

UDC 81'373[811.161.2+811.111]:81-115
DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863.3/30.212466>

Nataliia TODOROVA,
orcid.org/0000-0003-2520-2517
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Foreign Languages Department
Odesa Military Academy
(Odesa, Ukraine) sunshinenew@ukr.net

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTICS OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF PHRASEOTHEMATIC GROUP “LOCATION”

The article deals with the contrastive analysis of the semantics of English and Ukrainian phraseological units of the phraseothematic group “Location”. The purpose of the paper is to specify their semantic peculiarities as well as the extra-linguistic factors that caused them. Due to the fact that phraseological units can verbalize different types of location of the object in space, we distinguished three phraseosemantic fields within the phraseothematic group “Location”: “Projective location”, “Topological location” and “Deictic location”. Phraseosemantic field “Projective location” is quantitatively dominant in both languages and it falls into two phraseosemantic groups: “Distance” and “Location utilizing frames of references”. Phraseosemantic field “Topological Location” also consists of two phraseosemantic groups: “Location at locus” and “Location at topos”. The contrastive analysis of the semantics of English and Ukrainian phraseological units within each of the phraseosemantic groups revealed some isomorphic features. It was found out that the concept of distance is the most verbalized in both languages. Besides, the semantics of the phraseological units describing the location of the object at a short distance is related to interpersonal relations. Specific for English phraseological system, as compared to Ukrainian one, is the verbalization of the location of the object utilizing the absolute frame of references, connection of the location of the object with professional activities and a social status. During the study it was determined that Ukrainian phraseological units tend to verbalize long distance in horizontal dimension 360 degrees around a reference point and they demonstrate association of remoteness with danger. Extra-linguistic factors that had impact on the formation of the found peculiarities are the geographic conditions of living of the ethnic groups, their historical destiny and etiquette rules. The obtained results provide resources to develop lexical exercises for the cadets of the military educational institutions for developing linguistic and cultural competence in the process of learning English as a foreign language.

Key words: phraseological units, semantics, location, contrastive analysis, Ukrainian, English.

Наталія ТОДОРОВА,
orcid.org/0000-0003-2520-2517
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов
Військової академії (м. Одеса)
(Одеса, Україна) sunshinenew@ukr.net

ЗІСТАВНИЙ АНАЛІЗ СЕМАНТИКИ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ ФРАЗЕОТЕМАТИЧНОЇ ГРУПИ «ЛОКАЛІЗАЦІЯ»

Статтю присвячено зіставному аналізу семантики англійських та українських фразеологічних одиниць фразеотематичної групи «Локалізація». Мета аналізу – виявити їхні семантичні особливості та позамовні чинники, під впливом яких вони сформувалися. Оскільки фразеологічні одиниці спроможні вербалізувати різні типи локалізації об'єкта у просторі, нами було виділено три фразеосемантичних поля у складі фразеотематичної групи «Локалізація», а саме: «Проектна локалізація», «Топологічна локалізація» та «Дейктична локалізація». Фразеосемантичне поле «Проектна локалізація» кількісно домінує в обох мовах та розпадається на дві фразеосемантичні групи: «Відстань» та «Локалізація відносно системи орієнтування». Фразеосемантичне поле «Топологічна локалізація» також складається з двох фразеосемантичних груп: «Локалізація відносно локусу» та «Локалізація відносно топусу». У результаті зіставного аналізу семантики фразеологічних одиниць у межах кожної фразеосемантичної групи встановлено їхні ізоморфні характеристики. Зокрема, з'ясовано, що в обох мовах найвищою фразеологічною вербалізацією набуває поняття відстані. Семантика аналізованих фразеологічних одиниць демонструє зв'язок перебування об'єкта на близькій відстані з міжособистісними стосунками. Специфічною рисою англійської фразеологічної системи є наявність фразеологічних одиниць на позначення локалізації об'єкта відносно абсолютних орієнтирів та зв'язок локалізації об'єкта з його соціальним статусом

та професійною діяльністю (військовою і морською справою). Особливістю українських фразеологічних одиниць є вербалізація віддаленої відстані на 360 градусів навкруги об'єкта в горизонтальній площині та асоціація віддаленої відстані з небезпекою. На виявлені особливості семантики фразеологічних одиниць впливають такі позамовні фактори, як географічні умови проживання, історична доля та норми етикету етносів. Отримані результати надають матеріал для розроблення лексичних вправ для кадетів військових навчальних закладів для розвитку лінгвістичної та культурної компетенції у процесі вивчення англійської мови як іноземної.

Ключові слова: фразеологічні одиниці, семантика, локалізація, зіставний аналіз, українська, англійська мова.

Introduction. In terms of the currently dominant scientific paradigm, language is considered to be the mirror of the surrounding world that can reflect the reality, preserve the culture and transmit it to the future generations (Ter-Minasova, 2000: 38). As to performing this important function of preserving and transmitting the culture, phraseological units (PhU) are of great significance. They don't simply describe the world, they interpret it (Maslova, 2007: 82).

PhUs are specific language formulas: they are fixed language units that are characterized by separability and semantic integrity of their components that have reinterpreted meaning. In other words, they are metaphors and figurative comparisons that due to their reproducibility acquired a status of language units. According to N. Alefirenko, PhUs represent cognitive models that are prototypes based on the past experience and associated with the general idea about stereotype situations or ideal images of definite objects or phenomena (Alefirenko, 2011: 15). Thus, the meaning of PhUs is motivated, expressive and emotive. Phraseological system of the language reflects the subjective attitude of the definite community to the world and its outlook at life, so it can exhibit national and cultural peculiarities of the language more distinctly than the lexical system (Teliya, 1996: 83). Taking into consideration the above-mentioned characteristics of PhUs, contrastive analysis of semantics of PhUs of different languages gains particular importance in the process of a foreign language learning and teaching as it provides resources for linguistic and cultural competence.

Problem statement. However, among the great number of contrastive researches there are only few works that focus on the contrastive analysis of the PhUs verbalizing universal concepts of the objective reality (Ignatieva, 2004; Osyka, 2010; Paten, 2014; Pysmenna, 2008). It can be explained by the fact that the phraseological system of the language deals mostly with emotional sphere and does not fully reflect the surrounding world (Uzhchenko, Uzhchenko, 2005: 21). In our opinion, the contrastive analysis of the semantics of English and Ukrainian PhUs verbalizing perceptive reality, namely, the universal concept of location in space, is in demand, as it can contribute greatly

to solving an important scientific problem in the modern contrastive linguistics – the interrelation between language, cognition and culture. Besides, the results of this analysis can be used in the process of teaching English, in particular, to the cadets of Ukrainian military educational institutions. While performing their professional functions in English-speaking environment, they need knowledge about the peculiarities of the semantics of such PhUs not only to give and receive information about the location of objects but also to have a better understanding of English culture and mentality.

The purpose of the article is to conduct the contrastive analysis of the semantics of English and Ukrainian PhUs of the phraseothematic group “Location” in order to specify their semantic peculiarities as well as the extra-linguistic factors that caused them.

Materials and methods. The research is based on the main principles of the contrastive analysis defined by M. Kocherhan: the principle of systemic approach and semantic principle (Kocherhan, 2006). Thus, we analyzed the PhUs within the phraseothematic group “Location” and the phraseosemantic fields and groups it includes. The PhUs were grouped into fields and groups by means of ideographic, componential and definitional analyses. Contrastive analysis was applied to reveal their isomorphic and allomorphic semantic features. With the help of linguocultural method we determined the extra-linguistic factors that caused the found semantic peculiarities.

The data for the study were collected from phraseological dictionaries. Taking into account the complexity of phraseological meaning and a human-oriented character of the phraseological systems in general, we examined the PhUs that, besides specifying location, express emotional attitude to different types of it.

Results and discussion. According to S. Levinson, the concept of location correlates to all possible answers to *Where*-questions (Levinson, 2004: 65). Among all possible spatial relations that can be encoded by languages D. Kemmerer distinguishes *deictic*, *topological* and *projective* ones. *Deictic* relations concern specifying the location of the object in relation to the location of the speaker (e.g. *here*, *there*, *anywhere*). *Topological* relations can be described

as the location of the object at the definite place (e.g. *a dog in the yard*). *Projective* relations can be defined as the location of the object in relation to the definite reference point (e.g. *the ball is in front of the house*) (Kemmerer, 2010). The analysis of the semantics of the PhUs describing location of the object defined that they can verbalize all three categories of spatial relations. Thus, within the phraseothematic group “Location” we distinguished three phraseosemantic fields: “Deictic location”, “Topological location” and “Projective location”.

Phraseosemantic field “Projective location” is quantitatively dominant in both languages. It includes PhUs that describe a location of the object in relation to a reference point and falls into two phraseosemantic groups: “Distance” and “Location utilizing frames of references”.

Phraseosemantic group “Distance” is the most highly represented in both languages. Within it there is a number of PhUs verbalizing the concept of closeness, for example: English: *right under somebody’s nose, within (easy) reach of, [within] spitting distance, on the doorstep, hard on (upon, by), within a stone’s throw, within wind (of), within call (of), within earshot, in (within) shot*; Ukrainian: *під (перед) [самим] носом, рукою подати, тин об (у) тин, на два вершки, під боком, шапкою докинути, за десять кроків, на крок, далеко ходити не треба, палицею кинути*.

The common feature of this group is a synonymic paradigm of PhUs whose semantics, besides spatial information, conveys temporal one. In both languages such PhUs describe a situation when the object is close in both time and space: English: *at hand, next door (to), [just]around the corner*; Ukrainian: *не за горами, на порозі*.

Also, in both languages extreme closeness is verbalized by PhUs denoting physical contact between the objects, namely, fitting or sticking tight one to another: English: *fit like a wax, fit like a T, fit like a glove*; Ukrainian: *з шкірою не відірвати (не відірвеш), хоч зубами виривай (видирай), як собака за обгризену кістку з сл. триматися*.

One more isomorphic feature of the phraseosemantic group “Distance” in English and Ukrainian is the formation of a synonymic paradigms describing an emotional attitude to the location of the object at a short distance. In the languages under analysis such PhUs tend to have negative connotation as their semantics quite often reflects the accepted standards of behaviour and disapproving attitude to breaking the social norms. They can denote unwillingness to move closer to the object or keeping away from it: English: *not to touch (one, something) with a barge-*

pole, give someone or something a wide berth, not to touch (one, something) with a pair of tongs, keep one at the stick’s end, hold one at staves; Ukrainian: *[і] на гарматний постріл з сл. не допускати, і на очі не пускати, обминати десятою дорогою, вернути (відвертати) ніс (носа), вернути (відвертати) пику*. Quite often they express irritation caused by somebody’s close presence: English: *get tangled in one’s legs, stick to somebody like a bur, stick to somebody like a leech*; Ukrainian: *плутатися під ногами, над душею з сл. стояти, сидіти, мозолити очі*. Finally, they can reflect interpersonal relations and describe compulsory presence nearby. Such PhUs in both languages denote keeping one or something close and not letting go away: English: *keep one’s hand on one (something)*; Ukrainian: *не випускати з рук*.

In Ukrainian phraseological system we found PhUs denoting one’s staying nearby with some intentions, usually hoping for something or demanding something: Ukrainian: *бити бомки, ханьки м’яти біля кого-чого*. Among English PhUs there is a synonymic paradigm verbalizing a location of the object nearby and in readiness: English: *on deck, in the wings, at your fingertips*.

The concept of remoteness is also highly represented in the phraseological systems of the analyzed languages: English: *out of [gun] shot, beyond (over) [the] sea (seas), a good step, hell’s half acre, a great way (off), to hell and gone, end (ends) of the earth, at the back of beyond, out of cry, beyond earshot*; Ukrainian: *на відстані гарматного пострілу, блигом світ, [і] за синім морем, за тридцять земель, у далекий світ, за горами, за долами, за милю, не близький (далекій, такий) світ, [і] на краю світу, з далекого далека*.

It should be emphasized that Ukrainian PhUs tend to verbalize long distance in horizontal dimension not specifying the direction or 360 degrees around the reference point: Ukrainian: *[аж (хоч, геть)] на край світу (світа), на край землі, скільки ока*. This semantic peculiarity of Ukrainian PhUs can be explained by the homogeneous landscape of the Ukrainian territories. In English phraseological system, as compared to Ukrainian one, there is a greater number of PhUs describing distance in vertical dimension: English: *higher than a kite, in mid-air, way up, on high, way below, way down* (Todorova, 2014).

One more semantic peculiarity of Ukrainian PhUs revealed in the process of the contrastive analysis is a synonymic paradigm that describes long distance and far territories as dangerous, unknown and not liveable: Ukrainian: *де [вже] і перець не*

росте, до біса на роги, [самому] чортові в зуби, до біса в зуби, куди Макар телят не ганяв, де козам роги правлять. The negative perception of the remote territories is caused by the sedentary way of life of the Ukrainian ethnos, its historical destiny characterized by a great number of hostile invasions. Therefore, the remoteness is associated in the consciousness of Ukrainians with something unfamiliar, dangerous and threatening to life (Todorova, 2014).

Phraseosemantic group “Location utilizing frames of references” is the second one formed within the phraseosemantic field “Projective location” and it is not widely represented in the phraseological systems of the English and Ukrainian languages. It is formed by the PhUs that describe the location of the object in relation to a reference point utilizing one of the frames of references: intrinsic or absolute.

The isomorphic characteristics of this group is manifested in the fact that in both languages we found PhUs that specify the location of the object implying intrinsic frame of references. This frame of references is based on the intrinsic characteristics of the object (its front, rear, top, bottom, left or right side). The term “intrinsic” is used figuratively in reference to the characteristics of inanimate objects as such characteristics don’t belong to their essential nature. The prototype for these intrinsic characteristics is a human body. According to D. Kemmerer, in most cases, functional criteria are used to identify them, for example, the front of an inanimate object can be identified on the basis of the typical direction of motion or encounter (Kemmerer, 2010: 145). Thus, PhUs can denote a location on the right or left side of the object: English: *take the right hand of one; take the left hand of one*; Ukrainian: *по праву руку (руч); по ліву руку (руч)*.

Quite often in both languages PhUs, besides specifying the location of the objects in relation to their intrinsic characteristics, describe the distance between them. For example, two objects are close to each other, front to front (English: *face to face, eyeball to eyeball, front to front, head on, nose to nose*; Ukrainian: *лицем в лице, лицем до лица, лоб до лоба, ніс до носа, ніс у ніс*); close and side to side (English: *foot to foot, cheek by jowl, horse and horse, shoulder to shoulder, side by side*; Ukrainian: *коліно в коліно, лікоть в лікоть, рука в руку, плече в плече, стремено до стремена*); close and front to rear (English: *in Indian file, in single file*; Ukrainian: *в ряд, ряд у ряд*).

The peculiarity of the phraseosemantic group “Location utilizing frames of references” is the fact that the PhUs that specify the location

of the object utilizing the absolute frame of references are found only in the English language. Absolute frame of references involves a set of fixed bearings that are absolute and allow the speaker to describe a position of the object without any reference to the viewer location: mountains slopes, wind directions, celestial azimuth etc. (Levinson, 2004: 48). Thus, in English phraseological system there are PhUs that describe the location of the object in relation to the wind direction (English: *on the windy side of one, keep to (the) windward of*), gravitation (English: *on (upon) an even keel, out of (off) the plumb*) or a landmark (*from John-o'-Groats to Land's End, from Land's End*).

This phraseological gap in Ukrainian phraseological system backs up the statement that the phraseological layer of the language reflects only culturally significant aspects of the objective reality. For the Ukrainian ethnos, the possibility of specifying the location of the object utilizing some sort of absolute reference points was not vital in everyday life. For the English, as an island nation who were excellent navigators, orientation based on some absolute reference points was the only one possible in the open sea. Thus, appearing of the PhUs with such semantics in the English language is quite natural.

Phraseosemantic field “Topological Location” includes PhUs that are used to describe the location of the object at any kind of places. Within this field we distinguish two phraseosemantic groups: “Location at locus” and “Location at topos”.

These two terms (*locus* and *topos*) denote *place*. *Topos* originates from the ancient Greek *τόπος* and means *place, region, space*. *Locus* comes from the Latin *locus* and denotes *place, spot, locality*. It was used by Latin writers instead of Greek *τόπος* (Online etymology dictionary). Both terms are used in the modern Literature Studies for the purpose of describing the imaginary space of literary works. *Locus* is considered to be a component of *topos* and is used to denote a definite place in the continuum (Bulgakova, 2008: 32). Thus, the term *locus* is mostly used to refer to any kind of a confined or closed space and the term *topos* is used to refer to any open or unlimited space.

Taking into consideration the peculiarities of the usage of these terms, the phraseosemantic group “Location at locus” includes PhUs that describe the location of the object at some closed space. In both languages the PhUs of this group can verbalize location in private premises, for example, in one’s own house: English: *under one’s own vine and [one’s own] fig tree, keep one’s house*; Ukrainian: *не виходити з хати, держатися (триматися) хати*. Also, they can describe staying in one’s house:

English: *under one's roof, lie at host*; Ukrainian: *лишатися / лишитися на ласці, голову прихилити*.

The common feature of this group is a synonymic paradigm of PhUs that describe too long staying at somebody's place and have a negative connotation: English: *hang up one's hat, wear out one's welcome, outstay one's welcome*; Ukrainian: *днювати і ночувати, обтирати (отирати, витирати) кутки, потирати вузли*. Only in Ukrainian phraseological system we found a PhU that describes too short staying at one's place as disrespect: Ukrainian: *плюнути через поріг*. The semantics of these PhUs presents phraseology as a culture-bound phenomenon as it reflects the customary code of polite behaviour and etiquette rules.

Regarding the location in public premises, in both languages PhUs verbalize staying in prison: English: *be in (fall into, get in, get into, run into) trouble, behind bars, wear the stripes*; Ukrainian: *не бачити світу (світа) [білого (божого)], за [тюремними] ґратами, їсти біду*.

The peculiarity of this phraseosemantic group is found within English phraseological system. There is a synonymic paradigm describing being in the place of honor what emphasizes the importance of the social status in English linguoculture: English: *[sit] above the salt, [sit] below the salt, take the top of the table, at the bottom of the table*.

The phraseosemantic group "Location at topos" includes PhUs that verbalize a location of the object at some open space. PhUs denoting being outside on some open areas are found in both languages: English: *under the open sky, in the open, in the heart of nature, in the nature's lap*; Ukrainian: *під відкритим (голим) небом, просто [голого] неба [на землі], на лоні природи, під сімома вітрами*.

The peculiarity of this group in the English language is PhUs with the semantics associated with the professional activities, mostly with seafaring and warfare: English: *keep the sea, under canvas, be in the offing, hug the land, keep the sea, make (find) a lodgment, be on the field*.

Phraseosemantic field "Deictic Location" is mostly formed with PhUs verbalizing the notion of *anywhere* in both languages: English: *at every step, all over creation, all over the shop, at every hand, at every turn, far and wide, here and there and everywhere, of all*

hands, up hill and down dale, from end to end, every nook and corner, all around, right and left, high and low; Ukrainian: *по всіх світах, на кожному кроці, із краю в край, і хоч і під землею, по горах і долах, куди не кинься, хоч де, де не обернешся, куди не ткнися, по всіх усюдах, у широких світах, на всіх перехрестях, де попало, що ні крок*.

The peculiarity of this phraseosemantic field in the Ukrainian language is the fact that a number of PhUs tend to emphasize that something can be found anywhere 360 degrees around, everywhere till the horizon: Ukrainian: *куди око достає, як далеко око сягає, куди око дістане, скільки скинути оком, скільки оком докинеш, скільки оком захопиш, скільки бачить зір, скільки можна було засягти оком*.

Within this field there are few PhUs describing a location of the object at some or few places: English: *here and again, here and there, hither and thither, hither and yon*; Ukrainian: *мало де, і там і сям, то тут, то там, раз у раз*.

Conclusion. The contrastive analysis of the semantics of English and Ukrainian PhUs of the phraseothematic group "Location" revealed some isomorphic features. First, in both languages, the location of the object in relation to a reference point and the concept of distance are the most verbalized. Second, the semantics of these PhUs demonstrates the connection of the location of the object at the definite distance with interpersonal relations. Specific for English phraseological system is the verbalization of the location the object utilizing the absolute frame of references, connection of the location of the object with professional activities (seafaring and warfare) and a social status. The peculiarities of the Ukrainian PhUs are higher verbalization of the long distance in horizontal dimension 360 degrees around a reference point and the association of remoteness with danger. The extra-linguistic factors that caused the found semantic peculiarities are landscape, historical destiny of the ethnos, their way of life and etiquette rules.

The obtained results call for a deeper contrastive analysis of English and Ukrainian PhUs verbalizing other perceptive concepts and provide resources for developing a system of lexical exercises in order to improve linguistic and cultural competence of the cadets of Ukrainian military educational institutions learning English as a foreign language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Kemmerer D. A neuroscientific perspective on the linguistic encoding of categorical spatial relations. *Language, Cognition and Space: The State of the Art and New Directions*. L. : Equinox Publishing Ltd, 2010, P. 139–168.
2. Levinson S. C. Space in language and cognition. *Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 389 p.
3. Online etymology dictionary. URL : <http://www.etymonline.com>.
4. Алефиренко Н. Ф. Фразеологическое наследие в свете фреймовой семантики. *Ученые записки ЗабГГПУ*. 2011. № 2(37). С. 11–17.

5. Англо-український фразеологічний словник / уклад. Л. Т. Баранцев. Київ : Т-во «Знання», КОО, 2005. 1056 с.
6. Булгакова А. А. Топика в литературном процессе: пособие. Гродно : ГрГУ, 2008. 107 с.
7. Игнатъева М. Э. Отражение времени и пространства во фразеологии русского и английского языков : дисс. ... канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.20. Казань, 2004. 176 с.
8. Кочерган М. П. Основи зіставного мовознавства: підручник. Київ : Видавничий центр «Академія», 2006. 424 с.
9. Маслова В. А. Лингвокультурология. Москва : Академия, 2007.
10. Осыка М. В. Топонимические фразеологизмы в национальной концептосфере (на материале русской и французской лингвокультур): автореф. дис ... канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.19. Белгород, 2010. 22 с.
11. Патен І. М. Фраземи зі значенням руху: семантико-ідеографічний та лінгвокультурологічний підхід (на матеріалі української, російської, польської та англійської мов) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.15. Одеса, 2014. 20 с.
12. Письменна Ю. О. Етнічні особливості концептуалізації дійсності мовами європейського культурного ареалу (на матеріалі лексики і фразеології української, російської, англійської та італійської мов) : автореф. дис... канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.15. Київ, 2008. 20 с.
13. Телия В. Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. Москва : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. 228 с.
14. Тер-Минасова С. Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. Москва : Слово, 2000. 262 с.
15. Тодорова Н. Ю. Фразеологічні засоби вербалізації концепту віддаленості об'єкта в англійській та українській лінгвокультурах (зіставний аспект). *Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка*. Житомир : ЖДУ ім. Івана Франка, 2014. Вип. 2(74). С. 238–242.
16. Ужченко В. Д., Ужченко Д. В. Фразеологія сучасної української мови: посібник для студентів філологічних факультетів вищих навчальних закладів. Луганськ : Альма-матер, 2005. 400 с.
17. Фразеологічний словник української мови / уклад. В. М. Білоноженко та ін. Київ : Наук. думка, 1993. 984 с.

REFERENCES

1. Kemmerer D. A neuroscientific perspective on the linguistic encoding of categorical spatial relations. *Language, Cognition and Space: The State of the Art and New Directions*. L.: Equinox Publishing Ltd, 2010, P. 139–168.
2. Levinson S. C. Space in language and cognition. *Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 389 p.
3. Online etymology dictionary. URL: <http://www.etymonline.com>
4. Alefirenko N. F. Frazеологическое наследие в свете фреймовой семантики [Phraseological heritage in the light of frame semantics]. *Scholarly Notes of Transbaikal State University*, 2011, Nr. 2(37), pp. 11–17. [in Russian]
5. Anhlo-ukrainskyi frazeolohichnyi slovnyk / uklad. L. T. Barantsev [English-Ukrainian phrase-book] Kyiv, Znannia, 2005, 1056 p. [in Ukrainian]
6. Bulgakova A. A. Topika v literaturnom protsesse [Topic in the literary process]. Grodno, State University of Grodno, 2008, 107 p. [in Russian]
7. Ignatieva M. E. Otrazhenie vremeni i prostranstva vo frazeologii russkogo i angliyskogo yazykov [Reflection of time and space in phraseology of Russian and English languages]. Thesis for a candidate degree in philology, Kazan, 2004. [in Russian]
8. Kocherhan M. P. Osnovy zistavnoho movoznavstva [Fundamentals of comparative linguistics]. Kyiv, Academia, 2006, 424 p. [in Ukrainian]
9. Maslova V. A. Lingvokulturologiya [Linguoculturology]. Moscow, Akademiya, 2007. [in Russian]
10. Osyka M. V. Toponimicheskie frazeologizmy v natsionalnoy kontseptosfere (na materiale russkoy i frantsuzskoy lingvokultur) [Toponymic phraseological units in the national conceptsphere (based on the materials of Russian and French linguocultures)]. Thesis for a candidate degree in philology, Belgorod, 2010. [in Russian]
11. Paten I. P. Frazemy zi znachenniam rukhu: semantyko-ideohrafichnyi ta linhvokulturolohichnyi pidkhid (na materialii ukrainskoi, rosiiskoi, polskoi ta anhliiskoi mov) [Phraseological units with the meaning of movement: semantic, idiographic, linguistic and cultural aspects (on the material of the Ukrainian, Russian, Polish and English languages)]. Thesis for a candidate degree in philology, Odesa, 2014. [in Ukrainian]
12. Pysmennna Yu. O. Etnichni osoblyvosti kontseptualizatsii diisnosti movamy yevropeiskoho kulturnoho arealu (na materialii leksyky i frazeolohii ukrainskoi, rosiiskoi, anhliiskoi ta italiiskoi mov) [Ethnic peculiarities of world conceptualization by languages of European cultural area (based on lexis and phraseology of the Ukrainian, Russian, English and Italian languages)]. Thesis for a candidate degree in philology, Kyiv, 2008. [in Ukrainian]
13. Teliya V. N. Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskii, pragmaticheskii i lingvokulturologicheskii aspekty [Russian Phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects]. Moscow, Yazyki russkoy kultury, 1996, 228 p. [in Russian]
14. Ter-Minasova S. G. Yazyk i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya [Language and cross-linguistic communication]. Moscow, Slovo, 2000, 262 p. [in Russian]
15. Todorova N. Yu. Frazеологични zasoby verbalizatsii kontseptu viddalenosti obiekta v anhliiskii ta ukrainskii linhvokulturakh (zistavnyi aspekt) [Phraseological units of verbalization of the concept "remoteness" in English and Ukrainian linguocultures (contrastive-comparative aspect)]. *Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal*, 2014, Nr. 2 (74), pp. 238–242. [in Ukrainian]
16. Uzhchenko V. D., Uzhchenko D. V. Frazеологична suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy [Phraseology of the modern Ukrainian language]. Luhansk, Alma-mater, 2005, 400 p. [in Ukrainian]
17. Frazеологичnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy / uklad. V. M. Bilonozhenko ta in. [Phraseological dictionary of the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv, 1993, 984 p. [in Ukrainian]