

to the classical approach. It can explain why attributes contribute to the internal category structure without being shared by all category members, without being necessary and essential according to the Aristotelian model. An ostrich is an ostrich not only because it has feathers and it lays eggs. It also has a long neck like a flamingo and decorative feathers like a peacock. We should consider any sensible attribute suggested for a candidate in order to find a place for it in the category.

W. Labov studied categorization of crockery: cups, mugs, bowls, vases. The results of his experiments showed that in everyday situations we do not draw a sharp line between category 'X' and 'not X' and in ambiguous cases we use the names of the neighbouring categories [4].

It was also proved by other experiments. B. Berlin and P. Key demonstrated that despite the universal principles of color terms categorization, the reference boundaries of any color term is fuzzy [5]. So the term 'focus' meaning the best and most typical colors was introduced.

In order to study cognitive categories, we should look into the dictionary definitions. We can find the name of the category there (bird).

It also gives us the attributes that characterize birds: feathers, two legs, two wings, a beak and laying eggs. So there are attributes that group a robin, a parrot and an ostrich together and also differentiate them from each other. All these attributes lead to a detailed description of the internal category structure.

However, dictionary definitions are for practical use, not for systematic linguistic and cognitive analyses. Lexicographers can omit attributes that go without saying, it is important to grasp the general meaning. The question is: are the attributes necessary and essential. As we already mentioned in the beginning, the answer was put forward by Aristotle. So, a bird can be only a creature that has two legs, two wings, a beak, feathers and lays eggs. And if some creature has these attributes, it can be classified as a bird.

Speaking about cognitive categories with 'good' and 'bad' representatives and fuzzy boundaries, there can be a difficulty describing them. That is why it is important to turn to the prototypical approach formulated by E. Rosch.

It was proved that category members take a prototype as the best example with most obvious characteristics of the category. E. Rosch together with other psychologists put forward the idea that each category has got an internal structure with the center and periphery. Some category members become more salient than others in the human mind due to ontological reasons. Yet, this structure is not rigid. Both objective and subjective knowledge about the world is taken into account and the internal structure of the cognitive category consists of family resemblances mentioned by L. Wittgenstein,

Alternatively, A. Wierzbicka would not rely on the prototype in every case. She thinks we can give an exhaustive definition to the 'cup' and the 'game' in everyday situations. It is important to find a compromise between a classical and prototypical approaches and speak about the synthesis of two traditions [2, p. 226].

In conclusion we should say that categorization plays an important role in the processes of cognition and thinking. According to W. Labov, research in linguistics is about research in language categories. Most attempts are aimed at finding these categories, defining them and working out rules that help language elements find their place in this or that category [4, p. 133].

References

1. Аристотель. Категории. М.: Гос. Социально-Эконом. изд-во, 1939. – 84 с.
2. Вежицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. М.: Русские словари, 1997. – 416 с.
3. Витгенштейн Л. Философские исследования // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс. 1985. Вып. XVI. С. 79-128.
4. Лабов У. Структура денотативных значений // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс. 1983. Вып. XIV. С. 133-176.
5. Berlin B, Kay P. Basic Color Terms. Their universality and evolution. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1969. – 316 p.
6. Kleiber G. La Semantique du Prototype: Categories et le Sens Lexical. Paris, 1990. – 199 p.
7. The Blackwell Dictionary of Cognitive Psychology / Ed. by Michael W. Eysenck, Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1994. – 390 p.
8. Ungerer F., Schmid H.J. An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics. London-New York: Longman. – 306 p.
9. Zadeh L. Fuzzy Sets // Information and control. 1965. Vol. 8. № 1. P. 338-353.

Ванина Татьяна Олеговна

Кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры, Уральский филиал ФГБОУВО "Российский государственный университет правосудия"

Голощанова Татьяна Геннальевна

Кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры, Уральский филиал ФГБОУВО "Российский государственный университет правосудия", Южно-Уральский государственный университет

СТРУКТУРНАЯ МОДЕЛИРУЕМОСТЬ ЕДИНИЦ С ФРАЗООБРАЗУЮЩИМ ТВОРИТЕЛЬНЫМ ПАДЕЖОМ ИМЕНИ

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются продуктивные модели морфологически неизменяемых фразеологизмов современного русского языка, фразеобразующим компонентом которых является форма творительного падежа имени существительного в ракурсе их структуры и семантики. Для анализа взяты 877 фразеологических единиц в более чем 11000 употреблений.

Ключевые слова: фразеологизм, фразеологическое значение, фразеобразующий компонент, синтаксическая модель, словосочетание, слово-форма, сочетание слов, семантика.

Vanina Tatyana Olegovna

Associate Professor in Pedagogics, the Ural branch of the Russian State University of Justice

Goloschapova Tatyana Gennadijevna

Associate Professor in Philology, the Ural branch of the Russian State University of Justice, the South Ural State University

STRUCTURAL MODELMENT OF UNITS WITH THE PHRASE-FORMING INSTRUMENTAL CASE OF NOUNS

Abstract

The article deals with the productive models of Russian morphologically invariant idioms with the instrumental case of nouns as a phrase-forming component from the point of view of their structure and semantics. In the research process, 877 phraseological units in more than 11000 applications were considered.

Keywords: phraseological unit, phraseological meaning, phrase-forming component, syntactic model, set expression, word-form, semantics, word combination.

In Russian, a phraseologism, or a phraseological unit, is a nominative unit, which is used for designating almost all the actuals of the surrounding reality alongside with a word. As opposed to the word, whose unparted lexical meaning is formed from the morphemes it consists of, the phraseologism represents a separately formed structural unit of the secondary holistic nomination.

In Russian, there are a lot of phraseological units with the instrumental case of nouns in the quality of their phrase-forming components. These units represent one of the numerous structural-semantic models of the huge phraseological reserve. The abovementioned units are formed according to the productive original syntactical modals, namely the modal of the set expression and that of the word combination.

Having studied more than 877 phraseological units, we arrived at the conclusion that the model representing *the analog of the set expression* (G.A. Zolotova) is the most constructive (for example, *тихой каной* (on the sly, by stealth), *невооружённым глазом* (to the naked eye), *своими руками* (with one's own hand), *за закрытыми дверями* (behind closed doors), *всем миром* (all hands), *таким образом* (thereby) and so on). The phraseologism is a syntax-indissoluble unit because the internal communication between the meanings of its particular components and its meaning in whole is lost. From the point of view of the morphology, the phraseological units cannot change; they are fixed in only one form and denote one concept.

The components of the phraseological units lose their basic categorical and lexical properties and take part in forming the holistic phraseological meanings like the morphemes in the word: *семимильными шагами* – quickly, *в полный голос* – openly, *своими словами* – in one's own way, *с поднятым забралом* – openly, *русским языком* – understandable, clear.

By considering the phraseological units formed according to the model of the word combination (*the analog of the word combination*)

G.A. Zolotova) we can highlight a number of the particular structures among which the models formed according to the formulas both *compliant component + noun in the instrumental case* (380 units) and *preposition + compliant component + noun in the instrumental case* (253 units) are the most productive (for example, *большей частью* (for the most part), *главным образом* (mainly, in the main), *вашиими молитвами* (thanks to your prayers), *любой ценой* (at any cost, at all costs), *задним числом* (after the event, in retrospect), *ровным счётом* (no more than, in all), *с полной выкладкой* (in full kit), *с поднятым забралом* (openly, above board), *с протянутой рукой* (cap in hand), *с чистой совестью* (with an clear conscience) and so on).

Almost all the researchers in the field of the modern Russian language on the whole and in that of the phraseology in particular admit that the phraseological units are formed according to the model of the set expression (V. V. Vinogradov, V. V. Babaitseva, L.U. Maksimov, V.P. Zhukov, V.M. Mokienco, V.N. Teliya and others). [3], [5], [6], [7].

But in Russian, there are some units with the initial model formed according to the formula *component-preposition + noun in the instrumental case* (for example, *под боком* (close at hand), *под секретом* (in secret), *за кулисами* (behind the scenes), *с процентами* (with interest), *с Богом* (God be your help), *под замком* (under lock and key), *с лихвой* (with a return above cost), *с миром* (in peace), *с умом* (wisely, sensibly) and so on). As for these units, the opinions of the linguists differ. Some of them do not consider such units as phraseologisms, whereas the others believe that they compose an important part of the idioms of the modern Russian language. We take the view of such linguists as V. V. Vinogradov, A.I. Smirmitskiy, P.A. Lekant, and A.M. Chepasova, who mean that the combinations *component-name + component-preposition* appear in speech as finished units and have all the properties of phraseological units (*minimum phraseological units* by P.A. Lekant, or *unimicronate idioms* by A.I. Smirmitskiy). [1], [2], [4], [6].

In our card index, 211 units are built according to the initial model of the word combination: *между делом* (in spare time, between things, between this and then), *с размахом* (in a big way), *с треском* (with a bang), *с ветерком* (like the wind, with a zoom), *перед глазами* (before one's eyes), *под арестом* (under arrest), *с хвостиком* (and a bit more).

In terms of volume, among the initial models of the phraseological units we describe two-component models prevail (601 units). These are *за вычетом* (with the exception of smth.), *под знаменем* (under the banner of smth.), *под маской* (in the guise of smb., under the mask of smth.), *с размахом* (in a big way), *таким образом* (in that way, therefore), *сухонным языком* (in a stiff style, in a clumsy style) and others. Ternary models form the second largest group: *у разбитого корыта* (no better than at the start, with nothing), *всему фибрами души* (with one's whole heart, in all the fibres of one's being), *с молоком матери* (at one's mother's knees, with one's mother's milk), *с полным правом* (pleno jure. rightfully), *с тяжёлым сердцем* (with a heavy heart) and others.

The phrase-making component of the units we describe forms a new type of semantics and a new set of phraseological values. 260 nouns became structural-semantic components, which form new phraseological units. The forms of the instrumental case of the nouns *образ* and *вид* have the greatest phrase-making ability (222 and 152 units respectively), for

example, *естественным образом* (*naturally*), *никоим образом* (*in no way, by no means*), *официальным образом* (*officially*), *с бодрым видом* (*cheerfully*), *с деловым видом* (*in a businesslike manner*) and others.

Our research proved that any qualitative adjective involved in the forming phraseological values of the individual units might be a compliant component. In this way the structural modelment of idioms is put into effect.

Being morphologically invariant, the idioms of the syntax-initial models we describe continue their further development in the form of various types of structural variation. 370 units we studied (42,3% of the total number) vary their composition, while retaining the semantic identity.

The most productive type of variation is a component one associated with the change in the composition: *под носом*– *перед носом* (*under one's very nose, in the face of smb.*), *другими словами*– *иными словами* (*in other words*), *своим домом*– *собственным домом* (*separately, apart*), *всей душой*– *всем сердцем* (*with all one's heart and soul*), *щедрой рукой*– *широкой рукой* (*lavishly, with a bountiful hand*) and others.

In the models we describe the morphological variation of the idioms associated with the change in the gender, number, case, and comparative degree of the components as well as the word-formative one relating to the modification of components in connection with the change of the morphemes are also very productive. In this case, the semantic identity of the units remains: *каким путём*– *какими путями* (*in what way, by what means*), *одним ударом*– *в один удар* (*at a stroke, in one stroke*), *вверх ногами*– *кверху ногами* (*upside down*), *с хитрецей* – *с хитринкой* (*not without cunning*), *между прочим* – *промежду прочим* (*by the way*) and others.

In 225 idioms, the mixed variation was detected, i.e. the change of the component composition occurs simultaneously in different aspects while maintaining the meaning of the unit as a whole. So we can state the phonetic, component, and quantitative variation in the following semantically holistic units: *одним росчерком* – *росчерком пера* – *единым росчерком пера* (*with a stroke of the pen*).

Thus, the phraseological units with the instrumental case of nouns are structurally well organized: they are formed according to the initial models of both word combinations and set expressions. Phraseological units may consist of two -six components involved in the forming the integral value of the nominative unit which is separately arranged. The structural features of the described idioms are different types of varying the composition while maintaining the semantical identity.

References

1. Виноградов, В.В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. М. : Высшая школа. - 1972.
2. Жуков, В.П. Русская фразеология. М. : Высшая школа. - 1986.
3. Лекант, П.А. К вопросу о минимальной единице фразеологии. Проблемы фразеологии и задачи её изучения в высшей и средней школе. Вологда. - 1967. - С. 153-160.
4. Мокиенко, В.М. Славянская фразеология. М. : Высшая школа. - 1980.
5. Смирницкий, А.И. Лексикология английского языка. М. - 1956.
6. Телия, В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. М.: Языки русской культуры. - 1996.
7. Чепасова, А.М. Фразеологизмы в нашей речи. Челябинск, - 2000.

Вдовиченко Лариса Владимировна

Доцент/кандидат филологических наук, Сургутский государственный университет

АКСИОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ ИДЕОЛОГЕМЫ "ПОРЯДОК" В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ РОССИИ И США ИХ СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматриваются аксиологические аспекты идеологем «порядок» и «order» в политическом дискурсе России и США, также приводятся некоторые результаты сопоставительного исследования идеологем «порядок/order» в российском и американском политическом дискурсе.

Ключевые слова: идеологема, порядок, аксиологический аспект, смысловое варьирование.

Vdovichenko Larisa Vladimirovna

Associate professor/PhD in Phylology, Surgut State University

IDEOLOGEME "ORDER" AXIOLOGICAL ASPECTS IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF RUSSIA AND THE USA AND THEIR COMPARISON

Abstract

The article deals with axiological aspects of ideologeme "order" in the political discourse of Russia and the USA. It is also supplied with some results of comparative research of ideologeme "order" in Russian and American political discourse.

Keywords: ideologeme, order, axiological aspect, semantic variation.

A new scientific approach in cultural linguistics – axiological linguistics – appeared as a result of increased linguists' interest to the study of values (Ye.V. Babaeva, V.I. Karasik, N.A. Krasavsky, G.G. Sluschkina and others). One of the key problems of axiological linguistics is the problem of expressing values and disvalues in the language. Different means of evaluation in the language which appeared to be the main means of reflecting the system of values in semantics are of special interest (Yu. D. Apresyan, N.D. Arutyunova, Ye.V. Babayeva, Ye.M. Volf, V.D. Devkin, Yu. Dolnik, G.N. Sklyarevskaya, V.N. Teliya). M.N. Epstein considers a way of expressing evaluation in the language to be one of those linguistic problems which have to be taken into great consideration while analyzing ideological texts [Epstein 1991: 19]. At the lexical level one has to define such means as pragmemes, mythologemes, ideologemes, culturems (lingvoculturems).

In modern political linguistics in the process of cognitive approach "an ideologeme is thought out as a phenomenon forming conceptual schemes and categories, specifying the processes of perception, adaptation and evaluation of the information given about this or that ideologically important object. Semantic and emotional content of ideologemes can be