

Artículo de investigación

## Variability of phraseological units embodying the «blame» concept in national linguistic cultures

Вариантность фразеологизмов, воплощающих концепт «порицание», в национальных лингвокультурах

Variabilidad de las unidades fraseológicas que encarnan el concepto de "culpa" en las culturas lingüísticas nacionales

Recibido: 8 de agosto del 2019

Aceptado: 10 de septiembre del 2019

Written by:

**Tatiana Yu. Zalavina**<sup>63</sup>  
**Lyudmila I. Antropova**<sup>64</sup>  
**Nataliya V. Dyorina**<sup>65</sup>  
**Liliya S. Polyakova**<sup>66</sup>  
**Yuliya V. Yuzhakova**<sup>67</sup>

### Abstract

The study presents a conceptual analysis of the phraseological variation that arose as a result of reflecting the mental activity of people and the world language picture. It is vividly expressed in the phraseology of the language, which determines the state of the language and the conditions for its variability, which depend on the worldview and the cultural values of the speakers of national languages. The cognitive-linguistic study of phraseological corpus allows studying the variability of the French verbal phraseological units which represents the concept of blame as the component of the ethnic worldview. The concept of blame is a certain type of phraseological concept. It consists of verbal phraseological units of the French language. The verbal phraseological units which are the representatives of the given concept are included in the category of concept scenarios, as they objectify the semes of action, motion, and process. The aim of the study is via the example of the French verbal phraseological units-representatives of the concept of blame to demonstrate the ability of lexical and grammatical variation within a single language system, while maintaining the identity of their phraseological variants, and to prove the dynamics of the units at lexical and

### Аннотация

В статье проводится концептуальный анализ фразеологической вариантности, возникшей как результат отражения ментальной деятельности людей и языковой картины мира. Ярко и экспрессивно она репрезентирована во фразеологическом языковом фонде, который определяет и состояние языка, и условия его варьирования в зависимости от мировосприятия и культурных ценностей носителей национальных языков. Когнитивно-лингвистическое исследование фразеологических корпусов позволяет изучить вариантность французских глагольных фразеологизмов-репрезентантов концепта «порицание» как одной из составляющей этнической картины мира. Вербализуемый глагольными фразеологизмами французского языка концепт «порицание» рассматривается как особый тип фразеологических концептов. Глагольные фразеологизмы-репрезентанты рассматриваемого концепта вписываются в разряд концептов-сценариев, так как предполагают объективирование сем действия, движения, процесса. Цель предпринятого аналитического изучения

<sup>63</sup> Assistant professor of the Foreign Languages for Engineering Department, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia

<sup>64</sup> Professor of the Foreign Languages for Engineering Department, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia

<sup>65</sup> Assistant professor of the Foreign Languages for Engineering Department, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia

<sup>66</sup> Assistant professor of the Foreign Languages for Engineering Department, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia

<sup>67</sup> Assistant professor of the Foreign Languages for Engineering Department, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia

phraseological levels in synchronous level. This proves the novelty of the research, which results in the possibility of the existence of various phraseological features of the studied concept. They are a unified image, the same source of origin, a general denotative meaning, a partial or a complete coincidence of the structural meanings of the verbal lexical units when their grammatical structure does not coincide and vice versa. The variants of verbal phraseological units representatives of the concept of blame are being revealed. They are structured-grammatical, lexical-stylistic, lexical, and quantitative variants.

**Keywords:** Blame, concept, lexico-grammatical variations, phraseological variants, verbal phraseological units.

заключается в том, чтобы на примере французских глагольных фразеологизмов-репрезентантов концепта «порицание» показать их способность к лексико-грамматическому варьированию в пределах одной системы при сохранении тождества фразеологических вариантов, подтвердить проявление динамики единиц лексического и фразеологического уровней в синхронии. Сказанное определяет новизну исследования, которая вытекает из возможности существования разных вариантных фразеологических признаков изучаемого концепта: единый образ, один и тот же источник происхождения, общее денотативное значение, частичное или полное совпадение категориальных значений глагольных лексических единиц при несовпадении их грамматической структуры и наоборот. Выявлены типы вариантов глагольных фразеологизмов-репрезентантов концепта «порицание»: структурно-грамматические, лексико-стилистические, лексические и количественные варианты. Предназначается для широкого круга исследователей, интересующихся проблемами фразеологии, когнитивной семантики, лингвокультурологии.

**Ключевые слова:** порицание, концепт, лексико-грамматическое варьирование, фразеологические варианты, глагольные фразеологизмы.

## Resumen

El estudio presenta un análisis conceptual de la variación fraseológica que surgió como resultado de reflejar la actividad mental de las personas y la imagen del lenguaje mundial. Se expresa vívidamente en la fraseología del idioma, que determina el estado del idioma y las condiciones para su variabilidad, que dependen de la cosmovisión y los valores culturales de los hablantes de los idiomas nacionales. El estudio cognitivo-lingüístico del corpus fraseológico permite estudiar la variabilidad de las unidades fraseológicas verbales francesas que representan el concepto de culpa como el componente de la cosmovisión étnica. El concepto de culpa es un cierto tipo de concepto fraseológico. Consiste en unidades fraseológicas verbales de la lengua francesa. Las unidades de fraseología verbal que son los representantes del concepto dado se incluyen en la categoría de escenarios conceptuales, ya que objetivan los semes de acción, movimiento y proceso. El objetivo del estudio es a través del ejemplo de las unidades fraseológicas verbales francesas-representantes del concepto de culpa para demostrar la capacidad de variación léxica y gramatical dentro de un sistema de lenguaje único, mientras se mantiene la identidad de sus variantes fraseológicas, y para demostrar la dinámica de las unidades a nivel léxico y fraseológico en nivel sincrónico. Esto demuestra la novedad de la investigación, que da como resultado la posibilidad de la existencia de varias características fraseológicas del concepto estudiado. Son una imagen unificada, la misma fuente de origen, un significado denotativo general, una coincidencia parcial o completa de los significados estructurales de las unidades léxicas verbales cuando su estructura gramatical no coincide y viceversa. Se están revelando las variantes de las unidades de fraseología verbal representativas del concepto de culpa. Son variantes estructuradas-gramaticales, léxico-estilísticas, léxicas y cuantitativas.

**Palabras clave:** Culpa, concepto, variaciones lexico-gramaticales, variantes fraseológicas, unidades verbales fraseológicas.

## Introduction

Though the phenomenon of phraseological variation represents the most studied issue in linguistic research, the relevance of this problem has not lost its significance (Antropova et al., 2014; Antropova et al., 2017; Telia, 1972; Yuzhakova & Polyakova 2018). To understand the nature of the term and its basic properties, we refer to the definition of "variance" given in the comprehensive dictionary "Linguistics". The concept of variance reflects different ways of expressing the language essence - its modification, varieties, deviations from the norm (Sokolova, 1998, p. 80). The presence of a constant composition of structural components is a characteristic of a phraseological unit as a super word unit with its natural meaning. However, some deviations are possible in the component composition of phraseological groups associated with the semantic and pragmatic characteristics of these groups and with the source of their origin. The paper considers some theoretical positions of domestic and foreign scientists.

The largest domestic linguist N. F. Alefirenko speaks of the variability of the lexical composition of phraseological groups as a vivid manifestation of their dynamics in synchronism. The researcher simultaneously develops the idea of a communicatively conditioned process of the entire phraseological system, the improvement of which occurs due to the functional and semantic potentials of the phrase (Alefirenko, 2006, p. 5). Whereas Shansky, expresses a different point of view and proposes to consider phraseological variants as lexico-grammatical varieties of phrases. He emphasizes that they are also identical in terms of the degree of semantic cohesion and meaning. Therefore, the existing differences between phraseological variants do not allow the violation of their identity (Shansky, 2012, p. 55). V.N. Telia believes that the options of the phraseological flag include normal changes that preserve the lexical and grammatical properties of phraseological units, but do not lead to a change in the volume of the concept of the signified. The author emphasizes that these possible changes do not violate the systemic significance of the flag, the syntactic equivalence of the options, the relationship of the flag with other units at the synonymous, subject-thematic and phraseological levels. If "the replacement of a phraseological flag allows retaining the properties of invariance or identity of the reference correlation of the flag and its significance, then we are talking about varying the flag in its one or both plans" (Retsker, 1963, pp. 30-69). In his scientific research, the

phraseologist V.P. Zhukov (1986) extends the concept of the phraseological option to the phraseological series. The scientist proves that during the formation of phraseological groups it is better to use parallel phrases in speech, which are easy to subject gradually to phraseological groups. As this type of phraseology forms, he writes, there is the possibility of a cognitive-semantic analysis of variance as a condition for replacing the components of a word combination. Scientists classify the options of phraseological flags as phonetic, morphological, species, constructive, derivational, and lexical (Antropova, Zalavina & Polyakova, 2017, p. 166). Thus, some scientists see options in their form, that is, a plan for the expression of stable word combinations. The word combination is a variant of phraseological flags.

The attention of foreign researchers is attracted by the works of Giro, as he describes the essence and characteristics of phraseology in detail. According to P. Giro, idiom is "an expression of several words that form a syntactic and lexical unity; unity of form and meaning (*unité de forme et de sens*), deviation from the grammatical or lexical norm (*écart de la norme grammaticale ou lexicale*), a particular metaphorical meaning (*valeurs métaphoriques particulières*)" (Telia, 1972, p. 5). French researcher-linguist A. Rey expresses the idea of the unpredictability of the phraseology meaning and its semantic modeling. He says that "phraseology is an integral, unmotivated linguistic sign, arbitrary concerning its components and completely unpredictable" (Yarovaya, 2002). It is important to emphasize that domestic linguists, in the framework of their research, develop both general and specific problems of the idiom in different national languages (Medina, 2019). They also give a scientific interpretation to phraseological groups. The scientists emphasize the role of semantic factors in the formation of phraseological units and the ethnonational originality of lexico-phraseological groups. The authors explore the concepts of different types based on the criteria they developed for determining phraseological options.

According to A. Nazaryan, the phraseological option is a variant of the phraseological group fixed by the norm. The researchers characterize the norm by the unity of the image, the generality of the denotative-significative content, the function performed in the language and the categorical lexical-grammatical meaning (Nazaryan, 1987, p. 227).

Criteria for the attribution of phraseological units to the category of variant ones are elaborated in detail on the material of the French language by G.G. Sokolova: "...the speakers form the phraseological option in the language of the secondary range as a result of using the metropolis as general French lexeme components as well as specifically Belgian lexemes in the phraseology system, provided the preservation of the identity of their meanings, the structure is of the same type, the unity of associations that are caused by the original variable combination" (Sokolova, 1998, p. 480).

### The Present Study

The subject of our attention and analytical study is the ability of French verbal phraseological units-representatives of the concept "censure" to lexico-grammatical variation. Phraseological groups participate in the categorization of other linguistic reality. They form the cultural space and characterize their bearers, thereby creating the opportunity to join the culture or the country of the studied language (Dyorina, Savinova, Zalavina et al, 2017, p. 376). The uniqueness of language, and culture "determines the worldview of a particular carrier or a particular language, of a particular culture" (Syreishikova, 1948, p. 34). The phraseological composition of any national language is diverse, different in origin, closely connected with the history, culture and way of life of the people. The composition of the language embodies its spirit, imaginative way of thinking and value orientations, which testify to the culture of the nation: "the inner form of the phraseological units bears the evidence of nation's culture".

(Nazaryan, 1987, p. 132). Researches of the French phraseological body differ by the presence of the nationally marked material and multiple possibilities of its study. Investigation of the phraseological corpus of the French language is distinguished by the presence of commonly marked material and multiple possibilities for its research (Zalavina & Kisel, 2016, p. 9694).

The concept of "blaming" is "one of the types of negative evaluation of a person's activity, a negative attitude toward the situation created by extra-linguistic reality and people" (Lineva & Zalavina, 2013, p. 12). Therefore, the semantic differential feature in the grammatical structure of the verbal phraseological units was the same of the "negative evaluation of the object," which in its turn is based on the "establishment of order", "the active influence of the subject on the object" (Nazaryan, 1987, pp. 106-109). "Since

the concept of blame is associated with an action and is mainly verbalized through oral phraseological groups, the body of oral phraseological groups is determined by the presence in the grammatical structure of the categorical seme "action" or "procedure" an antic distinctive feature of the "negative evaluation of an object" and an integrated seme "process of expressing a negative attitude" (Zalavina & Kisel, 2016, pp. 9696).

### Methodology

Research material was taken from monolingual and bilingual phraseological dictionaries. The idioms with the general meaning of 'censure' via the continuous sampling method were selected. The study was based on the French-Russian phraseological dictionary (Retsker), *Locutions idiomatiques d'après le principe étimologique* (french), which is the dictionary of idiomatic expressions of the French language on the basis of the etymological principle (Syreishikova), it represents French forms of phraseological units with analysis of their meanings in Russian language; French language dictionary (Petit Robert), which presents French variants of phraseological units with the interpretation of their meanings in the French language (Retsker, 1963; Syreishikova, 1948). The analyzed phraseological units, being the integral semantic feature, have a common feature of 'expressing disapproval by negative evaluation. The general integrated semantic feature transfers an action, a process, an act, a judgment, a condition that can be expressed only with verbal phraseological units.

### Results and Analysis

We consider the variability of a verbal phraseological unit as the modification established by language standards, which do not change its semantic identity (Petit Larousse Illustré, 1989, p. 225). This implies that the phraseological variations are characterized by the signs of variability of verbal phraseological units. They are a single image, the same source of origin, a collective denotative meaning, the concurring numbers of meanings, the convergence of categorical definitions and language function, the convergence of vocabulary (partial or complete) when grammatical structures are different. Let us analyze these linguistic features more closely.

The first and most important feature that distinguishes the phraseological option from the phraseological synonym is the unity of the

image. Furthermore, this sig acts as a semantic invariant and plays a leading role in preserving the identities of the verbal phraseological unit with their lexical, structural, and grammatical changes.

The second feature, which is close to the unity of image, points to the same origin of phraseological variations. Identification of this source is an important necessity in the process of establishing variant forms of verbal phraseological units in French. Thus, verbal phraseological units *donner une peignée à qqn.* and *flanquer une peignée à qqn.* (e.g. in French) share meanings *drag smb by the hair, give a bashing aiming to scold someone (injurer qqn. e.g. in French)*, and, therefore, are phraseological variations. This explains the fact that both verbal phraseological units are of the same origin. They are based on the image of a comb, a brush. That is why their original idiomatic meaning is *to give a comb/ a brush to someone; to throw a few hairs, captured with a comb at someone*. The phraseological variants *tirer les oreilles à qqn.* and *allonger les oreilles à qqn.* (e.g. in French) represent their framework with a word *les oreille (e.g. in French)- ears*. As their original idiomatic meaning *drag someone by one's ear or tweak a child's ears*, they have established the meaning *'to reprimand someone, to punish someone (réprimander qqn. e.g. in French)*. Variability is more characteristic of idiomatic phraseological groups, as their inner form is rather transparent and is clear to the recipient and the agent.

Collective denotative meaning is the third feature. In terms of semantics, phraseological variants, having different stylistic coloring, are also equal alternatives. But such verbal phraseological units belong to different styles of speech. Thus, verbal phraseological units, for e.g. *casser la gueule à qqn.* (e.g. in French) which means *bash someone's face, snap somebody's neck* (conversational) in English; *donner sur la gueule à qqn.* (e.g. in French) or *slam in one's face, whack somebody one* (colloq.) in English belong to colloquial speech. They contain a word-footnote *la gueule (e.g. in French)*, which refers to vulgar language (e.g., in French a word *la gueule* is not included the literary norms). Thus, in the French-Russian phraseological dictionary by Recker, they are accompanied by a mark Conv. (abbr. from conversational) and colloq. (abbr. from colloquial). For example, verbal phraseological units *faire procès à qqn.*, *faire le (unu son) procès à qqn.* (e.g. in French) have a common figurative basis. They represent phraseological variants meaning to accuse, to preach down condemn.

The fourth feature is the concurring number of meanings. Phraseological variants, having a uniform image, a common origin, equivalent semantic meaning, have a concurring number of meanings. For example, verbal phraseological units *faire procès à qqn.* and *faire le (unu son) procès à qqn.* (French) have the same idiomatic basis. They are phraseological variants meaning *to blame, to reprimand, to censure*.

The fifth feature characterizes the overlapping of category meaning and the performed language function. Phraseological variants belong to the same class (e.g., non-communicative, or communicative phraseological units). They are a part of the same subclass (e.g., nominative, functional, interjection, or modal phraseological groups). Phraseological variants belong to the same lexical and grammatical category (e.g., substantive, adjective, verbal, or adverbial phraseological units). If the above functional and category overlapping is found, the phraseological units are classified as variants (Yuzhakova & Polyakova, 2018). Verbal phraseological units representing the concept of "blame" belong to the same class of communicative phraseological units, as they implement similar speaker's communicative intentions. These verbal phraseological signs refer to the secondary nomination signs, combining the function of naming the phenomenon of reality with the task of its intellectual and emotional qualification and evaluation. They belong to the same lexical and grammatical category, the category of verbal phraseological units since the verb is their core component. The dominant grammatical component reveals the correlation of the verbal phraseological unit with the verb: e.g., *chanter pouilles a qqn.* (French) – "to reproach, vilify, scold someone"; *donner une douche a qqn.* (French) - "to reprimand someone", "to read somebody a lesson", "to rebuke"; *mettre la patte sur qqn.* (French) - "to beat; deal with; to give a good telling-off"(coll.); *faire un bon / mauvais tour a qqn.* (French) - "to play a bad joke with someone, laugh at someone"; *monter une garde a qqn.* (French) – "to keep watch with someone, to reprimand someone severely", etc.

The sixth feature is the presence of at least one common component in phraseological variants for all other structural and grammatical differences. Thus, in the following examples, the standard element acting as a lexical invariant is the verb: *s'offrir le portrait de qqn.* (French) - "to laugh at someone" (coll.); *s'offrir la tete de qqn.* (French) – "to scoff, mock at someone" (coll.); *arranger qqn. aux petits oignons (French)* – "to tear someone to pieces"; *coller un pain (sur la*

*gueule) a qqn., flanquer un pain (sur la gueule) a qqn. (French)* – “whack somebody one” (coll); *mettre qqn. au pied du mur, tenir qqn. au pied du mur (French)* – “to nail someone to the wall”, and others. These examples demonstrate a semantic cohesion of verbal phraseological units, since the semantic invariant preserves their identity.

In modern French, phraseological variants comprise structural and grammatical variants, lexical variants, lexical-stylistic variants, quantitative variants, orthographic variants, combined variants. The study is based on the phraseological variants typology proposed by Nazaryan (Nazaryan, 1987, p. 228). The research has revealed that French verbal phraseological units representing the concept of “blame” have different types of phraseological variants: structural and grammatical variants, lexical variants, quantitative variants, lexical-stylistic ones. Verbal phraseological units, which are identical in their lexical composition, but differ in grammatical structures, can be attributed to the structural-grammatical variants. Morphological variants that differ in their morphological features belong to the above type. Morphological variation can be expressed by:

- a) The use of a different number of the noun: e.g., *faire une gorge chaude, faire des gorges chaudes (French)* – “to mock at someone”; *ne pas mâcher la chose, ne pas mâcher les mots (French)* – “to say straight, to put it baldly; to say plump, to criticize”, etc.; *se donner du talon dans le derriure, se donner des talons dans le derriure (French)* – “to laugh at”, etc.;
- b) The use of different articles: e.g., *passer au tamis, passer par le tamis (French)* - “to pick to pieces”, “to subject to criticism”; “to criticize severely” (coll.), etc. ; *faire du ragot, faire des ragots (French)* – “to throw mud at someone”, “to slander” (sl.); *casser du sucre sur le dos de qqn., casser le sucre sur la tkte de qqn. (French)* - “to slander”, “to gossip unkindly”, “to pick somebody to pieces”, “to slag somebody off” (coll.), etc.;
- c) The replacing of the article by a determiner (most often by a possessive adjective): e.g., *faire la leçon à qqn., faire à qqn. sa leçon (French)* – “to lecture sb.”, “to rebuke”, etc.; *apprêter la sauce à qqn., donner sa sauce à qqn. (French)* – “to rap somebody's knuckles”, “comb somebody's hair for him”, etc.;

- d) The omission of the article: e.g., *avoir un grief à qqn., faire grief à qqn. de qch. (French)* – “to accuse sb. of sth.”, “to blame sb.”; *regarder de mauvais oeil, voir d'un oeil mauvais (French)* – “to frown at sb.”; *dire la peste de qqn., dire peste et rage de qqn. (French)* – “to abuse left and right”, “to vilify” (coll.), etc.;

As for the lexical variants, they also comprise verbal phraseological units that differ in their lexical properties. Interchangeable components are represented by the ideographic synonyms or the synonyms used only in the given word combination: e.g., *mettre qqn. en poussiere, ridiculiser qqn. en poudre (French)* – “to reduce to dust”, “to leave in tatters”, “to criticize severely”; *chanter sa gamme a qqn., monter une gamme a qqn. (French)* - “to give somebody a severe rating”, “take over a rough road” (coll.); *jeter qch. a la face, jeter qch. a la figure (French)* - “to reproach”, “to blame”, “to rebuke”, “to rasp out an insult”; *lancer un trait contre qqn., envoyer un trait contre qqn. (French)* – “to criticize sharply”, to take a swipe at”, etc.

Quantitative variants involve verbal phraseological units, which differ in the degree of completeness. Phraseological variants of this type are usually formed by truncation, rarely by adding one or several components at the beginning, middle or the end of the word combination: e.g., *mettre qqn. en quatre quartiers, mettre qqn. en quartiers (French)* – “to lash out against”, “to tear to pieces”; *mettre qqn. en pieces, mettre qqn. en piuces dûtachüs (French)* – “to pick to pieces”, “to shoot down in flames”, etc.

Lexical-stylistic variants studied in this work comprise verbal phraseological units, the components of which are interchangeable and can be replaced by a number of stylistic synonyms: e.g., *se payer la tkte de qqn., se payer la gueule de qqn. (French)* - “to laugh”, “to mock at someone” (coll.); *arranger qqn. aux petits oignons, assaisonner qqn. aux petits oignons (French)* – “to beat the tar out of somebody”, “to grain in imitation of walnut”, “to give a walnut finish” (sl.); *tourner la vis a qqn., tortiller la vis a qqn. (French)* - “to snap somebody's neck”; *dire qqn. des pointes, décocher des pointes (French)* – “to crack jokes”, “to poke fun”, “to sharpen joke”, etc.

## Conclusion

The question of identity and difference in the meanings of phraseological units is of great importance for the solution of theoretical and practical problems of phraseology. Thus, the study of lexical and structural-grammatical changes within a single verbal phraseological unit is necessary to trace identity and difference in the meanings of phraseological units. Therefore, it is quite apparent why the researchers show great interest in the problems of phraseological variation. Studies in the above field reveal the dynamic development and high mobility of the phraseological composition of the language which stresses the need for further study of phraseological variation within the lingua-cognitive approach. Such studies are the key to identifying national-specific lexical and grammatical features of the world's languages, to understanding the ways of thinking, worldview, and culture of ethnos through the prism of words.

## About the authors

**Zalavina Tatyana Yu.**, Ph. D. (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages in Engineering Department, Education in the Humanities Institute, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests include the French language, the German language, cognitive linguistics, etc. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0210-7963>

**Antropova Lyudmila I.**, Ph. D. (Philology), Prof. of Foreign Languages in Engineering Department, Education in the Humanities Institute, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests include the French language, the German language, cognitive linguistics, etc. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0496-139X>

**Dyorina Natalya V.**, Ph. D. (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages in Engineering Department, Education in the Humanities Institute, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests include the English language, English and Russian literature, education, etc. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0613-0864>

**Liliya S. Polyakova**, PhD (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages for Engineering, Institute of Humanities, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests include the English language, discourse, gender linguistics, political

discourse, etc. <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9990-7694>

**Yulia V. Yuzhakova**, PhD (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages in Engineering Department, Institute for the Humanities, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia. Research interests include English language, discourse analysis, political discourse, cognitive linguistics, etc. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6790-044X>

## References

- Alefirenko, N. (2006). Connotation and pragmatics of the "language of cultures". *Slavic languages concerning culture*, 8-26.
- Antropova, L., Grigorieva, N., Zalavina T., Savinov D., Suvorova E., et al. (2014). Imagery and rethinking as a form of semantic transformation of verbal phraseological units. *Modern educational technologies in vocational training of students of the Technical University*, 12- 14.
- Antropova, L., Zalavina, T., & Polyakova, L. (2017). Linguistic and cultural space of Serbia and Russia: general and characteristic national and cultural Aspects. Naslede. *Journal of Language, Literature, Arts, and Culture*, 33-38.
- Dyorina, N., Savinova, T., Zalavina, T., Zerkina, N., Kisel, O., et al. (2017). Polydiscursive Space: The Word, the Text, the Communication. Magnitogorsk. NMSTU.
- Guiraud, P. (1969). La sémantique. «Que sais-je?». Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Lineva, A., & Zalavina, T. (2013). The inner form of phraseological units and the Linguistic picture of the world. *Actual problems of modern science, technology, and education*, 132- 134.
- Medina, J. (2019). Mirada metafórica de la realidad: construcción y deconstrucción de una teoría de la novela. *Revista Latinoamericana de Difusión Científica*, 1 (1), 3-21.
- Nazaryan, A. (1987). The phraseology of the Modern French Language. Moscow: High school.
- Petit Larousse Illustré (1989). Dictionnaire de la langue française. Paris: Librairie Larousse.
- Retsker, J. (1963). French-Russian Phraseological Dictionary. Moscow: State Publishing House of Foreign National Dictionaries.
- Rey, A. (2003). Dictionnaire des expressions et locutions. Paris: Le Robert.
- Suvorova, E.V., Polyakova, L.S. (2018). Types of inferences in discourse. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (1), 294-306.
- Shansky, N. (2012). The phraseology of the Modern Russian Language. Moscow: Librocom.

Sokolova, G. (1998). Variabilité phraséologique comme moyen d'enrichissement du français actuel. Actes du XXII-ème Congrès International de linguistique et philologie romanes, 479- 482. (in French)

Syreischikova, A. (1948). Locutions idiomatiques d'après le principe étimologique. Moscow: Publishing House of Literature in Foreign Languages. (in French)

Telia, V. (1972). Idiom variation and the principles of variant identification. Problems of stability and variation of phraseological units, 30-69.

Yarovaya, V. (2002). Linguistics. The Great Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow: The Great Russian Encyclopedia.

Yuzhakova, Yu., & Polyakova, L. (2018). Ethnic stereotypes in English political discourse.

*Philological Science. Questions of theory and practice*, 199-202.

Zalavina, T., Afanasyeva, O., & Shorokhova, L. (2016). The paremiological concept of "money" as a form of mental representation of knowledge about the world. *Problems of History, Philology, Culture*, 372-379.

Zalavina, T. (2007). Cognitive-pragmatic aspects of phraseological units with the meaning "blame", 1-25.

Zalavina, T., & Kisel, O. (2016). "Blame" concept in phraseology: cognitive semantic Aspect (based on the French language)". *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 9693-9703.

Zhukov, V. (1986). Russian Phraseology. Moscow: High school.