

Irina V. Zyкова

# Linguo-cultural studies of phraseologisms in Russia: past and present<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** The present paper looks into the history of linguo-cultural studies of phraseology within the Russian phraseological tradition as well as highlights some key peculiarities of their present development. The discussion dwells on the most important facts that characterize the specifics in terms of which the Russian thought has evolved from the 18<sup>th</sup> up to the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries in the understanding of phraseologisms as culture-dependent formations. The mainstream approaches engaged in the analysis of different ways of the ‘culture – phraseology’ interaction are outlined. The paper focuses more specifically on one of such approaches. It describes the major theoretical tenets elaborated within the linguoculturological approach to phraseology – an innovative area of investigation evolved in Russia at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Special attention is paid to the application of the linguoculturological principles of analyzing phraseologisms to the practice of dictionary-making. The specifics of representing the cultural information in “The Large Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language” is described in the given paper.

**Keywords:** linguo-cultural; cultural specifics; cultural information; phraseological image

## 1 Introductory remarks

Rapidly growing interest in the study of the interrelation of culture and language has led to the emergence of a specific research area investigating phraseologisms as special means capable of accumulating and transmitting cultural knowledge through centuries and across generations. Nowadays, cultural and intercultural (or cross-cultural) aspects of various types of multi-word expressions are central topics in phraseological studies. Since at present the research on phraseology as a culture-bound or culture-specific phenomenon is carried out by linguists

---

<sup>1</sup> The research is supported by the grant (№14-28-00130) from the Russian Science Foundation and is carried out at the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

from all over the world it is possible to speak about the existence within different national traditions of diverse as well as manifold approaches to the investigation of phraseologisms in a cultural (or linguo-cultural) perspective.

The present paper aims to highlight the major landmarks in the history of investigating cultural specifics of phraseology in Russia. It also intends to trace the main trends in the development of various linguo-cultural studies of phraseological units within the Russian phraseological tradition. Special attention is given to the approach to phraseologisms called ‘linguoculturological’ (from the term ‘linguoculturology’)<sup>2</sup> and worked out by representatives of Moscow phraseological school founded by Veronika N. Teliya.

## 2 Phraseology vs. culture: major facts from the history of research within the Russian phraseological tradition

### 2.1 Linguo-cultural studies of multi-word units in the 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> centuries

In Russia the exploration of cultural aspects of phraseology can be traced, at least, as far back as to the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Being one of the compilers of the “Slovar’ Akademii Rossiyskoy” (“Dictionary of Russia’s Academy”), the first explanatory dictionary of Russian published

---

<sup>2</sup> The distinction between the two terms ‘linguo-cultural studies’ and ‘linguoculturology’ (with its derivative ‘linguoculturological’) which seems important calls for some explanation. Within the framework of the present paper we use the term ‘linguo-cultural studies’ as a more general term, which is widely accepted across the world and which can be referred to all investigations (or to any investigation) that deal (or deals) with any issues of interplay between culture and phraseology (or between culture and language in general). We use the term ‘linguoculturology’ as a more specific term, which refers to a particular scientific discipline (or a particular scientific direction) which appeared in Russia (lit. in Russian ‘лингвокультурология’) at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and is characterized at present by specific methodology and theory elaborated (by Teliya’s scientific school) in the process of studying the cultural(-national) specifics of phraseological units as well as other language units from the point of view of cognitive semantics. The term ‘linguoculturology’ is derived from the names of two sciences ‘linguistics’ and ‘culturology’ the latter of which is defined in (OED 2013) as ‘U.S. the science or study of culture or a culture (1920)’ (etymology: “after German *Kulturologie*”), and its derivative ‘culturological’ – as ‘of or relating to culturology’. Due to the hierarchical (hyponymic) relationships between the two terms ‘linguo-cultural studies’ and ‘linguoculturology’ they (i.e. these terms) can be used interchangeably in certain (or corresponding) contexts.

in 1789–1794) Mikhail V. Lomonosov, an outstanding Russian scientist, pointed out that the Russian language was abundant with special language items, which could be termed as ‘phrasises’ or ‘idiomatisms’. These items, according to Lomonosov, were of particular importance due to their immediate connection with the Russian culture and life experience of the Russian people as well as the mode of specific – Russian – perception of the world. Many of such ‘idiomatisms’ were registered and explained in the dictionary in question, for example: *завонной колоколь* (lit. *the bell calling for church* (or *the church-going bell*); ~ *the smallest bell which is the first to start ringing*) ‘a person who speaks very much in a loud voice and usually interrupts others’; *звезда злощастная* (lit. *a star of bad luck*) ‘used to say about a person who has bad luck’ (SAR, vol. 3, 1792: columns 28, 32).

It is noteworthy that the 18<sup>th</sup> century was a rather relevant stage in the history of phraseology in a broad sense (i.e. including not only word-like but also sentence-like constructions). Due to the ever-growing interest in phraseology as a peculiar culture-dependent layer of the Russian language a few special collections of fixed phrases (mainly proverbs) were published. For instance, Anton A. Barsov’s “Collection of 4291 ancient Russian proverbs” came out in 1770. The book contained various types of folklore set-expressions of didactic or prescriptive character that encoded and conveyed moral values and peculiarities of worldview of the Russian people, e.g. *Берегись от бед, пока их нет* (lit. *Protect yourself from troubles while there are no troubles*); *Глаза человеку неприятели* (lit. *Eyes are not man’s friends*) (Barsov 1770).

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Russian scholars’ attention to multi-word items of various kinds increased significantly. Fixed phrases and sentences of the Russian language as well as of other foreign languages were in focus of many large-scope works. The issues concerning the link of prefabricated language units with culture, various cultural sources of their origin were addressed in a series of specialized lexicographic editions, monographic and paper publications of a number of prominent Russian scholars in the fields of ethnography, history and philology, for instance:

- Aleksandr Rikhter (1794–1826): “Dva opyta v slovesnosti. Rassuzhdenie o russkikh poslovitsakh” (1816).
- Dmitrij Knyazhevich (1788–1844): “Polnoe sobranie russkikh poslovits i pogovorok, raspolzhennoe po azbuchnomu poryadku, s prisovokupleniem tablitsy soderzhaniya onykh dlya udobneyshego priiskaniya” (1822).
- Ivan Snegirev (1793–1868): “Russkie v svoikh poslovitsakh. Rassuzhdeniya i issledovaniya ob otechestvennykh poslovitsakh i pogovorkakh” (1831–34); “Russkie narodnye poslovitsy i pritchi” (1848).
- Vladimir Dal’ (1801–1872): “Poslovitsy russkogo naroda” (1861/62).

- Izmail Sreznevsky (1812–1880): “Mysli ob istorii russkogo yazyka” (1849); “Zamechaniya ob obrazovanii slov iz vyrazheniy” (1873).
- Pavel Rybnikov (1831–1885): “Byt russkogo naroda v ego poslovitsakh” (1859).
- Fedor Buslaev (1818–1897): “Istoricheskie ocherki russkoy narodnoy slovesnosti i iskusstva” (1861).
- Morits Mikhel’son (1825–1908): “Khodyachie i metkie slova” (1892, reprint in 1896); “Russkaya mysl’ i rech’: Svoe i chuzhoe: Opyt russkoy frazeologii: Sbornik obraznykh slov i inoskazaniy” (1903–1904).
- Sergej Maksimov (1831–1901): “Krylatye slova” (1890, reprint in 1899).
- Aleksander Potebnya (1835–1891): “Mysl’ i yazyk” (1862); “Iz leksiyy po teorii slovesnosti. Basnya. Poslovitsa. Pogovorka” (1896) and many others.

In most cases, the works of the given period offered different typologies of phraseologisms (mainly proverbs and sayings) with regard to corresponding cultural domains which gave rise to their emergence and considered semantic variations of phraseological units when used in discourse. Special attention was paid to the issues concerning the influence of sociocultural evolution of Russia as well as other countries over the formation and functioning of phraseologisms in the Russian language (as well as in some other (classical and contemporary) languages).

Interesting facts with regard to the cultural sources of Russian proverbs and sayings (and other stable word combinations) were taken up and discussed in Ivan M. Snegirev’s works. The research conducted let the scholar classify multiword constructions into three main groups: 1) anthropological proverbs and sayings which stem from pagan beliefs and superstitions and reveal Russian people’s principles and ways of acting, their worldview, habits and customs, e.g.: *Чему быть, тому не миновать* (lit. *If something is to be it cannot be avoided*); 2) proverbs and sayings that refer to nature (its meteorological, astronomic, agricultural and medical aspects), e.g.: *Тихая вода берега допмывает* (lit. *Still water undermines/washes away the banks*); 3) historical proverbs and sayings (chronological, topographic and ethnographic), e.g.: *К кому Богородица, а к нам Литва* (lit. *to whom the Mother of God, but to us Lithuania*) (Snegirev 1831a, Snegirev 1831b, and Snegirev 1848). Snegirev provided the language units under consideration with the comments on the cultural factors that fostered the emergence of this or that proverb (or saying, and idiom) in the Russian language as well as on communicative situations in which their use could be most appropriate. Special attention was paid to the borrowings from different languages (Arabic, German, Greek, Serbian, Turkish, Tatar, etc) as the means that could influence in a certain sense the evolution of the Russian language, the mode of thinking of Russians and their life style.

Fedor I. Buslaev (1861) claimed in his book that there were two main stages (or epochs) in the history of Russian proverbs: 1) the stage related to the life of hunters, herders and warriors, e.g.: *из омыта в ад, как рукой подать* (lit. *out of the whirlpool into hell is like an arm's length distance*); 2) the stage related to a settled way of life, to the life of farmers, e.g.: *плуг кормит, а луз портит* (lit. *the plough feeds while the meadow corrupts*). The spread of Christian ideas, according to the scholar, also had a great impact on the development of the Russian phraseological fund. Buslaev stated repeatedly that proverbs (alongside myths, riddles, parables, tales) imprinted deep knowledge of life and social relations on people's minds, underscored that they were full of a people's wisdom and their study means "gaining an insight into thought" ("the Russian thought", in particular) (Buslaev 1861).

The ideas advanced and the research initiated with reference to cultural aspects of multi-word units of different kinds in Russian scholars' works of the 18<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> centuries were supported and further developed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century when they acquired firm theoretical grounding within a newly created academic discipline – phraseology.

## 2.2 Linguo-cultural investigations of phraseologisms in the 20<sup>th</sup> century

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the problem of relation between phraseology and culture enters a new stage of its development aiming at finding appropriate theoretical grounds and adequate methodological tools that can help to explore the relation between phraseology and culture and explicate the cultural-national specificity of phraseologisms of Russian as well as other languages.

Viktor V. Vinogradov, a founder of the Russian phraseological tradition, addressed this problem in his works. The scholar, in line with the ideas expressed earlier by Aleksander A. Potebnya (1914), emphasized that in the Russian language there were words with special cultural implications, i.e. words that render various symbolic meanings and may even serve as cultural symbols. For instance, *капля* (*a drop*) is regarded in Russian culture as a symbol of minimal quantity of something (Vinogradov 1938) and can be used as a symbolic component in a number of Russian phraseologisms, cf.: *ни капли* (lit. *not a drop of*) – 'absolutely none of something'; *капля в море* (lit. *a drop in the sea*) – 'an insignificant amount' which might be traced to historical (Indo-European) reasons. In his works, Vinogradov paid particular attention to the analysis of cultural sources of Russian phraseologisms and the history of their development and use (see, e.g., the analysis of *отливать нули* (lit. *to mould/cast bullets*) meaning 'to lie; to

disseminate gossip or stories that are impossible to believe' in [Vinogradov 1999: 269–271]).<sup>3</sup>

Based on Vinogradov's research as well as on the works of his predecessors, the Russian phraseological tradition developed since the late 1930s and up to the early 1990s owing to substantial contributions made by many prominent Russian scholars who started elaborating diverse approaches to the study of cultural-national and cultural-historical aspects of phraseologisms, for instance: B. A. Larin (1956), V. L. Arkhangel'skiy (1964), A. V. Kunin (1964), I. I. Chernysheva (1970), G. L. Permyakov (1970, 1971), L. I. Royzenzon (1972), A. I. Fedorov (1973), N. I. Tolstoy (1973), V. P. Zhukov (1975), R. N. Popov (1976), V. G. Gak (1977), Yu. A. Gvozdev (1977), A. D. Raykhshteyn (1980), V. G. Kostomarov & E. M. Vereshchagin (1982), E. M. Solodukho (1982), Yu. P. Solodub (1985) and many others. As a result, there appeared a number of scientific centers of phraseological studies in Moscow, Saint Petersburg, Kazan', Kostroma, Magnitogorsk, Novosibirsk, Oryol, Pskov, Rostov, Tula, Veliky Novgorod, Vladimir, Volgograd, Voronezh and some others. Thus, the Russian phraseological tradition of the period in question joined together the representatives of various phraseological schools with their own research agendas concerning the study of linguo-cultural peculiarities of phraseology.

As a result, due to the combined scientific efforts and much work done in the field of phraseology, the early 1990s saw the rapid development of several directions (or approaches) focused on the research of the interface between culture and phraseology in different theoretical-methodological frameworks within the Russian phraseological tradition. These directions can be defined as **mainstream approaches to linguo-cultural aspects of phraseology** at present. One of the distinctive features of these approaches is their multidisciplinary (i.e. intra- and interdisciplinary) character. They stand at the intersection of different branches of linguistics as well as other human sciences, such as anthropology, cognitive science, ethnography, philosophy, psychology, semiotics and some others. These mainstream approaches are as follows: the historical or diachronic approach, e.g. (Mokienko 2001; Shulezhkova 2011); the comparative

---

<sup>3</sup> It is worth noting that Vinogradov's observations and ideas were remarkable and to a certain extent innovative for that time in the sense that he was one of the first who suggested regarding components of phraseological units as culture-bound signs full of various cultural implications rather than exclusively language items. Interestingly, Vinogradov showed that in Russian water metaphor is used to a much greater degree than in other languages to represent the emotional state of a person and symbolizes the intensity of emotions, e.g.: *захлестнула волна ненависти* (~ one was overflowed by a wave of hatred), *нахлынула грусть* (~ a wave of sadness has rolled over him/her).

or contrastive approach, e.g. (Arsent'yeva 2006; Fedulenkova 2012); the regional-linguistic approach, e.g. (Mal'tseva 1993; Vereshchagin & Kostomarov 2005); the ethnolinguistic approach, e.g. (Tolstoy 1995; Berezovich 2007); psycholinguistic approach, e.g. (Dobrovol'skiy & Karaulov 1992; Stepanova 2012); the cognitive-linguistic approach, e.g. (Beliaevskaya 2005; Baranov & Dobrovol'skiy 2008); linguoculturological approach, e.g. (Teliya 1996).<sup>4</sup>

Despite the fact that the given approaches have to do with the same key problem, i.e. cultural insights into phraseologism-formation, and overlap in some ways, each approach is distinguished by its own theoretical objectives, academic tasks and methodology. This is true of the linguoculturological approach to phraseology developed within the Russian phraseological tradition by prof. Teliya and representatives of her phraseological school.

### 3 The linguoculturological approach to phraseology in the new millennium: theoretical and applied perspectives

The linguoculturological approach to phraseology is one of the latest and also one of the most rapidly growing research areas in contemporary Russian phraseology founded by prof. Veronika N. Teliya (1930–2011). The elaboration of the approach in question began in the early 1990-s within the research project launched at the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. Its quarter-century period of development brought together chiefly Moscow linguists as well as linguists from other Russia's cities and other countries, among them are E. G. Beliaevskaya, N. G. Bragina, T. Z. Cherdantseva, I. N. Cherkasova, D. B. Gudkov, S. V. Ivanova, S. V. Kabakova, M. L. Kovshova,

---

<sup>4</sup> It is worth special mentioning that the study of cultural aspects of phraseology within the framework of different approaches helps scholars establish novel and rather important language phenomena which reflect the current tendencies of the cultural development of a certain society (Russian, in particular) and serve as testimonies of how these tendencies influence the evolution of phraseology. Anti-proverbs are one of such phenomena which helps to reveal significant semantic changes in such seemingly 'unchangeable' units as proverbs accounted for by the impact of culture. Since their relevance as special culture-marked signs is very high they have become the subject-matter of multiple investigations and large-scale lexicographical descriptions, e.g. (Val'ter & Mokienko 2005). However, the discussion of their status and peculiarities is outside the scope of the present research.

V. V. Krasnykh, S. Lubensky, N. G. Med, V. A. Maslova, O. A. Meshcheryakova, E. O. Oparina, I. I. Sandomirskaya, I. V. Zakharenko, I. V. Zykova and many others.

### 3.1 Key theoretical and methodological aspects of the linguoculturological research of phraseologisms

The linguoculturological approach is, in essence, a further and highly productive line of development in the phraseological theory that stems from the works of prominent Russian scholars of the previous centuries engaged in the analysis of phraseology as a cultural (or culture-bound) phenomenon (see Section 2). From this point of view, its emergence was rather logical and predictable as it was actually brought about by the whole course of the evolution of the Russian phraseological thought and by the common tendencies in the advancement of the Russian phraseological tradition.

It is worth noting that as the approach of a synthetic type its theoretical and methodological foundations have been built up under the influence of several particular fields of the humanities. According to Teliya, the linguoculturological approach to phraseology inherits primarily the views of J. G. von Herder and W. von Humboldt (Teliya & Doroshenko 2010). It also adopts particular ideas couched in culturological and anthropological as well as philosophical, psychological and semiotic works of such Russian and foreign scholars, as A. K. Baiburin, R. Barthes, E. Cassirer, J. G. Frazer, G. D. Gachev, A. Ya. Gurevich, V. V. Ivanov, C. G. Jung, L. Lévy-Bruhl, D. S. Likhachev, Yu. M. Lotman, B. Malinovski, E. Sapir, G. G. Shpet, Yu. S. Stepanov, V. N. Toporov, E. B. Tylor, B. A. Uspensky, J. L. Weisgerber, B. L. Whorf, L. Wittgenstein and some others.

The foremost theoretical tenets of the linguoculturological approach to phraseology were formulated and discussed in a number of works by Teliya published since the mid-1990s to the 2010s (e.g. Teliya 1995, Teliya 1996, Teliya 1999, Teliya 2006; Teliya & Doroshenko 2010). As is stated in these works, the **basic theoretical assumptions** that underlie the approach in question are as follows:

- language and culture are two separate sign (or semiotic) systems between which there exist the relationships of interaction;
- one of the major consequences of the ‘culture–language’ interaction is the formation of phraseological signs;
- being created as a result of the culture and language interaction, phraseologisms are special signs that can store and accumulate a rather significant amount of cultural knowledge and reflect through their images peculiar ways of national (or culture-bound) worldview of reality;



- rich cultural contents of phraseologisms, their expressive and emotional force, their penetration into all domains of language, a wide range of discourse application and some other their typical properties turn phraseologisms into language means that can function as “cultural signs” (i.e. cultural prototypes, cultural symbols, cultural stereotypes);
- the “topmost” category and the starting point in linguoculturological research is the individual mentality of the language speaker who plays the crucial role in shaping the cultural content in phraseologisms.

Resting on these theoretical assumptions, the linguoculturological approach aims chiefly at the synchronic study of phraseologisms in their current use in diverse types of discourse. It is intended to explore the linguo-cultural competence of members of a particular linguo-cultural society on the basis of the analysis and description of cultural knowledge embedded in phraseologisms and constantly reproduced and activated through their (i.e. phraseologisms’) use in actual communicative practices (Teliya 1999). So, one of the major concerns within the linguoculturological framework is the research of phraseology as a crucial mechanism contributing to the formation and reinforcement of the collective cultural identity (Teliya et al. 1998).

Taking into account the fundamental and at the same time fairly challenging character of the aims set, the research agenda of the linguoculturological approach is quite large-scale. It implies a comprehensive study of a rather wide range of topical issues concerning the ways culture is incorporated into phraseological signs making the latter “instruments” of cultural memory and means of cultural-national self-awareness. In search for appropriate solutions, novel theoretical conceptions have been recently advanced, for instance, in (Zykova 2014).

In an attempt to make the knowledge about the process of ‘culture – language’ interaction explicit and in this way to discover how cultural information is translated into phraseological semantics, the investigation (Zykova 2014) elaborates the conception according to which **the phraseological meaning is formed as a result of the inter-semiotic transposition** (the term coined by R. Jakobson [1959]). Unlike Jakobson’s interpretation, the inter-semiotic transposition is understood in the research in question as a transfer of some conceptual content from non-verbal signs of culture (e.g. from such semiotic domains as craft, music, entertainment, sport, clothing, food, travelling, etc) into language, i.e. phraseological, signs, cf., for instance: *играть в прятки* (lit. *to play hide-and-seek*), *передать эстафету* (lit. *to pass the baton*), *кормить завтраками* (lit. *to feed someone breakfasts*), *вывести на дорожку* (lit. *to help someone to find the right path/way*).

The analysis conducted has revealed that the inter-semiotic transposition is essentially an ‘umbrella’ notion for a number of cognitive processes. To construct a phraseological meaning it is mostly likely to involve at least the following cognitive operations – selecting some conceptual contents from different semiotic domains of culture, its synthesizing and structuring. In accordance with the data obtained, these operations result primarily in the formation of the deep stratum of the phraseological meaning, which turned out to be a **macro-metaphorical conceptual model**. As it was stated, the model gives rise to a number of individual phraseological images underlying the semantics of corresponding phraseological signs. In particular, the case-study of Russian phraseologisms from the word-field of verbal communication (more than 1000 items) has showed that their meanings are based on 11 macro-metaphorical conceptual models (VERBAL COMMUNICATION IS COMMERCE, VERBAL COMMUNICATION IS PLAY, VERBAL COMMUNICATION IS GASTRONOMY, etc).<sup>5</sup> For instance, the macro-metaphorical conceptual model VERBAL COMMUNICATION IS CRAFT is characterized by a rather high degree of phraseological creativity. It generates in the Russian language a great quantity of phraseologisms as compared to the other models, e.g.: *шито белыми нитками* (lit. [it is] sewn with white threads) – ‘[of a story, excuse etc] (something) sounds shaky’; *отливать колокола* (lit. to mould/cast bells) – ‘to lie shamelessly’; *снимать стружку* (lit. to remove (wood) shavings) – ‘to reprimand, criticize severely’.

In addition, special attention was paid to the issue of what enables phraseologisms to act as a store of cultural knowledge. Resting on the notion of ‘cultural memory’ (Yuriy M. Lotman [2001]), the research conducted has proved that it is the macro-metaphorical conceptual models underlying the meaning of

---

<sup>5</sup> It should be specially noted that a macro-metaphorical conceptual model is a rather complex conceptual formation. According to the data of the research (Zykova 2014), it is created by a number of interlinked conceptual constituents of a different degree of complexity. Its formation starts with the synthesizing of elementary (archetypical) concepts (such as, for instance, UP/DOWN, FAR/CLOSE, LIGHT/DARK, etc). This process of synthesizing leads to the emergence of, at first, more complex non-metaphorical concepts (for instance, DIRECTION, LOCATION, DISTANCE, etc) and, then, of even more complex – metaphorical – concepts (for instance, WORD IS AN OBJECT SPECIALLY LOCATED, SPEAKING IS MOVEMENT IN A CERTAIN DIRECTION, etc.). The integrated unity of multiple interconnected metaphorical concepts is termed in the work in question as a macro-metaphorical conceptual model (for instance, VERBAL COMMUNICATION IS TRAVEL). The conceptual analysis of meanings of phraseological units that resulted in the establishment of particular (eleven) macro-metaphorical conceptual models had works by (Reddy 1979), (Lakoff, Johnson 1980), (Carleton 1995) as its starting point and was aimed at showing that conceptual metaphors are more complex conceptual structures than is usually assumed (see in detail [Zykova 2014, Zykova 2015]).

phraseologisms that make it possible for the latter to keep and accumulate significant amount of cultural information. Owing to these conceptual structures, phraseologisms are capable of retaining diverse types of cultural information rooted in collective experience of world-cognition of different historical periods (e.g., archetypal, mythological, religious, philosophical, scientific) as well as of collective experience of world-perception confined principally to such main kinds of sensuous experience as emotional, ethical and aesthetic experience (Zykova 2013b, Zykova 2014). It is worth mentioning that, according to the research findings, **any macro-metaphorical conceptual model stores all stated types of cultural information** – archetypal, mythological, religious, philosophical, scientific as well as emotional, ethical and aesthetic. However, these types of cultural information manifest themselves differently through the phraseological images that the models generate. As it is hardly possible to describe all of them in detail in one paper, we will consider one type of cultural information – the mythological information. For example, the macro-metaphorical conceptual model VERBAL COMMUNICATION IS TRAVEL gives rise to the phraseologism *язык до Киева доведет* (lit. *the tongue will help one to get to Kiev*) – ‘you can always find the way by asking’. The image of this idiom imprints on the mind of language speakers among others such vestiges of the mythological way of thinking as anthropomorphism due to which the tongue is viewed as a human being – a fellow traveler who does not let his companion be lost on his way to the required destination (Kiev). Another Russian phraseologism which is also based on the macro-metaphorical conceptual model in question is *обходить стороной* (~ *to pass something around/by*) – ‘intentionally not to discuss something’. Such primitive (or elementary) belief as magic-making characteristic of the mythological form of world-cognition finds its way into its image in this case. The avoidance of discussing something is understood in terms of a travel in which one takes a particular direction (i.e. *стороной*). The circuitous (or curved) way along which one moves (or travels) is endowed with special magic powers that can save a traveler from danger and evil force (see also Zykova 2011, Zykova 2013a, 2013b).

In general, due to the investigations performed over the last decades, the linguoculturological approach is at present the domain of research that has at its disposal rather effective terminological equipment. Much work has been done in order to elaborate linguoculturological terms proper that can provide a reliable conceptual grounding for an in-depth examination of key linguoculturological issues. The metalanguage of linguoculturological analysis and description of phraseology embraces the following terms as its basic items: ‘conceptual sphere of culture’ (or ‘conceptosphere of culture’), ‘codes of culture’, ‘cultural connotation’, ‘cultural prescriptions’, ‘cultural-national specifics’, ‘cultural reference’, ‘linguo-cultural identity’ and ‘cultural-national (collective) identity’,

‘linguo-cultural competence’, ‘cultural (sub)concepts’ and ‘linguo-cultural (sub) concepts’, ‘symbolarium of culture’ (that embraces such cultural phenomena as archetypes, totems, symbols, mythologemes, rituals, amulets, and some others) ‘cultural information’ or ‘cultural data’, ‘cultural semes’, ‘cultural background’, ‘cultural markers’ and ‘cultural markedness’, ‘cultural patterns’, ‘discourse stereotypes’, ‘basic layers of culture’ or ‘archeology of culture’, ‘cultural memory’ (e.g. Teliya et al. 1998; Oparina 1999; Krasnykh 2003; Bragina 2007; Beliaevskaya 2007; Kovshova 2009; Med 2014; Zykova 2015)<sup>6</sup>. For instance, within the linguoculturological framework ‘codes of culture’ are defined as those sources of the cultural worldview (e.g. animate beings, artefacts, etc.) that are products of their cultural cognition and cultural evaluation, e.g. ‘food code’, ‘spatial code’, ‘zoo-morphic code’, etc. helping to discover semantic regularities in sets of phraseological units with the corresponding components (Teliya, Doroshenko 2010: 10). As another example, ‘cultural prescriptions’ are understood as ethical and social guidelines that motivate the understanding of certain texts or signs of culture, the choice of particular patterns of behavior as well as determine the character of evaluative attitudes to them (Oparina 2004).

There is a number of novel terminological coinages that proved to be rather helpful in studying the cultural specifics of phraseologism-formation and are a matter of intense discussion in ongoing researches: ‘linguoculture’ (Krasnykh 2014), ‘quasi-symbols’, ‘quasi-prototypes’ and ‘quasi-stereotypes’ (Teliya 1996; Kovshova 2012), ‘macro-metaphorical conceptual model’ and ‘phraseological creativity’ (Zykova 2015).

Among recent significant advancements in the research field in question is the elaboration of linguoculturological methods of phraseological analysis. Nowadays, the linguoculturological methodology comprises such methods as the method of culturological interpretation of phraseologisms; the method of (linguo)culturological commentation; the method of linguoculturological experiment; the method of linguoculturological reconstruction of deep (conceptual) foundations of the meaning of phraseologisms; the method of linguoculturological decoding and interpretation of cultural information. These methods were

---

<sup>6</sup> It is a well-known fact that the level of development of a particular science (or a scientific discipline, a scientific direction) is determined by its notional and terminological apparatus, i.e. by the quantity of notions it discriminates as well as the quality of their elaboration which influences the results of the study of its (i.e. this science) subject-matter. The list of basic terms, which is given in the paper and is, undoubtedly, not complete, but is indicative of the fact that at present linguoculturology is a rapidly developing field of research with its own conceptual apparatus necessary for the in-depth study of different (or special) forms and ways of the ‘culture – phraseology’ interaction.

described in detail in a number of works in which they proved to be rather effective in studying phraseologisms as culture-bound signs (e.g. Teliya 1999, Teliya 2006; Kabakova 1999; Kovshova 2012; Zykova 2015).

The application of the linguoculturological methods devised has proved to be rather fruitful not only in exploring central as well as peculiar linguoculturological issues and in providing reliable evidence that helps to verify its key theoretical assumptions. Their use contributes to the development of the lexicographical theory and practice of dictionary-making.

### 3.2 The linguoculturological approach in the practice of dictionary compiling

Alongside particular theoretical tasks, the linguoculturological approach to phraseology aims to devise lexicographical principles of linguoculturological description of phraseologisms. As a significant outcome of the profound and long-standing work done in this direction, “*Bol’shoi frazeologicheskiy slovar’ russkogo yazyka*” (“The Large Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language”) was published in 2006 and its latest (fourth) edition came out in 2014. It was compiled by a whole team of linguists, which includes such scholars as V.N. Teliya (ed.), I.S. Brileva, D.B. Gudkov, I.V. Zakharenko, I.V. Zykova, S.V. Kabakova, M.L. Kovshova, V.V. Krasnykh.

The dictionary deals with 1,500 phraseologisms that are widely usable in the present-day Russian language. It is characterized by a number of novel features that distinguish it from many other contemporary lexicographical editions of Russian idioms that are described in detail in the *Foreword* written by Teliya (2006). The most remarkable distinction is that each entry of the dictionary is provided with a special section called “Culturological comments”.

The “Culturological comments” gives information based on the results of a comprehensive and thorough analysis of Russian idioms conducted with the help of two interrelated methods of culturological commentation and culturological interpretation. The methods in question involve several core analytical procedures intended to establish:

(1) the correlation between the entire image of a certain phraseologism (or some of its components) with such ancient layers of culture as archetypal oppositions, mythological beliefs, rituals, religious doctrines, historical traditions, old cultural conventions, folklore texts. For example, certain vestiges of the mythological thought can be discovered in the Russian idiom *злой язык* (lit. *an evil tongue*). In this phraseologism, *язык* (*tongue*) is conceived in terms of a living being who behaves in an aggressive manner. It means that the image of the idiom

imprints the traces of such ancient mode of world-cognition as animism, i.e. the belief in a supernatural power that organizes and animates the material universe (pp. 238–239);

(2) the correspondence between the entire image of a phraseologism (or some of its components) with codes of culture – thematically related sets of real (or material, physical) objects or phenomena endowed with diverse cultural senses or implications.

There are such codes of culture as the **anthropic** code which includes designations of people, their physical properties, mental and emotional states or characteristics, etc, e.g.: *братья по оружию* (lit. *brothers in arms*) (pp. 55–57); the **somatic** code which embraces parts or organs of the body and their functional peculiarities, e.g.: *во плоти и крови* (lit. *in flesh and blood*) (pp. 126–132); the **zoomorphic** code which includes animals, e.g.: *как рыба в воде* (lit. *like fish in water*) (pp. 311–312); the **artefact** code which includes various objects made by man, e.g.: *на ножках* (lit. *be at knives*) pp. 418–419); the **spatial** code which includes phenomena related to various dimensions of space, its parameters, properties as well as location, locomotion, directions, objects particularly situated, etc, e.g.: *вдоль и поперек* (lit. *along and across*; ~ *far and wide*) (pp. 105–107), the **vestimentary** code that comprises diverse articles and parts of costume or clothes, e.g.: *получать по шапке* (lit. *to get it at one's hat*) (pp. 166–168) and many others. All codes of culture are interlinked and this, most likely, allows components of one and the same phraseologism to correlate with different codes of culture rather than with one and the same code of culture. For instance, in the Russian idiom *отпетый дурак* (lit. *a fool over whom the burial service was read*) the component *отпетый* correlates with the religious code of culture, while the component *дурак* – with the anthropic code (pp. 507–508). Each code of culture comprises a great variety of constituent elements, which can function as symbols, prototypes or stereotypes in Russian culture. As an illustration, in the Russian idiom *держать в [своих] руках* (lit. *to hold in [one's] hands*) the component *рука* (*hand*) correlates with the somatic code of culture in which it serves as a symbol of power (p. 73);

(3) the link between the codes of culture to which components of phraseologisms are related and the kinds of tropes (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, hyperbole, simile, oxymoron, etc.) that underlie the formation of their images. For instance, both components of the Russian idiom *лакомый <жирный> кусок <кусочек>* (lit. *dainty <fat> (little) morsel*) correlate with the gastronomic code of culture which gives rise to the phraseological image based on the gastronomic metaphor. According to this image, a human being or some object is conceived in terms of something tasty, something that has a pleasant, appetizing flavour which makes it nice to eat (p. 347);

(4) the role that a certain idiom plays as a sign of culture (i.e. as a cultural symbol, a cultural stereotype or a cultural prototype). For instance, the Russian phraseologism *нести <тащить, везти> на своих плечах* (lit. *to carry <draw, drive> something on one's shoulders*) renders the stereotype of someone's exceptional responsibility for solving various (one's own or someone else's), rather challenging tasks and problems in life (p. 353). As another illustration, the Russian idiom *куриные <цыплячьи, птичьи> мозги* (lit. *a hen's <chicken's, bird's> brains*) serves as a cultural prototype of man's low intellectual abilities (pp. 343–345).

It should be specially emphasized that the section “Culturological comments” contains all the variety of information described above (points 1–4) with regard to each idiom that is given in the dictionary as a head matter of an entry. To demonstrate this, the extract of the “Culturological comments” to the Russian idiom *на ножках с кем-либо* (lit. *to be at knives with someone*) denoting ‘to be on extremely hostile terms with someone’ can be considered.

In accordance with the four core points described above, the section in question holds the following cultural data drawn in the course of the linguoculturological analysis of this phraseologism (pp. 418–419):

(1) The phraseological unit derives from the ancient mythological as well as religious ideas about *нож* (*knife*) as an instrument used in acts of sacrifice and as a tool applied in actions intended to make someone suffer martyrdom. Within the framework of the mythological mode of thinking, *нож* (*knife*) is perceived as an object endowed with magic (sacred) powers owing to which it can be employed in certain cult performances. The image of the idiom *на ножках* is related to such ancient archetypal oppositions as ‘own – alien’, ‘piece – war’ as well as to the opposition ‘life – death’.

(2) The component of the phraseologism *на* (*at*) correlates with the spatial code of culture, while the component *нож* (*knife*) – with the artefact code.

(3) The image of the phraseologism is based on the spatial-artefact metaphor by means of which extremely hostile relationships between people are perceived in terms of an armed struggle with the use of such type of lethal weapon as the knife. In this phraseological image *нож* (*knife*) is associated with death, aggression and serves as a symbol of destruction. The image also pertains to the conceptions of the ancient code of blood revenge (or vengeance) when murdering one's adversary was regarded as the only possibility to avenge injuries, insults or sufferings inflicted by him and to restore one's honour or reputation (compare with other Russian expressions characterized by similar cultural implications: *с ножом к горлу* (lit. *with a knife to someone's throat*), *нож в спину / в сердце* (lit. *(thrust) a knife into someone's back / heart*), *нож острый* (lit. *a sharp knife*)). In ancient times, *нож* (*knife*) was widely used in many rituals as a sign of war



declaration. The knife that was brought as a gift to a meeting meant the break-up of any relationships, feud, hatred and intransigence.

(4) In Russian culture the phraseological unit as a whole plays the role of the cultural prototype of particularly intense and very adverse relationships between people that imply no reconciliation and agreements of any kind.

Occupying a significant part of each entry, the section “Culturological comments” discloses different parameters of culture involvement into the process of phraseologism-formation. Importantly, multiple contexts of discourse use of Russian phraseologisms drawn from a wide range of up-to-date sources (i.e. literary and publicistic works, the National Russian Corpus, selected Internet texts) and presented abundantly in the dictionary under consideration testify to the fact that different layers of culture (from the most ancient to contemporary ones) can be activated in the course of communication by contemporary native speakers of the Russian language.

It should be specially noted that the dictionary in question aims primarily at developing (or upgrading the level of) linguo-cultural competence and linguo-cultural proficiency the acquisition of which results from the process of internalizing collective cultural experience and adopting cultural values through phraseological signs as culture-bound phenomena.

## 4 Concluding remarks and some further prospects

The linguo-cultural studies of phraseologisms in Russia have quite a long (centuries-old) history that embraces such necessary preparatory stages in their development as the collection (or inventorization) and description of Russian phraseologisms as well as idioms from different foreign languages. Though the tradition of studying phraseology as a special culture-dependent phenomenon actually goes as far back as to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, it is clearly felt to be rooted even in much earlier times. Notably, a wide range of fixed figurative multi-word items of various kinds (i.e. from word-like to sentence-like expressions, such as proverbs, sayings, winged expressions, aphorisms, maxims, etc) has been in focus of linguo-cultural research from the very start. Nowadays, the issues concerning the ways culture and phraseology interact have been explored by representatives of particular phraseological schools developed within the Russian phraseological tradition. They take up the research of cultural specificity of phraseologisms from a number of perspectives that can be united under the general term ‘linguo-cultural’ (i.e. historical or diachronic; comparative or contrastive; regional-linguistic;



ethnolinguistic; psycholinguistic; cognitive-linguistic and linguoculturological), but that apply different methodology. Among this variety of the perspectives or approaches, the perspective (approach) called ‘linguoculturological’ deserves particular attention.

Gaining scientific ground within the Russian phraseological tradition since the 1990s in the works of Teliya and her proponents, the linguoculturological approach to phraseology has firmly established itself at present as a relevant line of research focusing on a variety of issues concerning the cultural genesis of phraseology. On the one hand, it reclaims and further elaborates, and, on the other hand, it fits into and contributes to the development of different conventions of linguo-cultural investigations undertaken over the last two centuries in Russia as well as in other countries.

In the mid 2010s, being equipped with rather effective conceptual-terminological and methodological “tools”, the linguoculturological analysis of phraseology proved to achieve important results in the theoretical as well as applied domains of research on the ‘culture – phraseology’ interaction. Special methods and lexicographic techniques worked out make it possible to state that cultural data incorporated into phraseological signs are very heterogeneous both from the historical and contemporary points of view. Besides, they are indicative of particular means of how to identify, select, and lexicographically represent the (possible) ways in which phraseologisms are created under the influence of culture.

Thus, the linguoculturological approach opens up the routes to much more refined research in the field of cultural aspects of phraseology. However, for its future progress, much work still has to be done with regard to its both theoretical and applied domains.

Firstly, despite the fact that many of the theoretical assumptions have already got the empirical underpinnings, it is quite evident that due to their extent and scope the issues concerning possible forms of the ‘culture – phraseology’ interaction are hardly exhaustively described up to now. Hence, further extensive research with the employment of the linguoculturological methods elaborated is needed in order to comprehensively penetrate into the cultural genesis of phraseologisms. The areas of special interest for linguoculturologists are still those the study of which can give much better ideas as to what degree and in what ways cultural information manifests itself in phraseology; how and in what ways cultural knowledge embedded in phraseologisms determines native speakers’ national self-awareness and influences the formation of cultural-national identity; how diverse cultural information is integrated within a phraseological sign and to what extent different historical tiers of cultural data can be activated in living discourse practices and how it can influence the communicative behavior of speakers; what cultural factors are at work in the process of creating phraseologisms

and other stable word combinations. To find appropriate solutions to all these issues, it is the deep (conceptual) level of the correlation between culture and phraseology and cognitive bases of their interaction that must be further explored and expertized. In doing this, the linguoculturological approach has to reinforce and enlarge its connections mainly with cognitive science, psychology and cultural anthropology.

Secondly, the linguoculturological approach should have much stronger links with other branches of linguistics. On the one hand, all the evidence coming from the linguoculturological studies of phraseology has profound implications for native as well as foreign language learning and language teaching. It is certain to provide learners with better awareness of cultural inferences rendered in phraseologisms and, therefore, better communication strategies. Additionally, the data obtained through the linguoculturological analysis appears to be especially useful in comparative or contrastive linguistics, as it helps to reveal different modes of conceptualization in different languages. The findings of the linguoculturological research need particular attention in lexicography in which their application is still inappropriate and insufficient. On the other hand, for its further development the connection of the linguoculturological approach with corpus linguistics and computational linguistics is of particular importance. Analyses of abundant written and spoken data and their computational processing provided by these branches might yield, undoubtedly, much better understanding of the principles of the ‘culture – phraseology’ interaction.

**Acknowledgments:** For the discussion and feedback concerning the research described in the given paper, I would like to warmly thank Prof. Elena G. Beliaevskaya and Prof. Victoria V. Krasnykh. I am very grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and recommendations.

## References

- Arkhangel'skiy, Vladimir L. 1964. *Ustoychivye frazy v sovremennom russkom yazyke. Osnovy teorii ustoychivyykh fraz i problemy obshchey frazeologii*. Rostov-na-Donu: Rostovskiy universitet.
- Arsent'yeva, Elena F. 2006. *Frazeologiya i frazeografiya v sopostavitel'nom aspekte (na materiale russkogo i angliyskogo yazykov)*. Kazan': Kazanskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet.
- Beliaevskaya, Elena G. 2005. Kontseptual'nye osnovaniya semantiki yazykovykh edinits (ot leksikologii k frazeologii). *Vestnik MGLU* 500. 9–24.
- Beliaevskaya, Elena G. 2007. Kul'turologicheskaya informatsiya v semantike leksicheskikh edinits. *Voprosy kognitivnoy lingvistiki* 4. 44–50.

- Berezovich, Elena L. 2007. *Yazyk i traditsionnaya kul'tura: Etnolingvisticheskie issledovaniya*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Baranov, Anatoliy N. & Dobrovol'skiy, Dmitriy O. 2008. *Aspekty teorii frazeologii*. Moskva: Znak.
- Barsov, Anton. 1770. *Sobranie 4291 Drevnikh Rossiyskikh poslovits*. Moskva: Imperatorskiy Moskovskiy Universitet.
- Bragina, Nataliya G. 2007. *Pamyat' v yazyke i kul'ture*. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur.
- Buslaev, Fedor I. 1861. *Istoricheskie ocherki russkoy narodnoy slovesnosti i iskusstva*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya tovarishchestva "Obshchestvennaya pol'za".
- Carleton, Peter. 1995. *MetaSelf*. URL: <http://www.metaself.org/>
- Chernysheva, Irina I. 1970. *Frazeologiya sovremennogo nemetskogo yazyka*. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola.
- Dobrovol'skiy, Dmitriy O. & Karaulov, Yuriy N. 1992. Frazeologiya v assotsiativnom slovore. *Izvestiya RAN, seriya literatury i yazyka* 51 (6). 306–315.
- Fedorov, Aleksandr I. 1973. *Razvitie russkoy frazeologii v kontse XVIII – nachale XIX veka*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Fedulenkova, Tat'yana N. 2012. *Sopostavitel'naya frazeologiya angliyskogo, nemetskogo i shvedskogo yazykov*. Moskva: Izdatel'skiy Dom Akademii Estestvoznaniya.
- Gak, Vladimir G. 1977. *Sopostavitel'naya leksikologiya (na materiale frantsuzskogo i russkogo yazykov)*. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
- Gvozdev, Yuriy A. 1977. *Osnovy russkogo frazeobrazovaniya*. Rostov-na-Donu: Izdatel'stvo Rostovskogo universiteta.
- Jakobson, Roman O. 1959. On linguistic aspects of translation. In Brower Reuben (ed.), *On Translation*, 232–239. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Kabakova, Svetlana V. 1999. *Obraznoe osnovanie idiom (psikholingvokul'turologicheskie aspekty)*. Moskva: Institut yazykoznaniya RAN.
- Kostomarov, Vitaliy G. & Vereshchagin, Evgeniy M. 1982. Otbor i semantizatsiya frazeologizmov v uchebnom lingvostranovedcheskom slovore. *Slovari i lingvostranovedenie*. Moskva: Russkiy yazyk, 98–108.
- Kovshova, Mariya L. 2009. *Semantika i pragmatika frazeologizmov (lingvokul'turologicheskiy aspekt)*. Moskva: Institut yazykoznaniya RAN.
- Kovshova, Mariya L. 2012. *Lingvokul'turologicheskiy metod vo frazeologii: Kody kul'tury*. Moskva: Librokom.
- Krasnykh, Victoria V. 2003. «Svoy» sredi «chuzhikh»: mif ili real'nost'? Moskva: Gnozis.
- Krasnykh, Victoria V. 2014. Nekotorye bazovye ponyatiya psikholingvokul'turologii (v razvitie idey V.N. Teliya). In Victoria V. Krasnykh & Andrey I. Izotov (eds.), *Yazyk, soznanie, kommunikatsiya*, Vyp. 50, 167–175. Moskva: MAKSS Press.
- Kunin, Aleksandr V. 1964. *Osnovnye ponyatiya angliyskoy frazeologii kak lingvisticheskoy distsipliny i sozdanie anglo-russkogo frazeologicheskogo slovary*. Moskva: MGPIYa imeni M. Torea.
- Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Larin, Boris A. 1956. Ocherki po frazeologii: O sistematizatsii i metodakh issledovaniya frazeologii. *Uchenye zapiski Leningradskogo universiteta* 24. 200–225.
- Lotman, Yuriy M. 2001. *Semiosfera*. Sankt-Peterburg: Iskusstvo – SPB.
- Mal'tseva, Dina G. 1993. *Frazeologicheskie edinitsey nemetskogo yazyka v lingvostranovedcheskom aspekte i problemy perevoda*. Moskva: Vserossiyskiy tsentr perevodov nauchno-tehnicheskoy literatury i dokumentatsii.

- Med, Nataliya G. 2014. Natsional'no-kul'turnaya spetsifika ispanskikh frazeologizmov s gastronomicheskimi komponentami. In Victoria V. Krasnykh & Andrey I. Izotov (eds.), *Yazyk, soznanie, kommunikatsiya*, Vyp. 50, 216–222. Moskva: MAKSS Press.
- Mokienko, Valeriy M. (ed.). 2001. *Slovar' russkoy frazeologii. Istoriko-etimologicheskii spravochnik*. Sankt-Peterburg: Folio-PRESS.
- Oparina, Elena O. 1999. Lingvokul'turologiya: metodologicheskie osnovaniya i bazovye ponyatiya. *Yazyk i kul'tura*, 27–48. Moskva, INION RAN.
- Oparina, Elena O. 2004. Ustanovka kul'tury i diapazon metaforizatsii: K voprosu o motivakh obraznoy kontseptualizatsii. In Veronika N. Teliya (ed.), *Kul'turnye sloi vo frazeologizmakh i diskursivnykh praktikakh*, 53–59. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury.
- Permyakov, Grigorij L. 1970. *Ot pogovorki do skazki (zametki ob obshchey teorii klishe)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Permyakov, Grigorij L. 1971. *Paremiologicheskii eksperiment. Materialy dlya paremiologicheskogo minimuma*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Popov, Rostislav N. 1976. *Frazeologizmy sovremennogo russkogo yazyka s arhaichnymi znacheniyami i formami slov*. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola.
- Potebnya, Aleksander A. 1914. *O nekotorykh simvolakh v slavyanskoy narodnoy poezii*, 2nd edition. Khar'kov: Izdanie M.V. Potebnya.
- Raykhshteyn, Aleksandr D. 1980. *Sopostavitel'nyy analiz nemetskoj i russkoy frazeologii*. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola.
- Reddy, Michael. 1979. The conduit metaphor: A case of frame conflict in our language about language. In Andrew Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, 284–310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Royzenzon, Leonid I. 1972. Frazeologiya i stranovedenie. *Byulleten' po frazeologii* № 1. 12–19. Samarkand: Izdatel'stvo SamGU.
- Shulezhkova, Svetlana G. (ed.). 2011. *Frazeologicheskii slovar' staroslav'yanskogo yazyka*. Moskva: Flinta.
- Snegirev, Ivan M. 1831a. *Russkie v svoikh poslovitsakh. Rassuzhdeniya i issledovaniya ob otechestvennykh poslovitsakh i pogovorkakh*. Kn. I. Moskva: Universitetskaya tipografiya.
- Snegirev, Ivan M. 1831b. *Russkie v svoikh poslovitsakh. Rassuzhdeniya i issledovaniya ob otechestvennykh poslovitsakh i pogovorkakh*. Kn. II. Moskva: Universitetskaya tipografiya.
- Snegirev, Ivan M. 1848. *Russkie narodnye posloviцы i pritchi*. Moskva: Universitetskaya tipografiya.
- Solodub, Yuriy P. 1985. *Russkaya frazeologiya kak ob'ekt sopostavitel'nogo strukturno-tipologicheskogo issledovaniya* (na materiale frazeologizmov so znacheniem kachestvennoy otsenki litsa). Moskva.
- Solodukho, Eduard M. 1982. *Internatsional'nost' frazeologicheskoy zashifrovki otrazhaemoy deystvitel'nosti*. Kazan': Kazanskiy gosudarstvennyy universitet.
- Stepanova, Anna A. 2012. *Russkaya frazeologiya: psikhologicheskii aspekt issledovaniya*. Moskva: Soyuz-press.
- Teliya, Veronika N. 1995. O metodologicheskikh osnovaniyakh lingvokul'turologii. *Logika, metodologiya, filosofiya nauki* V. 102–106.
- Teliya, Veronika N. 1996. *Russkaya frazeologiya: Semanticheskii, pragmaticheskii i lingvokul'turologicheskii aspekty*. Moskva: Yazyki russkoy kul'tury.

- Teliya, Veronika N. 1999. Pervoocherednye zadachi i metodologicheskie problemy issledovaniya frazeologicheskogo sostava yazyka v kontekste kul'tury. In Veronika Teliya (ed.), *Frazeologiya v kontekste kul'tury*, 13–24. Moskva: Yazyki russkoy kul'tury.
- Teliya, Veronika N. 2006. Predislovie. In Veronika Teliya (ed.), *Bol'shoy frazeologicheskii slovar' russkogo yazyka. Znachenie. Upotreblenie. Kul'turologicheskii kommentariy*, 6–14. Moskva, AST-Press Kniga.
- Teliya, Veronika N., Bragina, Natalya G., Oparina, Elena O. & Sandomirskaya, Irina I. 1998. Phraseology as a language of culture: Its role in the representation of a collective mentality. In Anthony P. Cowie (ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Application*, 55–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Teliya, Veronika N. & Doroshenko, Anna V. 2010. Lingvokul'turologicheskaya gipoteza vosproizvodimosti yazykovykh vyrazheniy. In Mariya L. Kovshova & Grigoriy V. Tokarev (eds.), *Zhivodeystvuyushchaya svyaz' yazyka i kul'tury*, T.1, 7–13. Moskva-Tula: TGU im. L.N. Tolstogo.
- Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1973. K rekonstruktsii praslavyanskoy frazeologii. *Slavyanskoe yazykoznanie*, 272–293.
- Tolstoy, Nikita I. 1995. *Yazyk i narodnaya kul'tura. Ocherki po slavyanskoy mifologii i etnolingvistike*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Val'ter, Harri & Mokienko, Valerij M. 2005. *Antiposlovitsy russkogo naroda*. Sankt-Peterburg: Heva.
- Vereshchagin, Evgeniy M. & Kostomarov, Vitaliy G. 2005. *Yazyk i kul'tura. Tri lingvostranovedcheskie kontseptsii: leksicheskogo fona, rechepovedencheskikh taktik i sapientemy*. Moskva: Indrik.
- Vinogradov, Viktor V. 1938. *Sovremennyy russkiy yazyk. Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove*. Vyp. 1. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo.
- Vinogradov, Viktor V. 1999. *Istoriya slov*. Moskva: Rossiyskaya akademiya nauk; Otdelenie literatury i yazyka; Institut russkogo yazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova RAN.
- Zhukov, Vlas P. 1975. O znakovosti komponentov frazeologizma. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya* 6. 36–45.
- Zykova, Irina V. 2011. Contrastive studies: levels and stages of research on phraseologisms of different languages. In Antonio Pamies & Dmitriy Dobrovolskiy (eds.), *Linguo-cultural Competence and Phraseological Motivation*, 147–156. Baltmannsweiler: Schneider Verlag.
- Zykova, Irina V. 2013a. The proverb semantics in a linguoculturological perspective. In Jean-Michel Benayoun, Natalie Kübler & Jean-Philippe Zouogbo (eds.), *Parémiology. Proverbs et formes voisines*, T. 3, 345–357. Sainte Gemme: Presses Universitaires de Sainte Gemme.
- Zykova, Irina V. 2013b. Phraseological meaning as a mechanism of cultural memory. In Joanna Szerszunowicz, Bogusław Nowowiejski, Katsumasa Yagi & Takaaki Kanzaki (eds.), *Research on Phraseology Across Continents*, Vol. 2, 422–441. Białystok: University of Białystok Publishing House.
- Zykova, Irina V. 2014. *Rol' kontseptosfery kul'tury v formirovanii frazeologizmov kak kul'turno-yazykovykh znakov*. Moskva: Institut yazykoznaniiya RAN.
- Zykova, Irina V. 2015. *Kontseptosfera kul'tury i frazeologiya: Teoriya i metody lingvokul'turologicheskogo izucheniya*. Moskva: Lenand.

## Dictionaries

*Bol'shoy frazeologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka. Znachenie. Upotreblenie.*

*Kul'turologicheskiy kommentariy.* 2006. Veronika N. Teliya (ed.). Moskva: AST-Press Kniga.  
OED – *The Oxford English Dictionary online*. URL: [www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com) (access: 05 August – 04 November 2013).

*SAR – Slovar' Akademii Rossiyskoy.* 1792. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaya akademiya nauk. T. 3.