співвідносні з ними. Як свідчить аналіз, у похідних іменниках обох мов є спільні денотативні класи, якими характеризуються особи – *професія або вид діяльності*, що є найпродуктивнішим, *якості та властивості* та *ідеологічні течії і напрями*. Однак, у похідних іменниках німецької мови виділяються ще три класи, які відсутні у відповідних похідних української мови, а саме *вік*, *хвороби* та *родинні зв'язки*.

Результати дослідження структурно-семантичних характеристик похідних іменників не є вичерпними і можуть прогнозувати подальші дослідження семантичної структури іменників з іншими категоріальними значеннями.

### Список використаних джерел

15. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные проблемы семантики: Монография / Николай Федорович Алефиренко.– М.: Гнозис, 2005.– 326 с.
16. Арутюнова Н.Д. Лингвистические проблемы референции / Нина Давыдовна Арутюнова // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М.: Радуга, 1982. – Вып. 8.– С. 5-41
17. Кацнельсон С.Д. Категории языка и мышления: Из научного наследия / С.Д. Кацнельсон. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2001. – 864 с.
18. Копыленко М.М. Об употреблении термина денотат / М.М. Копыленко, З.Д. Попова // Семантические категории сопоставительного изучения русского языка. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронежского университета, 1981. – С. 5-10
19. Косовский Б.И. Типы значения слова / Б.И. Косовский // Методы изучения лексики: Сб. науч. тр. – Минск: Изд-во БГУ, 1975. – С. 118-127.
20. Лайонз Дж. Введение в теоретическую лингвистику / Джон Лайонз. – М.: Прогресс, 1978.– 544 с.
21. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь/ Под ред. В. Н. Ярцевой; Ин-т языкознания АН СССР. – М.: Сов. энцикл., 1990. – 682 с.
22. Никитин М.В. Основы лингвистической теории значения. – М.: Либроком, 2009. – 176 с.
23. Плотников Б.А. Основы семасиологии / Б.А. Плотников. – Минск: Вышэйшая школа, 1984. – 223 с.
24. Уфимцева А.А. Лексическое значение (Принцип семиологического описания лексики) / А.А. Уфимцева. – М.: Наука, 1986. – 240 с.

*Summary*. *The article considers the denotative and significative components of lexical meaning of derivative nouns with the Latin suffixes of German and Ukrainian. In the process of research different and similarity features of analyzed components are identified and their systemic and individual character is defined.*

*Key words: derivate, noun, denotation, significant, structural component.*

*T.N. Fedulenkova*

# ENGLISH VERBAL PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF BIBLICAL ORIGIN: FREQUENT STRUCTURAL MODELS

*Стаття присвячена одній з головних проблем сучасної лінгвістики і, зокрема, англійській фразеології, а саме: проблемі структурного моделювання фразеологічних одиниць. Об'єктом структурного аналізу стали дієслівні фразеологічні одиниці біблійного походження (БФО), які функціонують у сучасній англійській мові. Дослідження спрямоване на виявлення низки найбільш частотних структурних моделей вибраних фразеологічних одиниць.*

*Ключові слова: англійська фразеологія, біблійні фразеологічні одиниці (БФО), структурний аналіз, моделювання.*

To begin with, in the introduction to the monograph *Idioms and Idiomaticity* Chitra Fernando gives a working definition of an idiom which reads as follows: «Idioms, or conventional multiword expressions, often but not always non-literal, are hardly marginal in English, though they have been relatively neglected in lexical studies of the language» [17, 5]. The paper presented is targeted to oppose that neglect and to draw the learners' attention to the abundance of verbal (or nominative-communicative, according to A. V. Kunin) biblical phraseological units that function in Modern English.

It is important to point out that structural studies are among the most urgent issues in modern phraseology as it is maintained to be impossible to perceive the meaning of the phraseological unit without knowing its structure [6, 105].

The theoretical foundation of the paper is the conception of the phraseological unit and the method of phraseological identification with its general rules of the procedure initiated by professor A.V. Kunin [4, 37]. To define the semantic role of the leading component in the formation of the meaning of the whole phraseological unit, the method of componential analysis, based on dictionary definitions, was used. To single out different classes of phraseological units and different types of dependence of their components, to analyze their morphological, lexical and syntactical peculiarities, the method of phraseological description was used [6, 43]. To analyze and distinguish phraseological models in verbal biblical phraseology, the theory of phraseological modeling introduced by A.I. Alekhina [1; 2] and developed by E.V. Mikhailova [8], D.O. Dobrovol'skij [3], V.M. Savitskij [9] and T.N. Fedulenkova [10; 12; 13; 16] was used.

The total data base for structural analysis embraces about five hundred modern English phraseological units of biblical origin (BPU) extracted from the Bible [19], and confirmed by different types of academic dictionaries, both defining [15] and two-language [5] and even three-language ones [14], and by discourse samples of common life communication such as letters, advertisements, messages, newspapers, etc. (see also [18]) and finaly compiled into an authorised working booklet entitled *A Glossary of English-Russian Phraseological Units of Biblical Etymology*.

On having studied and analyzed the given bulk of phraseological units, we are enabled to state that the most widely spread verbal biblical idioms are those having two, three and four notional components. The following most frequent structural models of BPU under study were found out:

Model 1. $V + (d) + N$ — a two-component non-prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant dependence of components [4, 62]:

to darken council [Job XXXVIII, 2], to remove mountains [Corinthians XIII, 7], to cumber the ground [Luke XIII, 7], to spoil the Egyptians [Exodus XII, 36], to take thought [Matthew VI, 31], etc. The given structural-grammatical model allows variability of the verbal component: to bear/ carry the cross [Matthew X, 38; XVI, 24], to act/ play the fool [I Samuel XXVI, 21]. It has also a tendency to appear in discourse as a result of the reduction of the number of components in the phraseological unit, thus giving birth to a quantitative phraseological variant [11, 150]: to touch the ark of the covenant [2 Samuel VI, 6] > to touch the ark, to curse the day one was born [Job III, 1-3] > to curse the day, etc.

Model 2. $V + Prep + (d) + N$ — a two-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant dependence of components [4, 62]:

to walk in darkness [John XII, 35], to kick against the pricks [Acts IX, 5; XXVI, 14], to fall by the wayside [Luke VIII, 5; Matthew XIII, 4], to wrestle with an angel [Genesis XXXII, 24-25], to appeal to Caesar [Acts XXV, 11], etc. This structural-grammatical model serves as a base for phraseological units with the same structure but with new lexical components, thus allowing numerous lexical variants of the given phraseologisms. The lexical variability is first of all characteristic of verbal components of biblicisms: to trample under foot / to tread under foot [Isaiah XXV, 14], to cry/ declare/ proclaim/ shout from the house-tops [Luke XII, 3], prepositional variability is also inclusive: to proclaim upon the house-tops. The lexical variability of substantive components within the frame of the model is high as well: to rise from the dead / to rise from the grave [John II, XXII; Luke XVI, 31], to go to glory / to go to heaven / to go to kingdom-come / to go beyond the veil, etc.

Model 3. $V + \theta's + N$ — a three-component non-prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components:

to give one's life [John XV, 13], to search one's heart [Romans VIII, 27], to harden one' heart [Exodus VII, 3], to pitch one's tent [Genesis XII, 8], etc. This type of model easily produces verbal as well as structural variants: to bear/ carry one's cross [Matthew X, 38], to eat / swallow/ take back one's words [Jeremiah XV, 16], to strengthen somebody's hands / strengthen the hand of somebody [Samuel XXIII, 16], etc. The given model may appear as a result of quantitative change in the component structure of the phraseological unit: to sell one's birthright for a mess of pottage [Genesis XXV, 29-34] > to sell one's birthright, etc.

Model 4. $V + Prep + \theta's + N$ — a three-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components:

to spring from somebody's loins [Genesis XXXV, 2], to stink in somebody's nostrils [Amos IV, 10], to lie at somebody's door [Genesis IV, 10], etc. The biblical idioms obtaining this structural-grammatical model have a tendency to acquire morphological-syntactical variants [7, 184-185], e.*g.* correspondingly: to spring from the loins of somebody, to stink in the nostrils of somebody, to lie at the door of somebody.

Model 5. $V + (d) + N + Prep + (d) + N$ — a three-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant dependence of components:

to make bricks without straw [Exodus V], to eat the bread of idleness [Proverbs XXXI, 27], to grind the face of the poor [Isaiah III, 15], to beat swords into ploughshares [Isaiah II, 4], to cast pearls before swine [Matthew VII, 6], etc. Though verbal components may undergo variability here: to divide / to separate the sheep from the goats [Matthew XXV, 32-33], lexical variants are still more characteristic of the substantive component of the idiom: to sift the grain/ wheat from the chaff [Matthew III, 12], to eat the bread of affliction [Deuteronomy XVI, 3] / to eat the bread of sorrows/ humiliation [Psalms CXXVII, 2]. Quantitative-reduced variants [11, 150] are also observed within the frames of the model: to touch the ark of the covenant > to touch the ark [Samuel VI, 6], etc.

Model 6. V + (d) + N + Prep + θ − a three-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components:

to break bread with somebody [Acts XX, 7], to be a law into/ unto oneself [Romans II, 14], to make light of somebody/ something [Matthew XXII, 5], to dig a pit for somebody [Ecclesiastes X, 8], to open the door/ doors to something [Corinthians XV, 9], etc. Within the model the lexical variability is characteristic of substantive, prepositional and changeable components, the latter are symbolized by the Greek letter θ.

Model 7. V + θ + Prep + (d) + N − a three-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components:

to pluck/ take something by the beard [I Samuel XVII, 35], to build something on a rock [Matthew VII, 24], to build something on the sand [Matthew VII, 26], to take/ lay something to heart [Ecclesiastes VII, 2], etc. This structural model proves to very easily cause developing verbal variants: to bring/ call/ put something in question [Acts XIX, 40], to pull/ snatch somebody/ something out of the fire [Jude I, 23], to hide/ keep/ lay/ wrap up something in a napkin [Luke XX, 7], etc. As to substantive variants, they are a rare occasion within the pattern under analysis: to chastise somebody with scorpions/ whips [I Kings XII, 11].

Model 8. V + θ's + N + Prep + (d) + N − a four-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components:

to build one's house upon a rock [Matthew VII, 25], to cast one's bread upon the waters [Ecclesiastes XI, 1], to build one's house upon the sand [Matthew VII, 26], to hide one's light under a bushel [Matthew V, 15], etc. The phraseological units embraced by this type of structural model cannot be characterized by a high degree of lexical variability, though from time to time there may be observed the interchange of the verbal components that perform the function of the predicate in the sentence: to put one's hand to the plough / to set one's hand to the plough.

Model 9. V + θ's + N + Prep + θ − a four-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components:

to set one's face against something [Leviticus XVII, 10], to wash one's hands of somebody/ something [Matthew XXVII, 24], to open one's ears to something [Proverbs IV, 20], etc. Within the frame of this model the lexical variability of the verbal component develops: to set/ to turn one's face to something, to close/ to shut one's ears to something. The mixed type of variability, combining verbal variants and quantitative-reduced variants or morphological variants, is also observed within the model: to seal one's ears, to stop one's ears, to incline one's ear/ ears to something, etc.

Model 10. V + Adv + θ's + N + Prep + θ − a five-component prepositional phraseological model with the constant-variant-changeable dependence of components:

to bow down one's ear to somebody [Psalms XXXI, 2], throw in one's lot with somebody [Proverbs I, 14], to pour out one's wrath on somebody [Revelation XVI, 1], etc. The majority of the biblical phraseological units relating to this model are inclined to omit their adverbial component in speech, thus acquiring a quantitative-reduced variant: to cast in one's lot with somebody [Proverbs I, 14] > to cast one's lot with somebody. The quantitative-reduced variant often goes together with a verbal or some other lexical or lexical-grammatical variant: to lift up one's heel against somebody [John XIII, 18; Psalms XLI, 9] > to raise one's/ the heel against somebody, to lay down one's life for somebody [John XV, 13] > to give one's life for somebody.

The analysis undertaken drives the author to the conclusion that verbal / nominative-communicative phraseological units of biblical origin are widely spread in Modern English. This fact can be explained by the simplicity and naturalness of their grammatical structure that characterizes everyday speech of native speakers. The presence of prepositional components in the models demonstrates analytical character and flexibility of the phraseological units under study. The availability of alternative components and the abundance of different types of variants testifies to the fact that English phraseological units of biblical origin present a certain sub-class of phraseology, and being units with either full or partial semantic transference of components, their meaning is often explicit.

## Bibliography (References)

1. Алехина А. И. Фразеологическая единица и слово: К исследованию фразеологической системы / А. И. Алехина. – Минск : Изд-во Белорус. ун-та им. В. И. Ленина, 1979. – 152 с.
2. Алехина А. И. Идиоматика современного английского языка / А. И. Алехина. – Минск : Вышейшая шк., 1982. – 279 с.
3. Добровольский Д. О. Основы структурно-типологического анализа фразеологии современных германских языков (на материале немецкого, английского и нидерландского языков): Автореф. дис. ...д-ра филол. наук / Д. О. Добровольский. – М., 1990. – 40 с.
4. Кунин А. В. Английская фразеология: Теоретический курс / А. В. Кунин. – М. : Высш. шк., 1970. – 344 с.
5. Кунин А. В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь / А. В. Кунин / Лит. ред. М. Д. Литвинова. – [4-е изд., перераб. и доп.] – М. : Рус. яз. – 1984. – 944 с.
6. Кунин А. В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка: Учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / А. В. Кунин. – [2-е изд., перераб.] – М. : Высш. шк., Дубна : Изд. центр «Феникс», 1996. – 381 с.
7. Кунин А. В. Фразеология современного английского языка: Опыт систематизированного описания / А. В. Кунин. – М. : Изд-во «Международные отношения», 1972. – 288 с.
8. Михайлова Е. В. Фразеобразовательное моделирование в современных германских языках: (На материале глагольных фразеологизмов нем., англ. и нидерланд. языков): Дис. ... канд. филол. наук / Е. В. Михайлова – М., 1989. – 262 с.
9. Савицкий В. М. Английская фразеология: проблема моделирования / В. М. Савицкий. – Самара : Самарский ун-т, 1992. – 172 с.
10. Федуленкова Т. Н. Двумерные модели в фразеологии (на материале английского, немецкого и шведского языков) / Т. Н. Федуленкова // Языки и межкультурная коммуникация: актуальные проблемы филологической науки: Материалы Международной науч.-практ. конф. – СПб : Ленинградский гос. ун-т им. А. С. Пушкина, 2006. – С. 117-120.
11. Федуленкова Т. Н. Квантитативные versus лексические варианты фразеологических единиц / Т. Н. Федуленкова // Язык, культура, общество: Материалы IV международ. конф. – М. : РАН, Российская Академия лингв. наук, научный журнал «Вопросы филологии», 2007. – С. 150.
12. Федуленкова Т. Н. Одномерные и двумерные модели в английской, немецкой и шведской фразеологии: Монография / Т. Н. Федуленкова. – Архангельск : Поморский гос. ун-т, 2006. – 196 с.
13. Федуленкова Т. Н. Фреймовые модели симилятивных фразеологизмов в германских языках (на материале английского, немецкого и шведского языков) / Т. Н. Федуленкова // Проблемы культуры, языка и воспитания / Отв. ред. Т. В. Симашко. – Вып. VII. – Архангельск : Поморский гос. ун-т, 2006.
14. Федуленкова Т. Н., Мартюшова Е. В., Боннемарк М. Англо-немецко-шведский словарь библейской фразеологии / Т. Н. Федуленкова, Е. В. Мартюшова, М. Боннемарк. Архангельск : Поморский ун-т, 2008. – 167 с.
15. Cowie A. P., Mackin R., McCaig I. R. Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English / A. P. Cowie, R. Mackin, I. R. McCaig. – Vol. 2 : Phrase, Clause and Sentence Idioms. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1984. – 685 p.
16. Fedulenkova T. A new approach to the clipping of communicative phraseological units / T. N. Fedulenkova // Ranam: European Society for the Study of English : ESSE 6 – Strasbourg 2002 / Ed. P. Frath & M. Rissanen. – Strasbourg : Universit Marc Bloch, 2003. – Vol. 36. – P. 11-22.
17. Fernando Ch. Idioms and Idiomaticity / Ch. Fernando. – Oxford, New York : Oxford University Press, 1996. – 265 p.
18. Jeffrey D. L. A Dictionary of Biblical Tradition in English Literature / D. L. Jeffrey. – Michigan : William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. – 960 p.
19. The Holy Bible: The old and New Testament: Authorized King James Version. 1991. – Iowa : World Bible Publishers. – 582 p., 179 p., 32 p.

*Summary. The paper deals with one of the main problems of modern linguistics in general, and English phraseology in particular, i.e. the problem of structural modeling of phraseological units. The object under structural analysis are verbal phraseological units of biblical origin (BPU) that function in modern English. The study is aimed at singling out a set of the most frequent structural models of the selected phraseological units.*

*Key words: English phraseology, biblical phraseological units (BPU), structural analysis, modeling.*