

A. N. Baranov and D. O. Dobrovol'skij. *Osnovy frazeologii (kratkij kurs): Učeb. Posobie*. Moscow: Flinta Nauka, 2013. 312pp.

Reviewed by Ludmila Pöppel

The work under review is devoted to questions of phraseology such as the category of idiomaticity and the idiom, the specific characteristics of phraseology as a special part of the lexicon, the classification of phrasemes (multiword or fixed expressions), features of their semantics, stylistics, and syntactical behavior, the cultural specifics of the phraseology of different languages, aspects of translation, etc. Although the book is aimed at undergraduate and graduate students, it is obviously also a scholarly monograph addressed to linguistic specialists in phraseology, lexical semantics, and lexicography. Consisting of an introduction and ten chapters, it presents, on the basis of examples and in a lively, accessible form, the basic theoretical problems of phraseology and describes the peculiarities of entire classes of phraseological units. Illustrations are drawn from Russian, often in comparison with other languages, mostly English and German. Problems at the end of each section are intended to help the reader independently analyze phrasemes using the theoretical notions presented in the text. As an additional aid to the reader, each chapter is followed by a brief list of books and articles relevant to the topics treated in that chapter. The book is based on the conception of phraseology developed by the authors over the course of many years and discussed in a number of their scholarly works.

Chapter 1, "Istorija frazeologii: Napravlenija issledovanij" ("The History of Phraseology: Lines of Research"), outlines the existing approaches to the description of multiword expressions and assesses their advantages and shortcomings. According to the authors, American linguists have not traditionally and are not presently devoting enough study to phraseology, which may have to do with the powerful influence of behaviorism and generative grammar. In American and to

some extent in West European linguistics, phraseology has traditionally been regarded as a marginal phenomenon that is not concerned with the basic structure of natural languages. In recent years, however, particularly in connection with the rising worldwide popularity of Construction Grammar, it has become clear that language is structured far less regularly and systematically than was previously supposed. There is a great deal in language that is not predictable, which means that the speaker must memorize an enormous number of multiword constructions that cannot be evaluated on the basis of knowledge of the meaning of their components and/or knowledge of productive grammatical rules. It turns out that natural languages are phraseological through and through. And it now appears that much of what Construction Grammar has discovered is not fundamentally new and previously unknown but has in fact already been described and studied in detail within phraseology, often from different positions and in completely different terms but nevertheless thoroughly and on the basis of a huge body of empirical facts in various languages. Traditional phraseology has often suffered from its neglect and perhaps even ignorance of the latest theoretical linguistic trends and tendencies, existing all by itself, as it were, divorced from current debates within contemporary linguistics.

The chapter briefly describes the principal American and European approaches to phraseology. Their main differences and points of intersection include the classification of fixed expressions, their variation, the description of their semantics, structural-syntactic features and provenance, psycholinguistic aspects, the dictionary description of phraseology, comparative phraseology, and phraseology as a cultural phenomenon. All of these areas are intimately interconnected, since they describe one and the same subject.

Chapter 2, "Osnovnye ponjatija teoretičeskoj frazeologii" ("The Basic Concepts of Theoretical Phraseology"), addresses the question of how to distinguish phrasemes in the lexical system of language. It discusses in detail the idiomaticity and stability of phrasemes that make phrasemes different from other sorts of lexemes. New concepts are introduced to describe the phenomena of idiomaticity: reinterpretation, opacity (non-transparency), and complex denotation. These three types of idiomaticity are independent of each other but can operate simultaneously. That is, a single phraseme can belong at once to two or three categories. Several types are considered in each category. The essence

of reinterpretation consists of taking one meaning of a linguistic form and by metaphorical reconceptualization or a metonymical shift creating another meaning, e.g., *nos* 'nose' as a part of the face and as a part of a ship. The category REINTERPRETATION includes reinterpretation in the exact meaning (*železnoj zanaues* 'iron curtain' as a "fire-stopping device" in a theater is reinterpreted with the new meaning "political isolation"); intensional reinterpretation (the original meaning of the referent is absent—*burja v stakane vody* (a tempest in a teacup), 'to send somebody away with a flea in his/her ear' in the meaning "with an annoying hint or stinging rebuke"); referential reinterpretation (*genij vsex vremen i narodov*—'the genius of all ages and peoples' meaning 'Stalin'); the idiomaticity of citation arising on the basis of "winged words" (*krylatye slova*, i.e., famous quotations) referring back to the corresponding text (*ključ ot kvartiry, gde den'gi ležat* 'the key to the apartment where the money is stashed' from Il'f and Petrov's novel *The Twelve Chairs*) and pseudo-exhaustion (*ni kola, ni dvora* 'neither a fencepost nor a courtyard', i.e., *X has nothing to his/her name, doesn't own a thing*), where the idiom does not exhaust all potential objects of possession. NON-TRANSPARENCY, which in many cases does not exclude idiomaticity, is connected with the absence of standard rules of inference—for example, *brat' byka za roga* 'take the bull by the horns'—or with the absence in the dictionary of one or more components of the idiom, e.g., *dribs and drabs*. COMPLEX DENOTATION appears in the expansion or reduction of the form. This section provides many examples of expanded forms—for instance, idioms with the meaning 'to die', such as *protjanut' nogi, otbrosit' kon'ki, dat' duba, sygrat' v jaščik*, but none of reduction, unfortunately.

Two aspects of STABILITY are distinguished: structural stability, which characterizes phrasemes with respect to their inner structure, and stability in usage, which has to do with the perception and reproduction of a word group by native speakers. Such a description of fixed expressions makes it possible to identify a precise system of criteria for considering a given word group as an idiomatic expression; that is, it provides a tool for describing the various means a language possesses for creating phrasemes.

The classification of phrasemes in chapter 3 is based on two fundamental categories of phraseology—idiomaticity and stability. Six types are identified and discussed in detail: (i) idioms (*šiška na rovnom meste* 'big cheese (ironic)', *rabotat' spustja rukava* 'work any old way'), (ii) collocations (*zlo beret (kogo-libo)* 'makes someone furious', *vstretit' otpor* 'meet

with a rebuff'), (iii) proverbs (*cypljat po oseni sčitajut* 'don't count your chickens before they hatch'), (iv) grammatical phrasemes (*vo čto by to ni stalo* 'no matter what the cost', *po krajnej mere* 'at least'), (v) phraseological constructions (*X on i v Afrike X* 'X by any other name is still an X'), and (vi) situational clichés (*spokojnoj noči* 'good night', *goden do* 'best before'). It is not always possible to draw precise boundaries between the various types of multiword expressions. Depending on the criteria, a single expression can be classified both as an idiom and as a collocation—e.g., *otdat' dolžnoe komu-libo/čemu-libo* 'give credit where credit is due'.

A description is provided for each type of phraseme, together with the parameters for assigning a given phraseme to one or another class. The classification takes into account established tradition but has at the same time been expanded and supplemented with new classes of fixed expressions that accord well with intuition. Thus a new subclass—SPEECH FORMULAS—is introduced into the class IDIOMS. It represents a special group of idioms with the structure of a sentence whose semantics include a direct reference to the communicative situation. One example is the expression *ne bylo pečali, čerti nakačali* 'that's the last thing we need', used as a comment on the actions of the speaker or interlocutor or about the situation in which they find themselves. New here is the inclusion of grammatical phrasemes and phraseological constructions into the area of phraseology.

Chapter 4, "Semantičeskie otnošenija vo frazeologii" ("Semantic Relationships in Phraseology"), examines synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, inclusion (hyperhyponymy), conversion, and causativity. It is shown that these relationships are connected through the notion of the semantic field. This applies equally to both lexis and phraseology. It is noted that a characteristic feature of synonymy in phraseology is that the content plane of a phraseme contains not only the lexicalized meaning but also the inner form that in ordinary words is generally opaque but is present in idioms and is perceptible to native speakers. For example, in idioms with the semantics of death such as *ispustit' dux* 'give up the ghost' and *vystavit' kedy* 'turn up one's toes', the lexicalized meaning "to die" is the same, but the inner forms differ, so that in many contexts they are not mutually interchangeable. The description of antonymy distinguishes between the antonymy of idioms (*polnaja čaša* 'to have plenty' vs. *ni kola, ni dvora* 'to have nothing') and antonymy within semantic fields (BEDNOST'—BOGATSTVO (POVERTY—WEALTH), NOVOE—STAROE (NEW—OLD)). Idioms display the same

types of polysemy (radial, chain) as ordinary lexis, the radial type being the most frequent; for example, the idiom *v unison* 'in unison' has seven meanings.

Also discussed in this chapter are the relationships of conversion and causativity. Traditionally, especially in Western linguistics, these relations have been considered as belonging to the grammar. In many cases, however, because conversions such as *dat' v lob—polučit' v lob* 'smack/get smacked' are formed not in accordance with the regular grammatical rules but lexically according to certain unproductive principles, they must be treated within phraseology. Generally speaking, causative transformations that are connected with introducing a semantic Agent valency into the structure (*pošla po rukam—pustil ee po rukam* 'went from hand to hand—passed her/it from hand to hand') and a change in diathesis can in phraseology lead to a change in the set of lexical meanings (*prijti k obščemu znamenatelju—privesti k obščemu znamenatelju* 'arrive at a common denominator—bring to a common denominator'). The most worthwhile approach is to describe the differences between semantic relationships in the sphere of lexis, that is, of "ordinary words" and phrasemes.

Chapter 5, "Vnutrennjaja forma frazeologizmov" ("The Inner Form of Phrasemes"), deals with the distinctive feature of phraseology as compared to ordinary lexis. The notion of inner form derives from Wilhelm von Humboldt, while in Russia it is especially associated with Alexandr Potebnja. Two sides of inner form are considered—the figurative part, which in idioms is usually present in the form of a metaphor or other tropes, and the manner in which the real meaning of the idiom is referred to, that is, the figurative motivation of the idiom by its components. The vital conclusion drawn here is that inner form must be included in the interpretation of idioms, for otherwise the description of their semantics will remain incomplete.

Chapter 6 is devoted to questions of phraseography—the dictionary description of phrasemes. It not only considers various types of phraseological dictionaries which are illustrated with specific examples, but also addresses the most important problems typically confronting phraseography: the compilation of the word list, the collection of corpus examples, and so on.

Chapter 7 treats the stylistic distinctiveness of phraseology. According to the authors, the primary task in the description of phraseology as compared to ordinary lexis is to identify the criteria for assigning

stylistic marks to phraseology. Unlike ordinary lexis, phrasemes are characterized by heightened figurativeness, structural dynamism, and extensive use in everyday communication. This in turn means that rather than a neutral style, it is colloquial speech that should be considered the unmarked use of idioms. Four scales are proposed for the system of phraseological stylistic marks: the stylistic register (“high,” “neutral,” “vulgar,” and the meaningful absence of a mark, i.e., “colloquial,” etc.), discursive marks (“bookish,” “journalism,” “vernacular”), temporal marks (“obsolete,” “Soviet”), and register operators (“euphemism,” “dysphemism”). Detailed attention is devoted to the factors that influence the register properties of phrasemes, especially idioms—meaning, inner form, temporal characteristics, and style. Certain individual features of the proposed system are open to discussion, of course, since it does not coincide with the systems of other phraseological and explanatory dictionaries. Indisputably, however, it is not simply a theoretical investigation on the part of the authors but is based on their extensive practical experience in compiling phraseological dictionaries.

Chapter 8 discusses various types of authorial use of idioms, such as authorial lexical modification, authorial grammatical transformations, authorial semantic modification, and so on. Each type is considered on the basis of examples drawn from nineteenth-century and contemporary literature. Such, for example, is the idiom *netu xuda bez nexuda* used by Sasha Sokolov, which is an authorial lexical modification of the idiom *net xuda bez dobra* ‘no cloud without a silver lining’.

Chapter 9, “Sopostavitel’naja frazeologija i problemy perevoda” (“Comparative Phraseology and Problems of Translation”), represents a special research area in phraseology that consists of a comparative analysis of individual phrasemes and groups of phrasemes united by some feature. The beginning of the chapter presents and illustrates the usually distinguished types of interlingual equivalence, from full equivalence (*igrat’ s ognem* and *play with fire*) and partial equivalence (*vstat’ ne s toj nogi* and *to get up on the wrong side of the bed*) to phraseological analogies (*podložit’ svin’ju komu-libo* and *to play a dirty trick on someone*) and non-equivalent idioms (*ob’jasnit’ na pal’cax* and *explain in simple terms*). The section that follows on equivalence in the language system and in translation is particularly important. There are two separate aspects of equivalence: the translator may focus not on the semantic resemblance of individual lexical units but on the content of the text as a whole. These aspects are often ignored in the classroom, especially in foreign language study.

Chapter 10, "Nacional'no-kul'turnaja specifika frazeologii" ("National and Cultural Features of Phraseology"), presents the basic characteristics of this research area and describes two approaches—the comparative and the introspective.

It is worth dwelling in particular on what might be called the didactic aspect of the monograph. Besides the already mentioned clear structure and logical arrangement of the work, materials are lucidly presented. Practically every problem considered is illustrated with relevant examples and is followed by analysis, which undoubtedly enhances the value of the work for instructional purposes. Noteworthy as well are the many examples from other languages, especially English and German, which is especially important to foreign students of Slavic languages and enlivens the presentation of assigned problems in which new information is often introduced. The annotated list of literature at the end of each chapter allows the student to focus on sources dealing with specific issues rather than work haphazardly.

At the same time, one would like to see certain components supplemented and expanded. This applies especially to the exercises. Assignments do not encompass all of the problems treated in the corresponding chapters. It would be desirable both to increase their number and to present them in the order of increasing complexity. It would be of no little importance to include elementary exercises, as this would significantly broaden readership and would also facilitate mastery of the material among beginning students of linguistics and especially foreign students, whose level of preparation is usually considerably lower. In this connection I would like to mention one more point. Interest in the book would increase significantly if it were to appear in English. As a rule, students of language and literature learning Russian have difficulty coping with Russian scholarly texts on such a high level.

The Swedish linguist Östen Dahl once commented on his latest publication by acknowledging that he lacked the time to write a short article. Presenting the fundamental problems of phraseology in a strictly logical order and in a form that is both accessible to students and on the highest scholarly level is an extremely difficult, almost insurmountable task. Yet the authors have succeeded. Their book is one of a kind and is of undeniable value both to theoretical linguistics and in its practical applications, including university courses in phraseology. On the one hand, the authors have succeeded in incorporating the phraseological tradition into contemporary linguistic theory. On the other, they have made it clear to students that correct native-like utterances cannot

be constructed without a knowledge of phraseology. The popularity of the book is evident from the fact that the first printing sold out in a few months. A second edition appeared a year later, in 2014.

Stockholm University
Department of Slavic and Baltic Studies,
Finnish, Dutch, and German
SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
ludmila.poppel@slav.su.se

Received: February 2015