

повідомлення. **Перспективним** вважаємо комплексне дослідження дейктичних одиниць в англійськомовному рекламному дискурсі.

Література

- Білецька Т. О. Дейктична аргументація в електронних текстах-описах товарів [Електронний ресурс] / Т. О. Білецька. – Режим доступу : http://philology.kiev.ua/library/zagal/Movni_i_konceptualni_2011_36/087_095.pdf
- Білецька Т. О. Роль дейктичних елементів у реалізації стратегій впливу на адресата (на матеріалі англомовних текстів-описів товару комерційних інтернет-сайтів) [Електронний ресурс] / Т. О. Білецька. – Режим доступу : http://philology.kiev.ua/library/zagal/Movni_i_konceptualni_2014_36/087_095.pdf
- Ломакіна І. А. Семантика та прагматика особових займенникових слів у сучасних іспаномовних текстах : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : спец. 10.02.05 «Романські мови» / І. А. Ломакіна. – К., 2001. – 18 с.
- Македонова О.Д. Лінгвостилістична організація та прагматичне функціонування англійськомовного рекламного дискурсу : дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 «Германські мови» / О. Д. Македонова. – Запоріжжя, 2017. – 229 с.
- Малишенко А. О. Иллокутивный потенциал рекламных высказываний фемининной и маскулинной адресации / А. О. Малишенко // Вісник Харківського нац. ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна. – 2006. – №741. С. 103-105.
- Падучева Е.В. Семантические исследования / Е. В. Падучева. – М., 1996. – 464 с.
- Рюмина Л. И. Манипулятивные приемы в рекламе / Л. И. Рюмина. – М. : Март, 2004. – 240 с.

Джерела ілюстративного матеріалу

- Cosmopolitan, June, 2012. – 67р.
- Fit Pregnancy, May, 2012. – 33р.
- Glam, April, 2012. – 88р.
- Harpers Bazaar, March, 2012. – 12р.
- Harpers Bazaar, February. – 2012. - 30р.
- Marie Claire, October, 2011. – 35р.
- Marie Claire, March, 2012. – 15р.
- More, November, 2011. – 53р.
- Newsweek, November, 2010. – 17р.
- Newsweek, June-July, 2012. – 87р.
- Redbook, April, 2012. – 23р.
- Runner World, February, 2012. – 40р.
- Shape Magazine, November, 2011. – 18р.
- The Economist, February, 2010. – 45р.
- The Economist, October, 2011. – 23р.
- The Economist, November, 2012. – 7р.
- Today's Parents, May, 2012. – 25р.

(Матеріал надійшов до редакції 13.10.17)

УДК: 811.111:81'37

MYKHAYLENKO V. V.

(Ivano-Frankivsk King Danylo Galytskyi University of Law)

FUNCTIONAL SEMANTICS OF THE ADJECTIVE “CLEVER” IN DISCOURSE

The present article is a study of lexical and functional semantics of the adjective “CLEVER” belonging to the Semantic Domain of adjectives sharing “intelligent feature” in the language competence and author’s discourse. The dynamics of the components in the lexical meaning of the adjective structure is defined. The word connotative meaning differentiates between emotional, expressive, axiological and stylistic components. All the four components of connotation can or cannot be presented together or in different combinations. Let us consider the axiological or evaluative word meaning The word has an axiological component of meaning if it expresses the SPEAKER’S positive or negative judgment – approval or disapproval. It is closely connected with the object-logical specifying and supplementing it and therefore becomes a constituent of the dictionary entry definition. The lexical meaning undergoes some changes due to the ‘environment of the adjective which retaining a common feature can reveal its peripheral components. The position of these components is also changeable; compare: the lexical meaning taxonomy in the language competence registered in dictionaries and in discourse where the actualization of a certain component depends on the author’s intention. We would like to answer the question: “What (kind of) information must the SPEAKER associate to the word “CLEVER” of a language in order to be a competent user of the lexicon to be understood by the interlocutor?” There come the problems of pinpointing the component actualized in discourse. The functional semantic research poses an important questions on the shifts in the componential structure of the lexical meaning as the word becomes a pragmatic signal that conveys a particular evaluation, precisely in discourse. The interpretation of the evaluative component of the adjective is mainly determined by the author’s intention, type of register discourse and its distribution. The article provides various views upon the concept of axiological component and shares with the author’s criteria of its development in the lexical meaning of the adjective “clever”. The axiological component of the adjective in general discourse gets a central position and tentatively models the levels of its development.

Key words: adjective, lexical semantics functional semantics, denotation, connotation, axiological component, distribution, discourse

Михайленко В. В. Функціональна семантика прикметника “CLEVER” у дискурсі. У фокусі даної статті – дослідження лексичної іта функціональної семантики прикметника «CLEVER», який входить до семантичного поля прикметників із

загальним компонентом «інтелектуальна функція» у мовній компетенції та авторському дискурсі. Визначено динаміку компонентів у лексичному значенні структури прикметника.

Ключові слова: прикметник, лексична семантика, функціональна семантика, денотат, конотат, оцінний компонент, дистрибуція, дискурс

Михайленко В. В. Функціональна семантика прилагательного “CLEVER” в дискурсе. Настоящая статья представляет собой исследование лексической и функциональной семантики прилагательного «CLEVER», принадлежащего к семантическому полю прилагательных с общим компонентом «интеллектуальная функция» в языковой компетенции и авторском дискурсе. Определена динамика компонентов в лексическом значении структуры прилагательного.

Ключевые слова: прилагательное, лексическая семантика, функциональна семантика, денотат, коннотат, оценочный компонент, дистрибуция, дискурс.

INTRODUCTION

Studies of the relationship between language and the national perception of the world are undertaken in the framework of cultural and cognitive linguistics, pragmatics, and linguistic axiology. Contemporary linguistics is focused on the worldview reflected in the lexicon system, and the conceptual system of the language mental space. The lexical meaning of a word is a complex unity – its composition should be considered from the point of speech information parsing: the subject of the message not associated with the act of communication, and information related to the conditions and participants of communication. The first type of information corresponds to the denotative meaning of the word. The other type corresponds to the connotative meaning of the word. In semantics these two components are the *literal* and *figurative* meanings of a word, cf. in philosophy: extension and intension of a word. *Denotation* [Mykhaylenko 2015, p.144-145] can be synonymous with reference, and *connotation* [Mykhaylenko 2015, p. 122] with sense. The connotation essentially relates to how anything may be associated with a word or phrase, for example, an implied value judgment. Therefore, the word connotative meaning differentiates between emotional, expressive, axiological and stylistic components. All the four components of connotation can or cannot be presented together or in different combinations [Apresian 1995, p. 156-177]. Let us consider the axiological or evaluative word meaning (from Greek axiology → *axios*, “worthy” and *logos*, “science”). The word has an axiological component of meaning if it expresses the SPEAKER’S positive or negative judgment --approval or disapproval [see: Arutiunova 1982, p.3-23]. It is closely connected with the object-logical specifying and supplementing it and therefore becomes a constituent of the dictionary entry definition. Unlike the emotional component, the axiological component does not contribute to weakening of syntactic relationships.

The present study addresses some problems of functional semantics of the adjective “CLEVER” which belongs to the Semantic Domain of adjectives sharing “intelligent feature”. The lexical meaning undergoes some changes due to the ‘environment of the adjective which retaining a common feature can reveal its peripheral components. The position of these components is also changeable; compare: the lexical meaning taxonomy in the language competence registered in dictionaries and in discourse where the actualization of a certain component depends on the author’s intention. We would like to answer the question: ”What (kind of) information must the SPEAKER associate to the word “CLEVER of a language L in order to be a competent user of the lexicon of L to be understood by the interlocutor” [Yagubova 1996, 36-41].

The article provides various views upon the concept of axiological component [see: Wisniewska 2016, p.163-170] and shares with the author’s criteria of its development in the lexical meaning of the adjective “clever”. The axiological component of the adjective in general discourse gets a central position and tentatively models the levels of its development.

THE STATE OF ART

The notions of *word* and *word meaning* are problematic to pin down, and this is reflected in the difficulties one encounters in defining the basic terminology of lexical semantics. In part, this depends on the fact that the words ‘word’ and ‘meaning’ themselves have multiple meanings, depending on the context and the purpose they are used for [Matthews 1991]. The theoretical framework of the research is, first of all, classical and modern works of linguistics on “evaluation” both as a linguistic category, its means of expressing and as the evaluative or axiological

component of the word lexical meaning; investigations on the language philosophy, primarily the specific features of the reflection of the linguistic features of the national mentality; the works devoted to the study of axiology as a component of the word lexical meaning in various languages demonstrate a considerable interest of linguists in the axiological tissues; works of multiculturalism, cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, linguistic axiology. Mainly, the authors relate the axiological component to the SPEAKER'S intentions and behavior, to the linguistic form, to the manner of presentation, and the HEARER'S attitude [Uson, 2011, p. 291-292].

There are two kinds of theory of word meaning, first, a *semantic* theory of word meaning aimed at clarifying what meaning-determining information is encoded by the lexical items of a natural language; second, a *foundational* theory of word meaning aimed at singling out the facts whereby lexical expressions come to have the semantic properties they have for their users. [see: Johnson 2006, p.119-134]. A framework establishing that the word 'clever' encodes the lexical concept "INTELLECTUAL CHARACTERISTIC" would be an example of a semantic theory of word meaning.

INVESTIGATION

The lexeme is a set of the stem and the flexion, the stem in its turn consists of the root and a derivational affix taken out of its distribution in the sentence/text/discourse. The methods of linguistic research used in the work are determined by its aim and the data – etymological, definitional, component, corpuscular and discourse analysis. These approaches often end up splitting the notion of word into a number of more fine-grained and theoretically manageable notions, but still tend to regard 'word' as a term that zeroes in on a scientifically respectable concept [e.g.: Di Sciullo and Williams, 1987]. Every natural language has a *lexicon* organized into *lexical entries*, which contain information about *lexemes*. These are the smallest linguistic expressions that are conventionally associated with a non-compositional meaning and can be uttered in isolation to convey semantic content. *Lexemes* relate to *words* just like phonemes relate to phones in phonological theory.

The adjective clever originates from Middle English (in the sense 'quick to catch hold', only recorded in this period), perhaps, from: Dutch or Low German, and related to cleave, apparently, from: East Anglian dialectal cliver "expert at seizing." Cf.: East Frisian klüfer "skillful;" Norwegian dialectic klover "ready, skillful." The historical semantics of the word reveals the dynamics of the lexical meaning of "clever" from: "handy, dexterous(1580s,)" → the late 16th century 'manually skilful' → 'possessing mental agility,' first recorded in 1704 → still "a low word" applied to any thing a man likes, without a settled meaning [Johnson, 1755] → also often in the old use and dialect meant "well-shaped, attractive-looking" in the 19th century.

The contemporary dictionary entry of "clever" reveals the following constituents: (1) quick to understand, learn, and devise or apply ideas; (2) skilled at doing or achieving something; (3) showing skill and originality; (4) a simple but clever idea (5) [*informal*] sensible; (6) [BRITISH only: *informal*] healthy or well; (7) [American rarely] good-natured, agreeable [Chambers' Twentieth Century Dictionary; Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary; Chambers' Twentieth Century Dictionary; Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia]. Each constituent as a differential feature can have its own sub-domain. The componential analysis developed in the second half of the 1950s by European and American linguists (e.g., Pattier, Coseriu, Bloomfield, Nida), defines the common component in the lexemic meaning of all the constituents of the referred sub-domains and results in modeling the Semantic sub-domain of CLEVER as a constituent of the domain "INTELLECTUAL CHARACTERISTIC".

The relationship between linguistic structure and conceptual structure is the main concern of linguists and philosophers to investigate similarities and differences among languages and their organizations. Several principles are put forward by scholars – space and time, motion and location, force interactions, point of view and focus of attention to structure those organizations [cf. in Russian: Smirnova 2013]. We take an attempt to organize the list of retrieved lexemes according to the SPEAKER'S POINT OF VIEW – APPROVAL or DISAPPROVAL OF THE SUBJECT / OBJECT OF THE OF HIS/HER DISCOURSE which brought us to Conceptual system of

“CLEVER” in the English worldview: *artful, creative, imaginative, ingenious, innovative, inventive, adventurous, fresh, groundbreaking, original, visionary, cleverish, novel, gadgety, gimmicky, convenient, handy, neat, nifty, practical, sophisticated, useful; complex, sophisticated, adroit, deft, dexterous (also dextrous), expert, handsome, tricky, brainy, intelligent, sharp, smart; faster, alert, brainy, bright, keen, nimble, brilliant, intelligent, exceptional, fast, hyperintelligent, quick, quick-witted, smart, sharp-witted, supersmart, ultrasmart apt, ingenious, resourceful, acute, astute, heady, insightful, knowing, perceptive, percipient, savvy, discerning, perspicacious, sagacious, sapient, cerebral, erudite, genial, highbrow, scholarly, knowledgeable, learned, literate, well-read; educated, informed, schooled, wise, skilled, trained; creative, inventive, sane, sapient, sensible, sound, sage, judicious, prudent, cunning, foxy, shrewd, wily, logical, rational, flexible, lissome, lithe, lithesome, nimble, spry; coordinated; able, adept, capable, crafty, expert, competent, habile, masterful, masterly, proficient, intelligent qualified, skilled, skillful, sure-handed; double-jointed, loose-jointed, (given to or marked by mature) witty, facetious, humorous, jocular, smart, cerebral, highbrow, creative, high-browed, intellectual; skillful* [Avramova 2003, p.17-30].

The lexical Field Theory introduced by Trier (1931), it argues that words should be studied by looking at their relations to other words in the same lexical field. A lexical field is a set of semantically related lexical items whose meanings are mutually interdependent and which together provide a given domain of reality with conceptual structure. Lexical field theory assumes that lexical fields are closed sets with no overlapping meanings or semantic gaps. Whenever a word undergoes a change in meaning (e.g., its range of application is extended or contracted), the whole arrangement of its lexical field is affected (Lehrer 1974). However, all these sets closed in the system can connect and overlap in discourse. In applied linguistics – teaching English, lexicography (especially computational), translation – we must verify the lexical meaning of the unit in its distribution where the author’s intention, pre- and post-positional valence and the discourse register may actualize any component, covert or overt, could occupy either dominant or periphery.

There come the problems of pinpointing the component actualized in discourse. The authors of various corpora turned volumes of words and phrases into dynamic systems helpful, primarily, for linguists to approve or reject their hypo-deductive models, for educators to select the units in their distribution and in discourse registers in actual use, as well as for lexicographers to improve dictionary entries and enrich vocabularies.

In patterns 1-9 the positive component can be assigned to the lexeme *clever* (Cf.: Anna Wierzbicka elaborated the interpretation of the positive evaluative component in the French word *fierte* “duma in Polish [Wierzbicka 1992, 197]) – person, intelligence, his/her skill, his/her behavior, objects of his environment, characteristic of these objects:

1. CLEVER + N (human –being)

Manner or style of behavior:

I'm surprised how clever people are, walking without even thinking about it.

However, even a clever pupil at Oxford in those days would have done badly

Clever undergraduates liked them because of their enormous range.

2. V(be) CLEVER + N (human –being)

Skill and intelligence of human-being:

It takes a great deal of prestidigitatory skill to poison someone the Duke is daft but he is clever, and he has an entry to every house from Atholl to Dunkeld.

He was very clever and went into an entire theatrical about the whole thing.

You will see it my way. Look how clever, profound, etc. I am.

Even a clever pupil at Oxford in those days would have done badly.

3. CLEVER +N(object)

Function of a thing:

Yet we can not recommend the 300SL-24, even with it's clever gearbox.

But clever suspension changes and, more important, the four-wheel drive

Thanks to the clever syncro system, more than ample traction to make use of it.

Involves far more than ordering and taking delivery of powerful foxes loaded with clever software.

4. V(be) +CLEVER + N (performance)**Function characteristics**

It is a very clever performance -- what they call in theatrical circles a beautiful performance.

It was a clever wheeze, great fun to work, and it probably succeeded in neutralizing the German.

Yet we can not recommend the 300SL-24, even with it's clever gearbox.

5. CLEVER + N (performance)**Manner or style of behavior**

A good voice, pleasant melodies, clever arrangements and, in among the depression, some light touches of humour.

And a few of the clever puns which have secured Asterix an adult following, survive translation.

The first part of the programme consists of three short pieces: Cohan's clever solo for Bhuller in which he discards his garments, in front of Crickmay blow-up.

But Inverness now do a clever Roll-On Depilatory which is easy to apply and it doesn't drip.

6. CLEVER + N (idea, event)**Manner or style of behavior**

Has your clever idea won a 50 cash prize this month?

He emerges as a man with a big heart and a clever mind who did the best he could in difficult circumstances.

The positive component of clever can also be emphasized by the speaker using the following modifiers: very, too, more, real, really, bloody– person's intellect, skill, his/her manner of behavior or activity.

7. MODIFIER + CLEVER +N**Human state**

He is said to be very clever as well as deeply religious.

8. V(be) + MODIFIER + CLEVER (+ N)**Manner or style of behavior**

And here is the really clever part -- fewer people than ever will now be able to observe.

Frederic Bennett's letter (12 October) criticising the Archbishop of Canterbury is too clever by half.

Human state

She'll think I been real clever to find my own way back

Annie was real clever – even though she was only a little kid, like.

Finally Rachel responded and Phoebe had forgotten in her wanderings just how bloody clever Rachel was.

Wright converted his fourth League goal of the season. The second was altogether more clever.

9. V(be) + MODIFIER + CLEVER**Manner or style of behaviour**

Nothing particularly talented, beautiful or clever about her Boxing far too clever:

You have been very clever – in fact, too clever' and the goodie saying,

Wright converted his fourth League goal of the season. The second was altogether more clever...

We've proved you can train anything that way. Bubbles is actually very clever; it took her five minutes to learn how to leg yield.

In the following patterns the speaker adds either negation, or uses clever in the preposition to the lexeme with the negative evaluative component, or embeds the lexeme clever into the construction 'AS + Adj CLEVER AS Adj (antonymic):

10. CLEVER + N (opposite to clever)-+ N (human)

They come from such a set-up and I will show you a very clever liar.

Anything but sit in this room and powder my face and tell you what a clever fool you are.

Queen Maria Luisa, wife of Charles IV, an unlovely, clever, deceitful and immensely powerful woman.

11. V (be) +[Neg] +CLEVER + ENOUGH

She felt she was not clever enough to understand.

Mrs Phipps been clever enough to manage her husband's murder,

If they were clever enough to play so dumb.

12. Neg+VERB (look=be) + CLEVER

Plunging into the midst of a soft US market may not look clever in the short term.

13. AS + CLEVER + AS + STUPID

Characteristic

Some lawyers are typified as 'clever', others as 'stupid'; the former require one to be cautious

He gave us his splendid Brian which is as clever and well-judged a piece of comic acting as you'll see.

Ford people are admitting as much, just as the clever among them are no longer feigning surprise at our conclusions.

14. V (be) +[Neg]+ CLEVER + [ENOUGH]

Human state

He was not clever or epigrammatic in the Union manner and only occasionally witty, she felt she was not clever enough to understand.

You're just trying to be clever, and that's not too clever in itself, you know.'

talented, beautiful or clever about her, just a pleasant-looking girl-next-door.

I knew I was not clever. Proof positive: I had no qualifications.

We have defined positive axiological component the adjective clever in the following patterns:

CLEVER + N (human –being)

V(be) CLEVER + N (human –being)

CLEVER +N(object)

V(be) +CLEVER + N (performance)

CLEVER + N (performance)

CLEVER + N (idea, event)

MODIFIER + CLEVER +N

V(be) + MODIFIER + CLEVER (+ N)

V(be) + MODIFIER + CLEVER

The evaluation in the 'secondary communication can be found in [Булыгина, Шмелёв 1996, p. 236-242].

And the negative axiological component is revealed in the adjective clever used in the following patterns:

CLEVER + N (opposite to clever)-+ N (human)

V (be) +[Neg] +CLEVER + ENOUGH

Neg+VERB (look=be) + CLEVER

AS + CLEVER + AS + STUPID

(be) +[Neg]+ CLEVER + [ENOUGH]

It is unlikely that these distributions are accidental, because the patterns are registered in different discourses by The British National Corpus of the English language. The lexical meaning of “CLEVER” functioning in various discourse registers undergoes shifts of its components and brings the changes in the semantic hierarchy.

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

The study of the semantic structure of the adjective “clever” and its dynamics throughout the language makes it possible to specify the axiological component encoded in the word. The expression of an appraisal value by nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs has its own specific features, primarily, in terms of semantics and grammar, but when words of different parts of speech constitute one lexical-semantic field, a fundamental similarity is revealed, The main semantic sub-domains represented by words with the axiological component, can be defined as follows: (1) a human being, his inner world, his social life and activities; (2) his/her environment; (3) his/her community.

The functional semantic research poses an important questions on the shifts in the componential structure of the lexical meaning as the word becomes a pragmatic signal that conveys a particular

evaluation, precisely in discourse. The interpretation of the evaluative component of the adjective is mainly determined by the author's intention, type of register discourse and its distribution.

References

- Аврамова В. Концептосфера оценочности в национальной языковой картине мира / В. Аврамова // Проблемы когнитивного и функционального описания русского и болгарского языков. – Вып. 2. – Шумен : Изд-во «Епископ Константин Преславский», 2003. – С. 17-30.
- Апресян Ю. Д. Коннотация как часть прагматики слова / Ю. Д. Апресян // Избранные труды. – Т. 2. Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография. – М. : Восточная литература, 1995. – С. 156-177.
- Арутюнова Н. Д. Аксиология в механизмах жизни и языка / Н. Д. Арутюнова // Проблемы структурной лингвистики. – М. : Наука, 1982. – С. 3-23
- Булыгина Т. В., Шмелев Д. Н. Оценка при вторичной коммуникации / Т. В. Булыгина, Д. Н. Шмелев // Поэтика. Стилистика. Язык и культура. – М. : Наука, 1996. – С. 236-242.
- Смирнова Л. Г. Лексика русского языка с оценочным компонентом значения : системный и функциональный аспекты: автореф. дисс.... док. филол. наук : 10.02.01 / Л. Г. Смирнова / Смоленский гос. ун-т. – Смоленск, 2013. – 50 с.
- Ягубова М. А. Оценка в языковой картине мира / М. А. Ягубова // Вопросы стилистики : Язык и человек. Саратов : Колледж, 1996. Вып. 26. – С. 30-41.
- Di Sciullo Anne-Marie, Williams Edwin. On The Definition of Word / Anne-Marie Di Sciullo, Edwin Williams. – Boston : MIT Press, 1987 – 118 p.
- Johnson Kent. An Overview of Lexical Semantics / Kent Johnson // Philosophy Compass. – 2008. – Vol.3. – № 1. – Pp.119-134.
- Mathews Peter H. Morphology / Peter H. Mathews. – Cambridge : CUP, 1991. – 251p.
- Mykhaylenko Valery V. A Glossary of Linguistics and Translation Studies / Valery V. Mykhaylenko. – Ivano-Frankivsk : IFKDGUL, 2015. – 527 p.
- Uson Ricard Mairal et al. Current Trends in Longuistica / Ricard Mairal Uson. – Madrid : UNED, 2011. – 316 p.
- Wierzbicka A. Semantics, Culture and Cognition : Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations / A. Wierzbicka. – N.Y., Oxford : OUP, 1992. – 496 p.
- Wisniewska Natalia. Europeaness as an axiological component of the word *STATE* / Natalia Wisniewska // PrzegladWschodnioeuropejski. –2016. – Vol.12. – № 1. – Pp.163-170.

(Матеріал надійшов до редакції 21.09.17)

УДК: 811.133.1:81'373.7

ПАВЛЮК Е. О.

(Запорожский национальный университет)

УСТОЙЧИВЫЕ ОБОРОТЫ С АНТРОПОНИМИЧЕСКИМ КОМПОНЕНТОМ КАК ИСТОЧНИК ЛИНГВОСТРАНОВЕДЧЕСКОЙ ИНФОРМАЦИИ

В статье анализируются французские фразеологизмы с антропонимическим компонентом. В составе французских устойчивых оборотов в качестве их компонентов сохраняются антропонимы разных эпох – библейские, античные, собственно французские. Среди них представлены имена святых, реальных исторических лиц, антропонимы индивидуально-творческого происхождения и взятые из фольклорных источников. Многие из них, особенно те, фразеологические единицы, которые включают малоизвестные собственные имена, нуждаются в историко-литературных справках об их происхождении. Подобные комментарии лингвострановедческого характера особенно необходимы студентам, изучающим фразеологию французского языка.

Ключевые слова: антропоним, фразеологизмы, лингвострановедческая информация

Павлюк О. О. Стейкі звороти з антропонімічним компонентом як джерело лінгвокраїнознавчої інформації. У статті аналізуються французькі фразеологізми з антропонімічним компонентом. У складі французьких усталених зворотів у якості їх компонентів зберігаються антропоніми різних епох – біблійні, античні, власне французькі. Серед них представлено імена святих, реальних історичних осіб, антропоніми індивідуально-творчого походження і взяті з фольклорних джерел. Багато з них, особливо ті, фразеологічні одиниці, які включають маловідомі власні імена, потребують історико-літературних довідок про їх походження. Подібні коментарі лінгвокраїнознавчого характеру особливо необхідні студентам, які вивчають фразеологію французької мови.

Ключові слова: антропонім, фразеологізми, лінгвокраїнознавча інформація

Pavliuk O. O. Set-expressions with Anthroponymic Component as a Source of Linguistic and Regional Studies. The article analyzes the French phraseological units with an anthroponymic component. While analyzing a broad approach to phraseology is adopted, when both set expressions and phraseological units consisting totally of words with free meaning are considered. Anthroponyms are the object of anthroponymic science, representing the section of onomastics. There are different names, nicknames, surnames among the anthroponyms mentioned. The phraseological units have various sources: the Bible, the lives of the saints, the antique myths, literary works, real events. The purpose of the article is a linguistic analysis of phraseological units including proper names. We set the following tasks: to identify components-anthroponyms of the religious origin; to determine proper names which go back to folklore sources; to define the names of the literary characters in the phraseological units; to find the phraseological units with the names of real historical personalities of different eras; to give a linguistic and regional analysis of