФИКА ИДИОМЫ: ПРОПИСНЫЕ ИСТИНЫ ИЛИ СКРЫТЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ?

Аннотация

Этнокультурная специфика идиомы рассматривается с методологических позиций когнитивной фразеологии. В центре внимания два аспекта: лингвокультурологическое своеобразие идиомы и когнитивные факторы, обуславливающие их этнокультурную специфику. С точки зрения вербализации культурно маркированного отражения действительности в структуре фразеобразующего концепта рассматриваются его основные механизмы: а) сенсорно-перцептивные процессы, б) лингвокреативное мышление и в) обыденно-понятийные мировосприятия.

Ключевые слова: идиома, этнокультура, фразеологические универсалии, фразеологические уникалии, фразеобразующий концепт, лингвокреативное мышление.

Alefirenko N.F.

Belgorod National Research University

ETHNOCULTURAL IDIOM SPECIFICITY: FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OR LATENT PROBLEMS?

Abstract

Ethnocultural idiom specificity is dwelt upon from the methodological views of cognitive phraseology. The two aspects are under study, i.e. linguocultural idiom specificity and cognitive factors defining their ethnocultural specific nature. In terms of verbalisation of culture specific reflection of reality, the structure of phraseme forming concept implies the main mechanisms, namely: a) sensory perceptual processes, b) linguocreative thinking, and c) ordinary conceptual perception of the world.

Keywords: idiom, ethnoculture, phraseological universals, unique idioms, phraseme forming concept, linguocreative thinking.

Acknowledgements

The study is performed within the framework of implementation of BelSU's state task No. 241 for the year of 2015.

Introduction

At the stage of becoming phraseology a linguistic discipline, many researchers laid a special emphasis on studying the expressive figurative nature of phrasemics (in European terminology – *idiomology*), and its ethnolinguistic specificity. Perhaps the most profound observations were expressed by Leonid I. Roizenzon who called phrasemics the most original and complicated phenomenon “out of the all creations of human linguistic genius” (L. Roizenzon, 1977: 116). Over the time, this state of things seemed to become stable. At the turn of the 20th-21st centuries, however, against the background of the cognitive contrastive analysis of the phrasemes correlated in different languages, it began being doubted in the works of even such authoritative in phraseology scholars as Harry Walter and Valeriy M. Mokienko. According to them, nowadays there is an overestimation of phrasemics culture specific that originates from “the folkloric and linguistic romanticism of the first half of the 19th century” (H. Walter, V. Mokienko, 2013: 1). Their own studies constituted a ground for disproving the folkloric romanticism postulates. As viewed by these scholars, most phrasemes “by no means emerged on the folk and national ground proper, but on the all-European cultural and philosophical ones” (ibid: 2). The main reason for this is that in the languages compared there are phrasemes of the same vocabulary like Rus. *lovit' rybku v mutnoj vode* – Eng. *to fish in troubled waters*, ad lit. “*lovit' rybku v mutnoj vode*”; Rus. *iskat' igolku v stoge sena* – Eng. *to look for a needle in a haystack*, lit. “*iskat' igolku v stoge sena*”. No doubt, for peoples of small Europe linguocultural communication are of such importance that they could not have led to numerous borrowings and calques both in vocabulary and idiomology (T. Cherdanceva, 1996: 58; A. Cowie, 1998). The main reason for borrowing of “other’s” idiom is the lack of the corresponding concept (a naïve, trivial notion) in the cognitive base of the recipient language. Among other reasons one should name the necessity to express the polysemy of the known concept with the help of a loan idiom, to replenish the expressive means of the mother tongue, etc. (T. Fedulenkova, 2014). Special intensity of the phraseme interpenetration process was given by the Scriptures, i.e. idiomology of biblical origin penetrated into the linguistic consciousness of European people (D. Balakova et al., 2014). That is why the views of those researchers who do not exclude that “Somebody else’s” can turn into a part of “One’s own” are significant (S. Georgieva, 2013: 36; M. Lapteva, 2012; Zh. Fink, 2013: 151).

Finding out the ethnocultural specificity of phrasemics is certainly impossible without comparing folk wisdom fixed in the

tropes in different languages. However, it is very unlikely to solve the given task confining oneself just to the structurally semantic comparison of idioms, of closely related languages in particular (cf.: J. Korhonen, 2007). It was Aleksandr A. Reformatskiy who wrote the following: “Closely related languages are of great interest for the contrastive method as *the temptation of identifying “one’s own” with “somebody else’s” ... “lies on the surface”*. But it is exactly *that kind of provocative proximity, the overcoming of which is fraught with big practical difficulties*. It is especially applied to such groups of languages as Slavic and Turkic” (A. Revormatskiy, 1987: 41; *italized by – N.A.*). At the same time it is necessary to take into account that within the interpenetration of linguocultures foreign language units are subjected to paradigmatic and syntagmatic adaptation. “The adoption of something belonging to somebody else’s”, Aleksandr A. Revormatskiy continued his reasoning, “lies exactly in its subjecting to something of one’s own” (A. Revormatskiy, 1987: 42). Adapting loan phrasemes and their components in terms of adaptation to the nominative semantic system of the borrowing language is necessary for their effective functioning, indeed. For instance, “morphological adoption of foreign phraseologism [...] begins with endowing it with active grammatical categories (G. Kadantseva, 2008: 137). Thus, nouns in the composition of the English phrase borrowed by the German language, acquire the categories of number and gender, e.g. *der Zapper, die Bubble Economy*, verbs, in their turn, borrow a definite conjugation type (the weak one, as a rule – *maken, makte gemacht*), e.g. *bad blood maken*. Adjectives are adopted on the analogy of German, e.g. *easieres Leben*.

Nowadays such a delicate issue should be considered in the light of modern cognitive culture linguistics achievements, moreover, before our eyes contrastive cognitive linguistics is onward and upward (see N. Alefirenko, Sh. Zharkynbekova, 2014).

Linguocultural idiom specificit

Even in case of entire foreign phraseme adaptation the original connection with their traditional event discursive origins is retained. It is no coincidence that academician Fedor I. Buslaev called “well-known common expressions” “peculiar micromyths”, the semantics of which implies “both moral law and common sense expressed in short sayings that were bequeathed by ancestors to guide their descendants” (F. Buslaev, 1954: 37). Therefore appealing to phrasemes lets us approach to the realising the peculiarities of nation mental make-up not in an abstract way but in the context of that axiological space in which these phrasemes were formed. We act on the premise that the prime purpose of phrasemes is that of their reflexive function. The phraseme content is always aimed at the wisdom of the ages and nation value system fixed in them. Specific

culture worldview and peculiarities of national mentality are implemented in their discursive modus semantics. As a result, ethnolinguistic phraseme specificity of any language shows up in a multifaceted way, namely,

a) in reflection of nation mental make-up and the peculiarities of national consciousness;

b) featuring in peculiarities of national form and any nation ethnocultural colouring that is reflected in phraseological image, being specific for different peoples;

c) in the specific origins of phraseme forming concept (L. Bayramova 2013: 170);

d) in psychosemantic shades of phraseological connotation (A. Naciscione, 2010) caused by the genesis and peculiarities of meaning system functioning in either language, with this system mediating the process of ethnocultural perception, thinking and linguistic memory;

e) in ethnolinguistic distinction of encoding of one and the same content.

To make sure of this, it is quite enough to turn to spoken language that is extremely larded with specific set expressions, indeed. It seems that in any language there are lexical nominants that are used in them, e.g. *names for geese, ducks and hens*. However, their unusual combination with metaphoric epithets within the Russian linguistic consciousness, for instance, cause such associative-metaphorical meanings that are either absent in any other linguoculture, or applied in a different discursive pragmatic level. By the way, the uniqueness of most Russian phrasemes is exactly determined by their associative-notional relations within a certain discursive pragmatic paradigm. Thus, on sudden discovering somebody's negative traits of character, a Russian would most likely say: *gus' lapchatyi, khorosh gus', nu i gus'!*

Gus' lapchatyi is a humorous / ironic name for a rascal or just a dodger who is easy to get out of difficult situations, to avoid punishment for his actions or behaves as if he did not want to take the responsibility for his vices. The two other phrasemes are the variations of the previous one, i.e. *khoroosh gus' < khorosh gus' lapchatyi: nu i gus' < nu i gus' lapchatyi!* Cf.: "*Ai da Aleksei Ivanovich; nechego skazat', khorosh gus'!*" (A. Pushkin).

The metaphorical epithet *lapchatyi* plays one of the leading parts in the phrasemes under study. It implies an extremely important history- and culture-specific meaning that is connected with Count Vasily Petrovich Saltykov's economic activities. Ex-ambassador of His Majesty of Russia's Emperor for France, having retired and settled in his estate, located on the opposite bank of the quiet and tranquil Tesha river near Arzamas, turned out to be a good manager as we would call him today. On the meadows near the Tesha river, he used to breed large gaggles of geese. Among people Saltykov even got an inoffensive nickname "Goose Count". But the bred poultry had to be sold somewhere. Where? – In Moscow and Petersburg, certainly, in the main trade areas of those times. But that was a long way from Arzamas. How to cover such a distance? – People did their best and tried to transport geese on a cart. However, the latter used to lose their weight so that it was absolutely impossible even to look at them without compassion. That is why the master of the bird's land made up his mind to carry geese for long distances and keep their salable condition in an extraordinary way. People began to drive geese on their own. For that purpose even the land parallel to the road was ploughed up and sowed with grass for feeding the birds. It all seemed to satisfy everybody, the geese even put on excess weight on the way... New hardships did not keep them waiting: on their way the geese did get bloody feet. A new idea occurred to them – to provide geese with shoes. Skilled craftsmen put themselves on the map. They started to adjust very tiny bast shoes right to a goose foot. But that was not to geese's liking; moreover, they pecked those annoying "shoes" to bits. Since the idea of providing geese with ordinary bast shoes was not caught on, a new idea occurred to the people, a brainwave, indeed! It was based on goose's feet ability to withstand large temperature drops. It is common knowledge how easily birds can walk on ice as well as they are not afraid of wandering on hot sand. One day the Count was struck by such an idea: before being sent on a long journey, the geese were supposed to run through a long corridor, the beginning of which was tarred. The geese were driven through it at a run, after that they immediately got on the pre-paved fine river sand. Getting into the best of the molten slush, geese soles became covered with a

layer of adhesive resin, to which sand clung tightly. Thus, on their feet a thick protective layer was formed, that was called a horseshoe. Even such an expression as "*gusei podkovyvat' vedut*" (*geese are driven for shoeing*) became popular with people. Exactly in such very tiny "*lapotochki*" ("*bast shoes*") snow-white gaggles left behind a hundred miles away, getting not only to Moscow and St. Petersburg, and, as rumored, even to Paris. It looks like a legend, to be sure. However, until now the street, along which the birds were driven to form their "bast shoes", has been called Progonnaya (see: B. Zhestkov *Shkola zhizni.ru*).

The phrasemes under study (*gus' lapchatyi, khorosh gus', nu i gus'!*) are in epigrammatic relations with the preceded fixed simile *kak s gusya voda* that means 'somebody is absolutely indifferent about something; something decidedly does not affect somebody'. The simile itself, in its turn, is obliged for its origin not only to ordinary human power of observation. It dates back from a healer's discourse that represents a widespread verbal and cogitative event reflecting an ancient heathen popular belief that was rooted itself in ingenuous Russian folk's consciousness. That is why this is not a common proverb, as it seems to be, but a part of an old incantation, magic spell. Even both healers while throwing "incanted water" on ill children, and caring parents when bathing their precious child used to keep incanting. By doing this they wished their children to get rid of leanness (some ailment). "*S gusya voda, a s tebya, dityatko, vsya khudoba*". Sometimes this spell in the mouth of dear people turned out to be a form of direct address: "*Kak s gusya voda, s nashego Kolen'ki (ili Katen'ki) – khudoba*". Quite an ordinary fact served as the basis of such a comparison: goose feather is not wetted, as covered by a thin layer of fat; water rolls off a goose's back and it always comes out of the water completely dry. This commonplace observation was the basis for the appearance of another phraseme: *vykhodit' sukhim iz vody* – 'to avoid just deserts; remain untainted, unpunished; to wriggle out of a complicated, an unpleasant situation without any loss or damage. This phraseme can surely be translated into different languages. While being translated, however, its culture-specific uniqueness is lost even when their lexical components coincide: *to come out dry* – lit. *vyiti sukhim iz vody*. All the more reason this loss is noticeable when using the other phraseological equivalents: Eng. *come through unscathed* – lit. *vykhodit' nevredimym*; *to come off clear* – lit. *vyiti sukhim iz vody*; *thy back shall go unscathed* – lit. *tvoya spina vyidet nepovrezhdennoi*; *the unscathed hero of the fight* – lit. *nevredimyi geroi etoi bitvy*; *to come out with clean hands* – lit. *vyiti s chistymi rukami*.

So there is no doubt that ethnocultural idiom specificity is the soul of any language (S. Ivanova, Z. Chanysheva, 2010). Reflecting the long process of formation and development of axiological ethnoculture space, phrasemes retain and in a unique way pass on cultural guidelines and cognitive patterns, models and archetypes from one generation to another.

Cognitive factors

Cognitive factors in the realm of phraseology are connected with the mechanisms of the associative and figurative outside world's reflection in a human consciousness, and "the process of the appeared image-structures' getting involved into linguistics" by means of the indirect and derivative nomination signs. Making a start from such kind of views, scholars began to speak about various linguistic world images (LWI). As our studies showed, the formation of phrasemes is a multiway process due to which, in fact, the subjective and objective aura of the LWI is created. The nature of phraseological representation of the subjective world's image is in many respects determined by a complex interlacing of multiple-vector human activity. The image of the world being explained from this point of view opens up great possibilities for phraseme semiosis:

- to include the already metaphorically transformed reality in its linguocreative arsenal,
- gives a chance to get out of that "dull" one-plane perception of the world,
- to make proper axiological emphases in its application field,
- to form a sensible world image in associative correlation between the subject and verbal images, subject and linguistic symbols. Cf.: Russian phraseme *delit' shkuru neubitogo medvedya* that with a tint of irony, of course, expresses 'to revel in yet not reached goals; anticipating the results of yet not executed business, to build on anything not reasonable calculations, to divide

yet not received award’;

Belorus.: *на жывым мядзведзі скуру купляць, з незабітага ліса ф утра (кажух) швыць, скуру ў лесе фарбаваць(прадаваць), не скуб і, пакуль не зловіш; Germ. man soll das Fell nicht verkaufen, ehe man den Bären hat, lit. ‘ne sleduet prodavat’ shkuru, poka ne imeesh’ medvedya’; Eng. to cook a hare before catching him, lit. ‘zharit’ zaitsa prezhdе, chem on poiman’ or to eat the calf in the cow’s belly, lit. ‘est’ telenka, kotoryi eshche ne rodilsya’; catch the bear before you cook him, lit. ‘medvedya ne ubiv, shkury ne prodavai’; don’t sell the bear’s skin before you have caught the bear, lit. ‘ne prodavai medvezh’ei shkury, ne poimav sperva medvedya’; catch the bear before you sell his skin, lit. ‘prezhde poimai medvedya, a potom prodavai ego shkuru’.*

Everything in these phraseme variations is capacious, multivariate and figurative. It would seem, within one cognitive metaphor that ironically expresses the same sense, i.e. “to prematurely estimate the results of any business, to share profit from yet not carried out enterprise, undertaking”, phrasemes might lack any ethno-lingual specifics. However, in this case the value-semantic emphases are made in correspondence with the associations of their application field, too (Rus. *medved’* (bear), Belarus. *lis* (fox), Eng. *telenok, zayats, ugri* (calf, hare, eels)). And that is so, notwithstanding one and the same phraseme protosource. This phraseme became popular after the translation of the French fable “The Bear and the Travelers” (Cf.: *L’ours et les deux compagnons*) written by Jean de La Fontain (1621 – 1695). The fact that proves the linguocreativity of the ethno-lingual consciousness, looking for a proper designatum for an already metaphorised discursive situation, is that yet in the 1930s of the 20th century it was accepted to speak as follows: “**to sell (not to divide) the skin of a not yet killed bear**” (“**prodavat’ (ne delit’) shkuru neubitogo medvedya**”). It is interesting to note that outside the historical and culturological context it may seem that the basis of this phraseme is represented by the all-European image since the lexical composition of both German and English phraseme contains the lexeme *bear*. Cf. Germ.: *das Fell des Bärenverkaufen (unü verteilen)*, lit. ‘*продавать (делитъ) шкуру медведя*’;

Eng. *to sell bear’s skin before one has caught the bear*, lit. ‘*prodavat’ medvezh’yu shkuru perez tem, kak poimat’ medvedya*’.

However, in German linguoculture animalistic lexicon is most likely connected with the professional jargon of London Stock Exchange players that appeared in the 19th century. The falling exchange rate was associated with the image of a bear as a bear, hunting, tries to *knock down* its prey, and the increasing one – with the image of a bull as when the bull attacks it *throws* the enemy with its horns *up*.

Thus, phraseme semiosis is a cognitively conditioned process. Moreover, such conditionality is of isomorphic nature (T. Fedulenkova, 2005:125). The point is not only the language but the subjective experience represented by the image of the world has a *multi-level* structure (See: I. Vysokov, 2014).

First and foremost, it is necessary to highlight the fact that encoding with the help of phraseme components belonging to the subjective experience is implemented on the two interrelated levels of cognition, i.e. the surface and the profound levels. On the surface level the sensually shaped idea of the world is set up, whereas on the profound level its rational and emotional understanding is organised. The initial stage of image appearance is the transition from one sensual reality to another, from the surface structures to more profound ones. For instance, the initial stage on which the image of the phraseme [*stroit’*] *vozdushnye zamki* (cf.: [*to build*] *castles in the air*) emerges, is the surface and sensual and vague picture of the castle in unreal (overground, air) space. This picture is projected by semantics of the free syntactic phraseme prototype. It stimulates the associative search for the concept standing behind it and containing layer-by-layer semantic interpretation of the imagined. As a result there is an idea of something imaginary, impracticable, unrealisable. Such a transition, being carried out on a scale “the sensual – emotive and rational”, shapes a concept within the whole range of its value and semantic content: ‘fantastic, impracticable plans, conceptions, unrealisable desires’. To my mind, this vector of encoding by means of the phraseme components of subjective experience is not supposed to cause any basic objections. Nevertheless, the main issue remains unsettled: what stages of the phraseme forming interaction between the linguistic levels does the process of phraseological

semantics creation consist of? To reply to this question, one has to define the formation source of the main layers of a phraseme forming (discursive modus) concept.

I assume that the multilayer structure of the concept underlying the emergence of the phraseme is determined by cognition mechanisms of the object that is liable to phraseological representation. The main reflection mechanisms within the structure of the phraseme forming concept of reality are a) sensory perceptual processes, b) conceptions, c) linguocreative thinking, and d) commonplace and conceptual perception of the world. The cognitive-discursive entity of such an ascent consists in the harmonization of subjective sensuous and ethnocultural factors of the phraseologisation process.

Sensory perceptual processes

The process of phraseme formation is related to the actualization of the sensory perceptual realisation products in the linguistic consciousness. This is rather a complicated mental scanning process of the object of phraseological nomination that is connected with the so called *advancing reflection* (P. Anohin, 1980). The phraseme semiosis intension on the signal of the prototypical word combination presupposes the implementation by linguistic consciousness a cognitive and metaphorical projection of the image of the primary denotatum to the sphere of the secondary denotative situation, referring sensually perceived signs to abstract and directly not observed objects. Such a cogitative scanning of the object of the phraseological nomination results in a discursive modus concept, i.e. a cognitive substratum of the semantic content of the phraseme. For example, the meaning “to be engaged in something obviously senseless, useless” can be rendered by the Russian phrasemes *reshetom vodu nosit’* and *toloch’ vodu v stupe*; Eng. *to drop a bucket into an empty well*; lit. ‘*kidat’ vedro v pustoj kolodec*’; *to beat the air*, lit. ‘*molotit’ vozduh*’; *to mill the wind*, lit. ‘*na mel’nicu vetra*; Germ. *das Wasser pflügen*, lit. ‘*pahat’ vodu*’. As exemplified, the cognitive metaphor forming the discursive modus concept and, in the act of the phraseme semiosis having caught or created, the resemblance between some remote from each other contemplation objects, does the conscious transfer of the name from one denotatum to another one associated with it. Owing to this fact, at generation and perception of the phraseme-centered statement the advancing reflection serves as the main neurocognitive mechanism of modelling of the secondary denotative situation (N. Alefirenko, 2010: 58 – 65), which is denoted by a phraseme. This mechanism that brings the sensory perceptual processes and the reflection into effect uses the elements of anticipation. In cognitive phraseology anticipation is responsible for representation of subjects in indirect nomination in a human mind long before they are really perceived and realised.

The perception of the phraseme forming anticipation process through the prism of the advancing reflection creates a *conceptual bridge* (E. Vityaev’s term) that connects the rational anticipation of the phraseological denotatum with its emotive and figurative conception. Thus in the phraseme [*stroit’*] *vozdushnye zamki* touched upon above, such a conceptual bridge leads to the actualization of such evaluating components as ‘impracticability’ of ideas, their ‘unrealizability’. Causing the appearance of a phraseme forming concept in a linguistic consciousness, and defining the nature of its representans, the conceptual bridge also serves as a mechanism of appearance of the phraseme’s emotive components in its semantic structure. One can reveal the cognitive nature of this component basing on the theory of emotion developed by Pavel V. Simonov (P. Simonov, 1981). In the light of his approach, the phraseme emotivity has to be studied not as a insignificant component that is outside the phraseological semantics, but as its weighty constituent part. According to this theory, emotive component of phraseological meaning by its nature represents the human mind’s reflection product of an actual need and possibility of its satisfaction that is estimated by us on the basis of genetic and prior ethnocultural experience. For example: – *Churmenyaev? Tol’ko chto ot menya vyshel. Pryamo Gogolem!.. Ne v perenosnom – v bukval’nom smysle! Menya v vosemnadsati stranakh izdali – ya o sebe nikogda takogo ne voobrazil. Chto?... Da chital ya etu “Zhenshchinu v kresle”. Bred svoi kobyly!* (Yury Polyakov, “Goatling in milk”, p. 182). The prototype of the phraseme *bred svoi kobyly* (the grey mare’s nonsense) seems to be abracadabra. First of all, the epithet turns out to be absurd: why the mare is grey,

but not any other colour? It appears that its emergence in the component structure of the phraseme is caused by an ethnocultural factor: it was a popular belief that a grey horse was considered a silly animal; its appearance in a dream was taken as a lie harbinger. Cf. *vrat' kaksiviyi merin (to lie as a grey gelding)*. The lexeme *bred* (nonsense) was, probably, a component part of the phraseme used in its secondary meaning – ‘chatter’. Cf. Rus. dial.: *bredá* – ‘the talker, the fool’, Ukr., Belarus. *brednyá* – ‘lies, lie’, Old Pol. *brzedzić* – ‘to chatter’, *ubrdac sobie* – ‘to hammer (drive) into the head’. Franc Miklošič and Erich Berneker considered these words going back to the verbal forms *'bredú, brestí'*. This explanation is confirmed by the examples like *sumasbród*, originally ‘gone crazy’. By the way, Nicolaas van Wijk compared these words with Middle Low Germ., Middle Dutch *praten* – ‘to talk, to chatter’, Eng. *prate* – ‘a chatterbox’, *to prate* – ‘to talk foolishly or tediously about something’.

Linguocreative thinking and ordinary conceptual perception of the world

In terms of explanation of ethnocultural phraseme specifics (D. Dobrovolskii, 1998: 48; L. Zainullina, 2005), conceptions represent a reflection product of a set of the brightest external, sensually perceived certain signs of a subject or a phenomenon. On the other hand, these are images generalized by ethnocultural experience. The most specific feature of conception is that demonstrativeness and generality are connected within it. Exactly in such a two-unity idea the conception of that denotative situation which is designated by the phraseme *bred sivoi kobyly* is formed. The interaction between the etymological meaning of the lexical component *bred* and the symbolical figurativeness of the phrase *sivaya kobyla* – ‘nonsense’ creates the semantic content ‘the obvious nonsense proceeding from a silly being’. Its discursive associative communication with such a highly intellectual product as a book generates a rough colloquial and even a contemptuous connotation – ‘utter nonsense, baloney’. In Vladimir I. Dahl’s Dictionary after significant definition of the word *bred* – ‘the incoherent, senseless speeches delivered in an unconsciousness of the patient’ – is given generally — metaphorical, coll.: ‘something silly, senseless, improbable’. It forms a basis to a synonymy of the phraseme and such words as *glupost', bodyaga, mura, beliberda, tarabarshchina, absurd, nonsens, akhineya, nelepitsa, zaviral'nye idei, fantasmagoriya, chush', purga, zaum', abrakadabra, nesurazitsa, neskladitsa, erunda, vzdor, galimat'ya, bezlepitsa, drebeden', bessmyslitsa, eres', bredyatina, dich', baida, pustyaki, pustoe, chepukha, bredni*.

At the ordinary conceptual level the essential bases of the phraseological nomination are set up, i.e. its ability to integrate personal and ethnocultural experience of the world’s development. Here, the conceptual core of the phraseme forming concept that expresses the main idea of the phraseme is actualized. The conceptual phase of the interaction between the cognitive and pragmatic intensions of phraseological nomination and the phraseme’s derivational base begins from that moment when “the great bundle of knowledge accumulated by the mankind starts to be included in the individual experience” (B. Lomov, 2008: 169). Thus, the conception underlying the phraseme *ne vynosit' sor iz izby* originated in a popular belief that using the sweepings unkind people can put an evil curse. Therefore the litter had to be collected in a kiln’s corner and burnt later in order not to be used by those unkind people for their evil purposes. With time, having enriched with the vital experience concerning fraught consequences of the data disclosure concerning a narrow circle of people, conception turned into an ordinary notion that finally created such a phraseological meaning as ‘not to disclose the quarrels, squabbles occurring between close people’. Those who broke the taboo were exposed to condemnation. In ethnocultural communities, free from this superstition, for designation of this concept phrasemes arose on other images. Cf. English *to wear one's heart upon one's sleeve* – lit. ‘nosit' svoe serdtse na rukave’; *it is an ill bird that fouls its own nest* – lit. ‘tol'ko durnaya ptitsa zasoryaet svoe gnezdo’; *to foul one's own nest* – lit. ‘gádit' v sóbstvennom gnezde’; *to tell tales out of school* – lit. ‘razbaltyvat' za stenami shkoly’; *to wash one's dirty linen in public* – lit. ‘stirat' gryaznoe bel'e u vsekh na glazakh’. At the ordinary conceptual level the structure of the phraseme forming image gets for the account of close connection between the processes of nomination and

predication a certain “panoramic view” that allows to be beyond specifically perceived situation.

Conclusion

Cognitive discursive approach to the judgment of specifics of idiom generation and perception allows considering the latent problems of ethno-linguistic character behind the seeming common truths. When solving the problem of correlation of the universal and unique in phraseology of any language (R. Khairullina, M. Aichichek, A. Boztash, 2011: 197; B. Aginsky, 1984; J. Greenberg, 1963), it is necessary to distinguish the cognitive and ethno-linguistic bases for comparing phrasemes. The cognitive factor is mainly objective as at understanding of phrasemes it is focused on natural and cultural realia. The latter can be common in case they are the products of universal perception of the world, as well as specific if they are linked to the life of one nation. The ethno-linguistic factor is principally subjective as relies on optional selection (selective combination theory) of the lexemes forming a designator (meaning) of a phraseme. Even the same concepts in different languages can be nominated by combination theory of nonequivalent lexemes.

Ethno-linguistic specifics of phrasemes are shown in all cases of divergences between their denotata and designata which can be determined by the reasons of both cultural and linguistic character. Cultural specifics of a phraseme assumes its correlation to an original topic (a thematic subject, a concept, a communicative event, a phraseme forming discourse) of mentality or spiritual culture of ethnos, its history, beliefs, traditions, and natural living conditions. However, differentiation of the cognitive and linguistic factors influencing the formation of phraseological universals and unique is not the only possible one. Some scientists as a subject of the analysis choose *national and cultural* language specifics. The point of view of Nikolai A. Berdyaev recognising culture national is the cornerstone of such an approach: “The culture was never and will never be abstract human, it is always specifically human, i.e. national” (N. Berdyaev, 1997: 85). It is precisely this philosophical view that became basic for Veronika N. Telija’s research that investigated the national and cultural specifics of Russian phrasemes. According to the approach, everything that can be interpreted in terms of evaluativity, creates national and cultural specifics in phraseology (V. Telija, 1996: 214). This understanding is specified by Natalya M. Firsova (2004: 51-52) treating national phraseme specifics as manifestation of their original signs that reflect (explicitly or implicitly) both actually linguistic and extralinguistic (social, historical, cultural, psychological, ethnic) realia of any national cultural community.

In our concept of a phraseme semiosis we differentiate phraseological universals and phraseological uniques. The typology of phraseological unique is caused by the system of universal concepts such as life, death, immortality, conscience, sin, evil, labour, idleness, etc. Phraseological unique typology is the result of display of the most different manifestations of ethnoculture in phraseology: a) national traditions which are defined as steady elements of culture, customs and ceremonies that carry out the function of subconscious familiarising with the system of spiritual norms and values dominating in the society; b) household culture; c) daily behaviour (the norms of communication accepted in this society); d) features of national thinking; e) products of art culture; e) way of development and representation of natural resources and natural habitat.

Since phraseme forming concepts represent the discursively marked “culture bundles” – cognition products of different nations, meanings of even genetically close phrasemes differ in different languages, particularly when they designate the same denotative situation. It can be explained by the fact that the linguocreative thinking of each people for representation of even the same concept uses different phraseological images or their variable interpretations. Thanks to their ethnocultural originality, phrasemes carry out the most important mission of preservation of cultural heritage of the people, fixing and transferring its cultural guidelines and stereotypes from generation to generation, as well as valuable and semantic standards, mythologemes and archetypes developed for centuries – the universal congenital mental structures making the content of collective unconscious in the semantics of idioms.

References

1. Alefirenko, N.F. (2013). Smysl, modusnye kontsepty i znachenie. In: Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gos. un-ta. № 31 (322). Filologiya. Iskusstvovedenie, vyp. 84, s. 8–14.
2. Alefirenko, N.F., Zharkynbekova, Sh.K. (2014). Osnovnye tendentsii i perspektivy razvitiya sopostavitel'noi lingvokognitivistiki. In: Nauchnye doklady vysshei shkoly. Filologicheskie nauki. Moskva, vyp. 5, s. 18–25.
3. Anokhin, P.K. (1980). Uzlavye voprosy teorii funktsional'nykh sistem. Moskva: Nauka, 400 s. ISBN 5-02-013392-2.
4. Bairamova, L.K. (2013). Lakunarnaya slavyanskaya frazeologiya kak natsional'nyi komponent lingvokul'tury. In: XV Mezhdunarodnyi s"ezd slavistov. Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii. Greifswald, s. 170–173.
5. Balakova, D. i dr. (2014). Lepta bibleiskoi mudrosti: bibleiskie krylatye vyrazheniya i aforizmy na russkom, angliiskom, belorusskom, nemetskom, slovatskom i ukrainskom yazykakh. Mogilev: MGU imeni A. A. Kuleshova, 208 s.
6. Berdyayev, N. A. (1997). Sud'ba Rossii. Samosoznanie. Rostov n/D: Feniks, ISBN: 5-222-00213-6.
7. Buslaev, F.I. (1954). Russkie poslovitsy i pogovorki, sobrannye i ob'yasnennye. Moskva: Nauka, 457 s. ISBN ne ukazan.
8. Val'ter, KH., mokienco, V.M. (2013). Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii: razlichnoe v edinom. In: XV Mezhdunarodnyi s"ezd slavistov. Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii. Greifswald, s. 1–18.
9. Val'ter, KH., mokienco, V.M. (2013). Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii: razlichnoe v edinom. In: XV Mezhdunarodnyi s"ezd slavistov. Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii. Greifswald, s. 1–18.
10. Vysokov, I. E. (2014). Psikhologiya poznaniya. Moskva: "Yurait", ISBN 978-5-9916-3528-8.
11. Georgieva, S. (2013). Zakonomernosti formirovaniya natsional'noi spetsifiki bolgarskoi frazeologii. In: XV Mezhdunarodnyi s"ezd slavistov. Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii. Greifswald, S. 36–39.
12. Gizatova, G.K. (2010). Tipologiya frazeologicheskikh universalii. Kazan': Izd-vo Kazan. un-ta, 197 s. ISBN 5-89216-024-6.
13. Dobrovolskii, D.O. (1998). Natsional'no-kul'turnaya spetsifika vo frazeologii (1). In: Voprosy yazykoznaniya. Moskva, № 6. S. 48–57.
14. Zainullina, L.A. (2005). Natsional'no-kul'turnaya spetsifika frazeologicheskikh oborotov. Moskva: Nauka, 235 s.
15. Ivanova, S.V., Chanyшева, Z.Z. 2010. Lingvokul'turologiya: problemy, poiski, resheniya: Monografiya. – Ufa: RITs BashGU, - 366s.
16. Ivanova, S.V., Chanyшева, Z.Z. 2010. Lingvokul'turologiya: problemy, poiski, resheniya: Monografiya. – Ufa: RITs BashGU, - 366s.
17. Kirillova, N.N. (2003). Frazeologiya romanskikh yazykov: etnolingvisticheskii aspekt: monografiya. – SPb: Izd-vo RGPU im. A.I. Gertsena, 319 s. ISBN 978-5-8465-1282-5.
18. Kovshova, L.M. (1999). Kak s pisanoi torboi nosit'sya: printsipy kognitivno-kul'turologicheskogo issledovaniya idiom. In: Frazeologiya v kontekste kul'tury. Moskva: Yazyki russkoi kul'tury, s. 164–173. ISBN: 5-88766-061-9.
19. Lapteva, M.L. (2012). "Svoe" i "Chuzhoe" v kognitivno-diskursivnom prostranstve russkoi frazemiki: monografiya. Astrakhan': ID "Astrakhanskii universitet", 296 s. ISBN 5-88200-777-1.
20. Mal'tseva, D. G. (1991). Stranovedenie cherez frazeologizmy (posobie po nemetskomu yazyku). – Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 172 s. ISBN: 5-06-001721-4.
21. Mezentseva, E.S. (2005). Poslovichnyi fond yazyka kak fragment yazykovogo soznaniya etnosa. In: Vestnik KazNU, №2, s. 23–26.
22. Reformatskii, A.A. (1987). O sopostavitel'nom metode // Reformatskii A.A. Lingvistika i poetika. Moskva, c. 40–52. ISBN ne ukazan.
23. Roizenzon, L.I. (1973). Lektsii po obshchei i russkoi frazeologii. – Samarkand: Izd-vo Samarkand. un-ta, 223 s. ISBN ne ukazan.
24. Simonov, P.V. (1993). Sozidayushchii mozg. – Moskva: Nauka, 109s. ISBN 5-02-005744-4: 210.00.
25. Teliya, V.N. (1998). Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskii, pragmaticheskii i lingvokul'turologicheskii aspekty. Moskva: Shkola "Yazyki russkoi kul'tury", ISBN: 5-88766-047-3.
26. Fedulenkova, T.N., Adamiya, Z.K., Chabashvili, M. (2014). Frazeologicheskoe prostranstvo natsional'nogo slovarya v sopostavitel'nom aspekte. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Akademiya Estestvoznaniya", ISBN 978-5-91327-273-7
27. Fink, ZH. (2013). Sravnitel'nye frazeologizmy: natsional'nye i obshcheevropeiskie. In: XV Mezhdunarodnyi s"ezd slavistov. Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii. Greifswald, 2013. S. 151–159.
28. Fink, ZH. (2013). Sravnitel'nye frazeologizmy: natsional'nye i obshcheevropeiskie. In: XV Mezhdunarodnyi s"ezd slavistov. Natsional'noe i internatsional'noe v slavyanskoi frazeologii. Greifswald, 2013. S. 151–159.
29. Khairullina, R.KH., Aichichek Musap, Boztash Abdullakh (2011). Universal'nye kul'turnye kontsepty v kontekste mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii. In: Vestnik Adygeiskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2: Filologiya i iskusstvovedenie, vyp. 3, s. 197–202.
30. Cherdantseva, T. Z. (1996). Idiomatika i kul'tura (postanovka voprosa) / T. Z. Cherdantseva. In: Voprosy yazykoznaniya, Moskva, № 1, s. 58–70.
31. Shakhovskii, V.I., Panchenko, N.N. (1999). Natsional'no-kul'turnaya spetsifika kontsepta "obman" vo frazeologicheskoi aspekte. In: Frazeologiya v kontekste kul'tury. M., s. 285–288. ISBN 5-88766-061-9 AGINSKY, B.W. 1984. The importance of language universals / B.W. Aginsky, E.G. Aginsky. In: "Word", №3, vol. 4.
32. Cowie, A.P. (1998). Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Application. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
33. Croft, W. (1996). Typology and Universals. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
34. Crystal, D. (2009). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language: 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN: 9780521530330.
35. Dobrovolskij, D. & Piirainen, E. (2005). Figurative Language: Cross-cultural Linguistics and Cross-linguistic Perspectives. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
36. Duden (2008). Redewendungen. Wörterbuch der deutschen Idiomatik. In: 3. Überarb. Aufl. Hrsg.v.d. Dudenredaktion. Mannheim. 959 S.
37. Fedulenkova, T. (2006). Is Phraseology Typologically Relevant? In: Collocations and Idioms 1: The 1st Nordic Conference on Syntactic Freezes / Ed. Marja Nenonen / University of Joensuu, pp. 51–52.
38. Fedulenkova, T. (2005). Isomorphism and Allomorphy of English, German and Swedish Phraseological Units Based on Metaphor. In: Phraseology 2005: The many faces of Phraseology: Proceedings of an interdisciplinary conference. Louvain-la-Neuve, pp. 125–128.
39. Fleischer, W. (1982). Phraseologie der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Leipzig: VEB Bibliogr. Institut.
40. Glaser, R. (1995). Linguistic Features and Genre Profiles of Scientific English. Frankfurt-am-Mein, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wein: Peter Lang.
41. Glaser, R. (1995). Linguistic Features and Genre Profiles of Scientific English. Frankfurt-am-Mein, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wein: Peter Lang.
42. Greenberg, J.H. (1963). Memorandum concerning language universals / J.H. Greenberg, Ch. Osgood, J. Jenkins. In: Universals of language, ed. by J.H. Greenberg. Cambridge (Mass.).
43. Korhonen, J. (2007). Probleme der kontrastiven Phraseologie. Phraseologie. Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung. Berlin: De Gruyter, 613 s. ISBN 3-503-09812-7.
44. Naciscione, A. (2010). Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.