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Abstract: This paper is devoted to the problems of presentation of phraseological units in contextual use, allowing to establish the most widespread phraseological transformations in English and Russian languages. It provides a systematization of these approaches to the study of idioms and offers an integrated modeling method of phraseological transformations based on the identification of syntactic, logico-semantic, motivational, structural, derivational and nominative models of phraseological transforms. A brief analyses is given to the description of all the stages in the formation of phraseological transforms: occasionalisms and neologisms. The main focus is on the need for revealing the most essential language processes found its reflection in the phraseological fund, which have not been investigated by researchers earlier.
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INTRODUCTION

Phraseology is a special part of the wealth of each language in which the originality and uniqueness of the language are shown. In the light of keen interest in studying of cultures and languages of different people linguists-lexicographers, translators and teachers of foreign languages feel the need for more exact transfer of semantic volume of phraseological unit (PU). Traditional principle of disclosure of the maintenance of a word meaning through a minimum of the distinctive signs is insufficient nowadays.

The detailed analysis of phraseological variety, research of the stylistic use of phraseological units show the dynamic character of phraseology. The dynamic state of the language is caused by the formation, functioning and interaction of commonly used language units together with occasional. The formation of new meanings of words under the influence of phraseological units serves as an indicator of dynamic processes in the semantic development of units of language system. The nature of phraseological units determines the necessity of their investigation in the anthropocentric paradigm.

The modern paradigm of linguistics marks different word-formation activities at different stages of language development. The study of authors’ variations of phraseological units in speech is very significant for understanding the patterns of word-formation as “new phraseological units are created on the same model like author’s converted units” [1].

The majority of Western European linguists suggest a link with the “decoded aspect of axiomatic” as one of the main features of units of language. It is assumed that each coding is idiomatic. George W. Grace was the first not only to introduce the term ‘idiomatology’ but also to use it in the sense that coincides with our conviction that it shows principal features of a science. The famous scholar Sweet notes that “the meaning of each idiom is an isolated entity that can not be inferred from the meaning of the words of which it is composed” [2]. More than half a century later scientists as Bar-Hillel [3], Cowan [4], Fries [5], Nida [6] and Pei [7] interpreted idiom as lexical group. Kenneth Pike (1967) called his phrasal unit a hypermorpheme and described it as a specific sequence of two or more specific morphemes [8]. Thus what we normally refer to as ‘idiomatic expression’ must be a subset of the hypermorpheme. Allan Healey (1968) excluded monomorphemic lexemes as idioms, yet both linguists understood idioms in the usual and generally accepted view, referring to an additional hypermorphemic (i.e. idiomatic) meaning which is not predictable from its constituent parts [9].
The term “formula” was attached to polymorphemic constructions irrespective of the dictionary status of the involved form (Jespersen). Swadesh calls the semantic polymorphemic forms as complex lexemes. The representative of the Prague linguistic school Frantisek Chermak considers that "a distinctive feature of any idiom is any anomaly, at least, one of its components if we mention its paradigmatic or syntagmatic aspects" [10].

In western linguistics phraseological unit is considered as the unique and fixed combination of two elements, some of which don't act in other situations, or work but only in very limited number.

Linguistic analysis of western works on phraseology shows that the approaches to the study of idioms are more structural, based on formal approach while semantics is what really matters Russian scientists. The results of the study of existing works in phraseology suggest that there was not enough use of communicative and functional approach to the study of the phraseological material and the absence of the theory related to the phraseological transformations. The theory of this level can reveal the causes, assumptions and parameters of transformations as a process. The diachronic aspect of the research and analysis of the historical background of literature corpus can detect the direction of the dynamics of transformational theory related to the phraseological transform.

Many Russian scientists considering the reasons of innovations in a language, in the field of word formation, grammar, in stereotypes of speech behavior point the influence of social factors as democratization of the Russian society, any removal of restrictions in political and social life.

An idiom is a realization of cultural knowledge, cognitive "memory" which keeps the cultural traditions of folk mentality that determine the functioning and reproduction of phraseology as a constant view of the world.

When we have objective data about typical and stereotypical comparisons, we can understand the ontology and mechanisms of functioning of phraseological units in a language or a text.

Stereotypical nature of native speakers’ reactions towards occasional phraseological units allow to make conclusion that typicality of images, underlying phraseological meanings and involvement of the symbol, models and culture settings, reflecting the understanding, characteristic of the linguocultural unity, brings us to the idea that phraseological unit is the result of collective thinking. Moreover, the fact that it is impossible to comprehend a phraseological unit only according to the individual experience, figurativeness of these linguistic units and their ability to cause certain feelings, emotions and relations, allows to determine the cultural identity of the speakers. All this makes it possible to assume that phraseological units are the collective representations that belong to the archaic way of thinking and therefore phraseologisms must be generated and perceived by the archaic structures of consciousness that co-exist along with the structures of logics. This type of consciousness is characterized by the syncretism of psychic processes, concrete and imaginary nature of nature processes, unique logics that does not presuppose the existence of a cause-and-effect relationship and based on the law of “communion” meaning the identification of the object and the subject.

It was revealed that the acceptability of any construction from recipient’s point of view is determined by correlation with a linguistic norm and the corresponding model and ability to its logically correct interpretation. In its formal structure many transformed units are entities, corresponding to an active or passive phrase-generating model created, however, in violation of the laws of the compatibility and interoperability of immediate constituents. Therefore the interpretation in many cases is entirely dependent on the context.

The original PU is not a product created in the act of communication, in opposition to an occasional phraseological unit. It is reproduced in a speech in its actual form. They have already laid the illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect. The speaker only needs to identify his intentions with that, what is conventionally attached in idioms, in their standard use and perception. This feature of phraseological units determines ability to serve as a cultural and linguistic stereotypes.

As experimental data showed that national linguistic personality perceives an object not according to space and time, but also according to the meaning, containing cultural stereotypes and models.

The method of semantic transformations is based on the fact that semantic identity and typological similarity of the internal form of a number of phraseological units belonging to different languages, indicate the formation of unified semantics for structural and semantic model.

We assume that phrase formation is a cognitive process, in which, with the help of mental operations on the basis of old knowledge we see the categorization of new knowledge and new units in speech, language and the mental lexicon.
The basis of the linguistic approach to the phrase formation includes the following principles: (1) the principle of language representation of the human experience through the prism of human activities, with the most important feature is the ability to implicit linguistic representations: the cognitive structure of the new words can reflect even those elements of the denotative situations that do not have the explicit expression; (2) phrase formational structure of the new language unit (or occasionalism) may be related to the propositional structure motivating judgment and can be considered as a special type of knowledge representation; (3) the principle, based on the categorization of prototypical nature of human experience, knowledge about the world and their language representation.

The study of the linguistic parameters of the phenomenon of phraseological transformation implies the vision to this process as a cognitive process, aimed at the conceptualization of new facts in the matrix existing in the phraseological corpus of language, the result of which are new phraseological transforms.

All phraseological transformations can be divided into two groups: structural-semantic and semantic transformations. The methods of structural-semantic transformations include the expansion of component structure, replacement of components, formation of transformed units according to models, ellipsis, modification of syntactic model, segmentation, role inversion; methods of semantic transformation include double actualization, literal form and complete reconsideration of PU.

In the modern theory of phraseology the ability of PU to be a powerful means of compression, through which they pass in compressed form comparable to the amount of text information (objective and subjective) of the knowable object does not raise objections. In this regard, a high informative capacity of conciseness and expressiveness of the phraseological unit make it indispensable, where it is necessary to give precise, succinct and expressive characteristics of the subject, a person or action. According to the observations of phraseologists, the farther away the initial situation from the reality, the brighter and more original image generated by it.

Occasional phraseology is considered as a set of phraseological speech of new formations that have a characteristic of occasional units like accessory speech, no reproducibility, author affiliation, derivatives, non-normativity, functional disposability, contextual conditioning, increased expressiveness, synchronous and diachronic diffuseness.

We are inclined to differentiate definitions of phraseological transform and occasional idiom. Phraseological transforms are the variants of phraseological units functioning in the speech which are not recorded in the standard dictionaries, formed by separate native speakers with definite communicative purposes. Transformations of language phraseological units, as a whole are not beyond semantic similarity with a phraseological invariant, but characterized by contextual semantic increments or partial change of component structure.

Occasional idioms are units operating in speech which are not units of the national vocabulary, they are not recorded in the standard dictionaries and formed by individual native speakers with certain communicative goals by transforming of language PU. Such PU are significantly different from a phraseological invariant in the semantics and/or structure.

The pragmatic value of a phraseological transform is determined by motivation of the statement. The communicative aspect of occasional phraseological configurations and pragmatic value of the statement are defined by correspondence of systemic characteristics of correlating elements in a context.

Modern linguistic paradigm proves that PU possesses different range of transformative potential. A number of characteristics of each PU determines the degree of activity of conversion processes. Units with an active transformative potential are usually composed of three or more components formed by standard models of phrases and sentences that have an isomorphic form and meaning. The absence of any one or more of these features reduces the activity of the transformation processes.

Thus, PU is interpreted as a linguistic unit, characterized by the asymmetry of the expression and the content of the plan, reproducibility, stability of structure and use, as well as the low degree of regularity.

Russian scientist T. Malinsky points out three conditions for distinguishing phraseological neologisms from the occasional uses of the PU: "there is a triple fixation of neologism by various written sources, checking on the knowledge of the neologism by native speakers and the lack of phraseological units’ fixation in monolingual dictionaries" [11].
Thus, new PU appearing originally in the speech of one person can be repeated by other native speakers. But until this unit functions at the level of the speech, it remains as a nonce word.

The formation of occasional variants of PU is performed in the models that exist in the language: "the frequency of transformations has rather definite modeling properties of the main types, its variation with colloquial words..." [12].

One of the main extra-factors causing occasional transformation of language idioms is mainly author's intentions. Occasional transformations of language idioms are made with the aim to make new, additional meanings by changing the valuation and stylistic markedness, increasing its expressiveness. Changes in the semantics of idiom is motivated by the desire of the authors to concretize the explication, intensify the meaning of PU. Language phraseological unit is a model for the processes of occasional modeling. For the implementation of the occasional modeling the features of basic PU are revealed which activate processes of transformation and define author's intentions, using the methods of occasional conversion of PU.

Currently, linguistics studies several major researching methods of the occasional phraseology: (1) "the method of nesting" presented by N. Khalikova, which shows the analysis of all occasionalisms of one phraseological unit [13]; (2) classificational method studies the similarities and differences in the use of different phraseological occasionalisms, in which the analysis of the same model is defined as different PU and there is a well-established classification of phraseological occasionalisms on formal aspects of the transformation of component composition.

Obviously, each method has certain advantages. The method of nesting helps to determine the direction of rethinking of semantic components of PU and set the degree of semantic fusion. While classificational method sets the number of typical modifications that have similar motivation and performance variation.

Complex method of phraseological transformations’ modeling involves an obligatory detection of syntax, logical-semantic, motivational, structural and semantic, derivational and nominative models of phraseological transforms. Modeling of these aspects include the identification of the following: the structural organization of idiomatic transformation as a combination of words (syntax model); logico-semantic organization of idiomatic transformer (logico-semantic / iso-semantic model); the internal form of idiomatic transformer (motivational model); the value of the component of idiomatic transformation implemented in a number of phraseological transforms based on their structural and linguistic parameters (structural and semantic model); PU-prototype (derivative model); a referential area of the idiomatic transform (nominating model) [14]. This objectively reflects the proposed algorithm which is the application of integrated modeling approach of the phraseological transformation that has a different compatibility of certain lexemes and their equivalents in different languages ??leading to the fact that the same images get different phraseological reflection.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of phraseological transforms in Russian and English has revealed some new trends in their development: the presence of function-stylistically marked units, shift of individual units in the status of common used PU followed by removal of some pragmatic constraints of the use.

Detection of features of PU functioning requires studying all the manifestations connected with spheres of three fundamental functions of language-nominative, communicative, pragmatic-in their close interaction. The nominative value of phraseological units consists in their ability to designate these or those fragments of reality, to reflect various semantic categories.

Semasiological analysis shows that semantic and grammatical features of each PU play a crucial role in drawing up a concrete word-formation paradigm. They influence on the degree of activity / inactivity of transformational processes, degree of converting potential of phraseological units, quantity of phraseological derivatives, openness / closeness of phraseological ranks.

The direction and rates of diachronic changes in the language are closely connected as with extralinguistic factors (history, geography, policy, culture of ethnos) and linguistic laws: type and language system.

Phraseological transformations appear under the influence of the events occurring in the society and their structural and language parameters depend on the language type.
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