

UDC 81'373.7:159.942.5]=161.2=112.2=111
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2663-2691/2021-86-15>

**INTELLIGENT PERSONALITY: TYPES OF METAPHORICAL RETHINKING
WHEN FORMING A PHRASEOLOGICAL IMAGE
(case study of the Ukrainian, German and English languages)**

Soshko Oksana Hryhorivna,
*Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology
and Translation
Kiev National University of Trade and Economics
ok_soshko@ukr.net
orcid.org/0000-0003-4633-7621*

Purpose. The main purpose of this paper is to interpret and differentiate the types of metaphorization mechanisms in Ukrainian, German and English phraseological units, which characterize positive intellectual abilities of a person, as well as to identify their common and distinctive features since one of the main characteristics of phraseological systems of different languages is the unity of general and special. Based on this goal and the general task of anthropocentric phraseology – the study of the ratio of linguistic and extralinguistic meanings, the existing definitions of phraseological units in languages are investigated, and the phraseological meaning is considered as an object of linguistic research. Phrasemes, or phraseological units, are studied in different directions. The study of them as units reflecting the human factor in any language remains relevant in recent decades. Metaphor is also in the focus of modern linguistics because of its relationship between linguistic phenomena and perception, memory and thinking, acquisition and application of human knowledge and experience.

Methods. Since phraseological units are also studied in linguistic and linguocultural aspects, a complex research methodology is used here. According to the set goal and specific tasks, such basic methods as descriptive, comparative, component analysis were used.

Results. The research findings are as follows: the author suggests a general classification of the mechanisms of metaphorization in phraseological units taking into account the components of their inner form. The models of phraseological units are highlighted, which are based on different types of metaphorical rethinking. The proposed classification can be used to study the semantic features of phraseological units using the material of different languages, as well as for their further correct ideographic separation.

Conclusions. In the studied languages phrasemes with metaphorical rethinking form a rather large group. Many of them have a fairly transparent structure of meaning, the motivation of which is based on broad connotations known to almost any native speaker. The research objective includes identifying semantic similarities and differences between phraseological units of languages studied. The connection of phraseological units with the cultural code is preserved in the collective subconscious memory of native speakers. Phraseologisms, reflecting in their semantics the long process of people's cultural development, fix and transmit cultural attitudes and archetypes, standards and stereotypes from generation to generation.

Key words: phraseological unit/phraseme, idiom, metaphor, metaphorization, structural-semantic analysis, inner form.

**ЛЮДИНА РОЗУМНА: ТИПИ МЕТАФОРИЧНОГО ПЕРЕОСМИСЛЕННЯ
ПРИ ФОРМУВАННІ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНОГО ОБРАЗУ
(на матеріалі української, німецької та англійської мов)**

Сошко Оксана Григорівна,
*кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри іноземної філології та перекладу
Київського національного
торговельно-економічного університету
ok_soshko@ukr.net
orcid.org/0000-0003-4633-7621*

Мета. Основна мета дослідження – це інтерпретувати та диференціювати типи механізмів метафоризації в українських, німецьких та англійських фразеологізмах, які характеризують позитивні інтелектуальні здібності людини, а також виявити їх спільні та відмінні риси, адже однією з основних характеристик фразем різних мов виступає єдність загального і специфічного. Виходячи із цієї мети і спільного завдання антропоцентричної фразеології, що полягає у вивченні співвідношення мовних та екстралінгвістичних значень, досліджуються мовні визначення фразеологізмів у мові, а фразеологічне значення розглядається як об'єкт лінгвістичного дослідження. Вивчення фразем відбувається за різними напрямками. Вивчення їх як одиниць, що відбивають людський фактор в будь-якій мові, залишається актуальним в останні десятиліття. Метафора також знаходиться в центрі уваги сучасної лінгвістики через її взаємозв'язок між мовними явищами і сприйняттям, пам'яттю і мисленням, надбанням і застосуванням людських знань і досвіду.

Методи. Оскільки фразеологічні одиниці розглядаються в лінгвістичному і лінгвокультурному аспектах, використовується комплексна дослідницька методологія. Згідно з поставленою метою та конкретними завданнями використовувалися такі основні методи, як описовий, зіставний, а також метод компонентного аналізу.

Результати. Автор пропонує загальну класифікацію механізмів метафоризації у фразеологічних одиницях, що вивчаються з урахуванням компонентів їхньої внутрішньої форми. Виділено моделі фразеологізмів, засновані на різних типах

метафоричного переосмислення. Запропонована класифікація може бути застосована для вивчення семантичних особливостей фразеологізмів на матеріалі різних мов, а також для їх подальшого правильного ідеографічного розподілу.

Висновки. У досліджуваних мовах фраземи з метафоричним переосмисленням утворюють досить велику групу. Багато з них мають досить прозору смислову структуру, мотивація якої заснована на широких конотаціях, відомих практично кожному носію мови. У завдання дослідження входило виявлення семантичних подібностей і відмінностей між фразеологізмами мов. Зв'язок фразеологізмів із культурним кодом зберігається в колективній підсвідомій пам'яті носіїв мови. Фразеологізми, що відображають в своїй семантиці тривалий процес культурного розвитку людей, фіксують та передають культурні установки й архетипи, стандарти і стереотипи з покоління в покоління.

Ключові слова: фразеологічна одиниця/фразема, ідіома, метафора, метафоричне переосмислення, структурно-семантичний аналіз, внутрішня форма.

Introduction

The anthropocentric nature of the scientific paradigm of recent decades determines the increased attention of linguists to those areas of the language that are associated with the manifestations of the linguistic personality. In this regard, there is a growing interest in the problem of evaluation as an integral part of human cognitive activity and in various forms of its linguistic reflection in language. The article touches upon one of the varieties of a positive phraseological assessment of personality in terms of mental abilities, the consideration of which has not been given significant attention both in native and foreign linguistics. Further study of phraseological units and their semantic potential is also important. The figurativeness and evaluative semantics of phraseological units are mentioned in the works of linguists, but there is still no separate study of phraseological units from this position.

The object of this study are Ukrainian, German and English phraseological units denoting human intellectual characteristics and containing a component which is metaphorically rethought, collected by the method of sequential sampling from such lexicographic sources as phraseological, explanatory, paremiological, phraseological-etymological dictionaries of the above languages. We are considering as the subject of our research the structural and semantic features of these phraseologisms.

The study of phraseological metaphor is relevant due to the involvement in the linguistic approach associated with the description of the linguistic picture of the world, which is reflected in human consciousness. There is a number of scientific works devoted to the analysis of the inner form of phrasemes, including those with a metaphorically rethought component in its composition. Structural and semantic characteristics of phraseological units, including those with a metaphorically rethought component, were studied by domestic scientists using the material of the Slavic and Germanic languages (Alad'ko, 2011; Bedrych, 2016; Dem'yanenko, 2003; Karakutsya, 2002; Pasik, 2000; Pasyurkivs'ka, 2009; Zavaryns'ka, 2010). Scientists in their research proceed from the fact that the meaning of a phraseological unit as a composite, integral nomination is created by a combined metaphorical or metonymic rethinking of the word constituents.

The purpose of this work is to consider the metaphorical mechanisms for creating phrasemes, as well as, on the basis of a comparative analysis, to identify common and distinctive features of these phraseological units in Ukrainian, German and English. Also, based on the above, we highlight the most productive models of metaphorical rethinking typical for the studied languages.

Phraseology, which describes the process of human thinking and a person from the point of view of his intellectual abilities, takes an important place in the system of any language. At the same time, scientists have different approaches to the definition of human intelligence. Many people have expressed opinions about the scientific viability of emotional intelligence. Some scholars consider the scientific viability of emotional intelligence and define it as the capacity to reason about emotions, and of emotions to enhance thinking (Mayer, Salovey, et al., 2004). Sometimes intelligence is seen as a social phenomenon. According to Merriam-Webster dictionary, “intelligent, clever, and brilliant mean having a good amount of mental ability. Intelligent is used of a person who can handle new situations and solve problems” (M-W). We accept all definitions regarding the process of human thinking and a person in terms of his intellectual abilities, considered in a positive way.

The analysis of phraseological units denoting intellectual characteristics of a person made it possible to distinguish the following types of metaphorical interpretation of their inner form:

Models of phraseological units based on rethinking the name of a character in sacred texts

First, we would like to consider a group that is composed of phraseological units of biblical origin, which include components denoting the characters of the sacred history. It should be noted that there are phrasemes to denote both mental characteristics and people – their carriers. So, the phraseme Ukr. *агнець божий* (SFUM, 2008: 19) is a biblical expression, in the New Testament it means Jesus Christ: *Назавтра бачить Йоан, що Ісус йде до него, й рече: Ось Агнець Божий, що бере на себе гріх світа* (Іван, 1, 29); *Назавтра знов стояв Йоан і два з учеників його; і, споглянувши на Ісуса идучого, рече: ось Агнець Божий* (Іван, 1, 35-36). Outside the Bible, this expression means an honest, decent, blameless person who will not compromise with his conscience, but always remain modest, honest in his intentions and in everyday life; sometimes it is rethought in a disapproving sense as ‘a person who is not adapted to life, who cannot withstand difficulties; weak-willed, meek, sometimes mentally limited’ (*агнець* obsolete “*lamb*”) (SFSUM, 2009: 29).

In the lexical-phraseological system of the studied languages, there are units for denoting the mental characteristics of a person, in which Solomon is mentioned, the third king of the Israel-Jewish state, depicted in the Old Testament books as a very wise man. Therefore, in phraseological units, his name is used as a standard of wisdom, Germ. *salomonische Weisheit* “Solomon’s wisdom (ability to make wise decisions quickly)” (NUFS: 2, 1981: 310); Eng. *Solomon’s wisdom* (*the wisdom of Solomon*) (2 Chronicles 9, 3-4; 1 Kings 10, 4-5) (BARFS, 2005: 827). These phrasemes are etymologically

of biblical origin, as the corresponding fragments are in the Books of Kings (3 4.30, 10.4) and the Book of Chronicles (2 9.3): Germ. *Und da die Königin von Reicharabien sah die Weisheit Salomos und das Haus, das er gebaut hatte*; Eng. *And when the queen of Sheba had seen the wisdom of Solomon, and the house that he had built*.

A similar meaning, as well as biblical, more specific, New Testament origin has the phraseme Eng. *serpentine wisdom (the wisdom of the serpent)* (BARFS, 2005: 827), compare (Matthew 10.16): *Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves*.

Models of phraseological units based on rethinking a person's name

In this group, as in the previous one, among these units there are those that at the level of their integral meaning denote not only a certain mental characteristic abstracted from a person, but also a personality – its possessor. In this case, such a person can be the bearer not only of certain mental qualities, but also other mental characteristics, among which the mental trait itself takes a more or less leading place. Moreover, the idiomatic representation of such a person may even include indications of his other, external features. Thus, the semantics of such a phraseme is marked by the complex nature of the mental traits that it expresses, and their heterogeneity. In the inner form of phrasemes both individual words and the entire phraseme as a whole can be metaphorically rethought.

As for the typology of motivational characteristics, within this model, a person in terms of his mental properties can be characterized by metaphorical rethinking of the name of social status or occupation. Ukrainian phraseme *аристократ духу* (sometimes ironically) “a person of high intellectual level” (SFUM, 2008: 21) comes from the expression of the Danish writer and philosopher Henrik Steffens (1773-1845) “aristocracy of the spirit”, with which he characterized the supporters of A.V. Schlegel, the ideologist of German romanticism. The popularity of this expression was facilitated by the brochure “Über den deutschen Geistes Aristokratismus” (1819) by S. Asher (ESKSV, 2005: 35). As indicated, this expression can be used with an ironic, negative connotation. Perhaps this irony is motivated, among other things, by the negative attitude towards the aristocracy as a social stratum and, accordingly, by the same connotation of words to denote this stratum. The concept of spirit is defined as “an intangible beginning in a person, opposite to the body; a substrate of the highest abilities of a person as a being gifted with reason and will; consciousness, thinking, mental abilities; the beginning that determines behavior, actions; general nature, content, true meaning of something” (FS, 2006: 275). Thus, in the phraseme Ukr. *аристократ духу*, the meaning of the height of intelligence is metaphorically conveyed through its ‘aristocracy’, i.e., elitism (compare: aristocracy – ‘the upper stratum of society; nobility // the privileged elite of any class or social group’ (NTSUM: 1, 2007: 40)). The assessment of mental properties is not isolated here, but appears as part of a comprehensive assessment of other spiritual qualities of a person.

An intelligent, but forgetful, inattentive person in the German spoken language is jokingly characterized by the phraseme *ein zerstreuter Professor* ‘an absent-minded professor’ (NRFS, 1975: 443). Metaphorization is based on the behavior of an absent-minded, though intelligent person using the stereotypical image of a professor (scientist), for whom such character traits are considered indicative: indeed, a scientist in constant intellectual search is self-absorbed and therefore inattentive to everyday circumstances.

The phraseological expression of characteristics through the indication of a particular profession (say, military service) with its inherent stereotypical social connotations concerning the general idea of the representatives of these professions, seems interesting. In the phraseme Eng. *old soldier* ‘a person with experience, an experienced person’ (AUFSS, 2006: 719) the noun ‘soldier’ at the level of the inner form denotes an ordinary serviceman, but in terms of motivation of phraseological meaning, the associative-connotative peripheral components of the content of this word are important here, which contribute to the stereotype positive qualities that, from the point of view of the linguistic culture of speakers of English and other languages, a person who is engaged in military affairs should have: persistence, discipline, resilience. Accordingly, an “old soldier” is a person who, in addition to these qualities, also has the experience and knowledge acquired in the course of life. The type of semantic development that underlies the rethinking of such phrasemes can be referred to *antonomasia*, i.e. to the cases of using proper names as appellative vocabulary.

Іван is the most common name first in Old Russian, and then in Old Ukrainian, Old Russian and Old Belarusian languages (Uzhchenko, 1988: 23–24). As a hero of fairy tales, he is kind, smart, always wins. But in the same tales, it is also mentioned about ‘two smart ones, and the third Ivan.’ As for phraseology, this anthroponym can act in various secondary meanings, including the expression of internal, mental features of the person of a certain ethnosocial status, compare: *ростом з Івана, а розумом з болвана; два брати різні і обидва Івановичі; мудрий Іван по шкоді* (ibid., 24). Thus, this proper name, due to its prevalence and belonging to a certain group, acquires a generalized meaning, beginning at the same time to express not ‘complementary’ but certain generalized mental characteristics.

The surname of a famous person can also be a component of a metaphorical ‘anthroponymous’ phraseme, for example, Eng. *the Admirable Crichton* ‘an educated man’ (BARFS, 2005: 185) – named after James Crichton, a famous Scottish scholar of the 16th century, who received his master’s degree at the age of fourteen and had a very attractive appearance.

Motivation of the metaphorical ‘toponymic’ phraseme Eng.-Amer. *a Philadelphia lawyer* ‘a man with a sharp mind; a rogue’ (AUFSS, 2006: 755) is somewhat different in accordance with the fact that here the anthroponymic component takes another, subordinate place in the phraseological structure. The English-speaking community endows the lawyer with such stereotypical qualities as intelligence and cunning dexterity in actions; the lexeme *Philadelphia*, indicates the area where, historically, an extremely dexterous lawyer who knows how to manipulate with the law, worked (FD, 2011).

Models of phraseological units based on rethinking the names of animals

The principle of zoocentrism plays an important role in the system of phraseological symbols of human qualities, because animals have always had a significant position in human life, and their vital functions and characteristics in

the transformed form continue to serve as a basis for expressing a ‘reference scale’ for certain properties. (Levchenko, 2005: 50). In the process of cultural evolution, changes in mythological and religious ideas, man’s attitude to the animal world changes, but the attribution of certain features to animals that are characteristic of human mentality, including the mind, remains unchanged.

The symbol of an intelligent, but cunning, and even insidious person in all studied languages is a fox, especially old and, therefore, experienced: Ukr. *старий лис; стара лисиця* (FSUM, 1998: 97); Germ. *ein alter (schlauer) Fuchs* (NRFS, 1975: 192); Eng. *old fox* (AUFS, 2006: 718). In combination with this zoonym, the definition of ‘old’ (and, therefore, ‘experienced’) plays an intensifying role. In the Ukrainian language, the names of folklore characters of the Ukrainian folk tale *Лисичка-сестричка* and *Лис-Микита* are also used to denote a clever, cunning man (URRUFTS, 1991: 81).

The correlation of age and experience can be traced in the phrasemes Ukr. *старий (стріляний) горобець (вовк)* ‘an experienced person who is difficult to outwit’. These phrasemes are parts of the proverb *старого горобця на полові не зловиш* (“you can’t catch an old sparrow on chaff”); the later ones are expressions – *стріляний горобець* (“a shot sparrow” – a sparrow that has been shot more than once), and other statements with *стріляний (обстріляний)* (“shot (fired)”) component: *стріляний птах, обстріляна ворона, стріляний вовк*, etc. (FSUM, 1998: 39). Similarly compare: Germ. *ein alter Hase* ‘an experienced, skilled person’ (NRFS, 1975: 265) (lit. ‘old hare’); Eng. *old bird* (part of the proverb *old birds are not to be caught with chaff*) ‘an experienced person’ (in American English in this sense phraseme *old coon* is used) (AUFS, 2006: 717). Phraseme Eng. *be dog (old dog) at something* (ibid., 83) conveys a more specific meaning of experience in a particular case.

Models of phraseological units based on rethinking the name of an artifact

A wise person, who is characterized by reason, experience, knowledge, is described by phrasemes with metaphors associated with the designation of containers of something valuable, in particular drinking water: Ukr. *кладезь мудрості (премудрості)* (lit. “a well of wisdom” about someone who has great knowledge, wisdom or about something that has extensive and valuable information) (URRUFTS, 1991: 74), Eng. *a depository of learning* (BARFS, 2005: 208); Germ. *ein Born der Weisheit* “well of wisdom” (NUFS: 1, 1981: 118).

The meaning of ‘one who has diverse knowledge’ is expressed by phrases with keywords to denote specialized, including paper, containers of information: Ukr. *ходячий довідник* ‘one who has diverse knowledge and can always answer any question’ (SFUM, 2008: 211), *ходяча енциклопедія* ‘a person who has diverse knowledge and can provide information on many issues’ (ibid., 232); Germ. *eine wandelnde Chronik* (“walking newspaper”) (about a man who is always aware of all events) (NUFS: 1, 1981: 134), *ein wandelndes (lebendes) Lexikon* (“walking encyclopedia”) (NUFS: 2, 1981: 23); Eng. *a walking encyclopaedia* (BARFS, 2005: 240). All of them are formed through the metaphorical transfer to a person of the name of an encyclopedia, a reference book that unites the most essential information on all branches of knowledge, as well as anthropomorphic indications of a new referent by emphasizing the human property of walking. In secondary use, these phrasemes can acquire an ironic meaning.

Sometimes the head as a container of the mind is indicated by other names of artifacts of the conceptual sphere ‘Dishes’, as a result of which their functions are transferred to denote mental activity: Ukr. *казанок (баняк, макітра) варить* [SFUM, 2008: 285]; *голова варить* [ibid., 156] ‘someone is smart, quick-witted, etc., well-versed in something’. According to D. Aladko, it is the basic association of a person’s head with a household item that contributes to the associative perception of the functioning of dishes as a psycho-mental activity of a person (Alad’ko, 2011: 9-10).

Models of phraseological units based on rethinking the names of visual (optical) characteristics

The contrast between darkness and light can be metaphorically interpreted in a sense related to a person’s mental and cognitive characteristics. This is proved, among other things, by the semantic structure of the corresponding words. So, the word Ukr. *light*, in addition to its direct meaning ‘radiant energy emitted by any body, is perceived by sight and makes the surrounding visible’, has a figurative meaning ‘used as a symbol of truth, reason, enlightenment or joy, happiness’ (NTSUM: 3, 2007: 254). Germ. *das Licht*, in addition to the direct meaning ‘light, illumination; lights’, is used in a figurative meaning ‘a person of high intelligence’ (BNRS, 2007: 620). Communication meaning Eng. *light* (‘the energy of the sun, fire, lamps, etc., which makes it possible to see things’ (LDCE, p. 818)) with the mental activity of a person shows the expression *see the light* ‘to understand something suddenly’. This is evidenced by the semantics of such derivatives from the corresponding roots, as, Ukr. *education, enlightenment*, Germ. *Aufklärung*, Eng. *Enlightenment*.

Thus, it can be argued that in all three studied languages, lexemes expressing the concept of ‘light’ show a semantic connection with the cognitive ability of a person to perceive, identify and distinguish objects and phenomena of the surrounding reality. And from what you can see, you can draw further conclusions, interpret it, and the like. So, a person who has visual information is perceived by verbal thinking as intelligent and educated; accordingly, ‘darkness’ is interpreted as ‘something unknown, incomprehensible; lack of adequate mental properties’.

Phraseme Ukr. *світла (ясна) голова* metaphorically and at the same time metonymically denotes a person who thinks clearly, logically (SFUM, 2008: 158); compare: Germ. *j-d ist sehr helle* ‘somebody is very smart, has a head on his shoulders’ (NUFS: 1, 1981: 321); *ein heller (klarer, offener) Kopf* ‘bright head, clear mind’ (ibid., 397). An English metaphorical substantive idiom with a metonymically rethought somatic component *a clear head* means an intelligent person with a bright head (BARFS, 2005: 366).

Models of phraseological units based on rethinking spatial (parametric) features

Spatial interpretation on a high-low scale is applied to mental properties through a secondary quantitative interpretation in phrasemes *високої проби* 1. ‘something perfect, skillfully made, of high quality’, 2. ‘gifted, talented in something’ (SFUM, 2008: 570) and *низької (невисокої) проби* 1. ‘something imperfect, primitive’, 2. ‘uncultured, has bad luck’

(ibid., 570). The characteristic of a quality object made of good metal, without impurities, of gold or silver, or, in contrast, of precious metal of low quality, is transferred to human qualities: a person *високої проби* – gifted, talented, *низької (невисокої) проби* – rudeness, bad temper. A well-mannered, cultured person is characterized by phraseological unit *тонкого ладу* (SFUM, 2008: 325) ‘refined, highly educated, with good manners’. Phraseme Germ. *feine Manieren* (BNRS, 2007: 328) ‘good manners’ also contains in the composition *fein* with the same meaning. However, these are rather descriptive expressions with a metaphorical component.

Conclusions

The characterized phraseological units can be considered as important components of the inner world of a person, therefore, are of interest for linguistic modeling and for identifying ethnic features of the world perception.

It is obvious that the phraseological units denoting the positive intellectual characteristics of a person are of interest not only in the linguistic aspect, but also in the linguocultural one, since the phraseological units with high connotative potential are the keepers of cultural information and represent quite a bright fragment of the linguistic picture of the world. It can be summarized that not only a phraseological image can be nationally unique, but also the semantic result itself in the form of a generalized figurative meaning of a phraseological unit. Phraseological images used in the studied languages to denote the intellectual characteristics of a person have both an interethnic and ethnocultural character.

On the material of the studied languages, the following models of phraseological units, based on different types of metaphorization have been identified: rethinking the name of a character in sacred texts, a person’s name, the names of animals, the name of an artifact, the names of visual/optical characteristics, spatial/parametric features.

The results obtained in the course of the research as fragments of linguistic pictures of the world can be used in identifying and describing the national-cultural specifics of linguistic pictures of the world as a whole, as well as in studying the problems of intercultural communication.

References:

1. Alad’ko D.O. (2011) *Typolohiya modeley nominatsiy posudu v anhliys’kiy ta ukrayins’kiy movakh*. [Typology of models of tableware nominations in English and Ukrainian] Kyiv, Ukraine: Drahomanov National Pedagogical University, 18 p. [in Ukrainian].
2. AUFS: *Anhlo-ukrayins’kyy frazeolohichnyy slovnyk* (2006) [English-Ukrainian phraseological dictionary]. Barantsev, K.T. (ed.). Kyiv, Ukraine: Znannya, 1056 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. BARFS: *Bol’shoy anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskii slovar’*: Okolo 20000 frazeologicheskikh yedinit (2005) [Comprehensive English-Russian phraseological dictionary: About 20,000 phraseological units]. Kunin, A.V. (auth.-comp.). – Moscow: Zhivoy yazyk, 944 p. [in Russian].
4. Bedrych Yaroslava (2016) *Metaphors of inclusive semantics in the language of science*. *Advanced Education*, 2016, Issue 5, 21-27. DOI: 10.20535/2410-8286.61283.
5. BNRS: *Bol’shoy nemetsko-russkiy slovar’* (2007) [Comprehensive German-Russian Dictionary]. Leyn, K., Mal’tseva, D.G. (eds.). – Moscow: Russkiy yazyk – Media, 1159 p. [in Russian].
6. Dem’yanenko N.B. (2003) *Pol’s’ki frazeolohichni odynytsi na poznachennya mental’nykh vlastyvostey lyudyny: strukturno-semantychna ta formal’no-hramatychna kharakterystyky*. [Polish phraseological units denoting human mental properties: structural-semantic and formal-grammatical characteristics] Kyiv, Ukraine: Kyiv National University. Institute of Philology, 23 p. [in Ukrainian].
7. M-W: *Dictionary and Thesaurus*. Merriam-Webster Online. Access mode: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>
8. ESKSV: *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar’ krylatykh slov i vyrazheniy: Boleye 4000 statey* (2005) [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Idioms and Expressions: More than 4000 articles]. Serov, V. (eds.). Moscow: Lokid-Press, 880 p. [in Russian].
9. FS: *Filosofskiy slovar’* (2006) [Philosophical Dictionary] Andrushchenko, I.V., Vusatyuk, O.A., et al. (eds.). Kyiv, Ukraine: A.S.K., 1056 p. [in Russian].
10. FSUM: *Frazeolohichnyy slovnyk ukrayins’koyi movy* (1998) [Phraseological dictionary of the Ukrainian language]. Uzhchenko, V.D., Uzhchenko, D.V., Kyiv, Ukraine: Osvita, 224 p. [in Ukrainian].
11. Karakutsya O.M. (2002) *Frazeolohizmy ukrayins’koyi movy z komponentom ‘dusha’ (strukturno-semantychnyy, ideohrafichnyy, linhvokul’turolohichnyy aspekty)* [Phraseologisms of the Ukrainian language with the ‘soul’ component (structural-semantic, ideographic, linguocultural aspects)] Kharkiv, Ukraine, 19 p. [in Ukrainian].
12. Levchenko O.P. (2005) *Frazeolohichna symbolika: linhvokul’turolohichnyy aspekt*. [Phraseological symbolism: linguocultural aspect] L’viv, Ukraine: LRIDU NADU, 352 p. [in Ukrainian].
13. LDCE: *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1995) England, Essex: Longman Group LTD, 1668 p.
14. Mayer, J.D.; Salovey, P.; Caruso, D. R. (2004). ‘Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications’. *Psychological Inquiry*. 60 (3): 197–215. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli1503_02.
15. NRFS: *Nemetsko-russkiy frazeologicheskii slovar’* (1975) [German-Russian phraseological dictionary] Binovich, L.E., Grishin, N.N. (eds.). Moscow: Russkiy yazyk, 656 p. [in Russian].
16. NUFSS: *Nimets’ko-ukrayins’kyy frazeolohichnyy slovnyk* (1981) [German-Ukrainian phraseological dictionary] (Vols. 1-2) Havrys’, V.I., Prorochenko, O.P. (eds.). Kyiv, Ukraine: Radyans’ka shkola, V. 1. – 416 p., V. 2. – 384 p. [in Ukrainian].
17. NTSUM: *Novyy tлумachnyy slovnyk ukrayins’koyi movy* (2007) In 3 vols. [New Dictionary of Ukrainian language]. Yaremenko V., Slipushko O. (eds.). Kyiv, Ukraine: “Akonit”, V. 1 / A-K/. – 926 p., V. 2 / K-П/. – 926 p., V. 3 / П-Я/. – 862 p. [in Ukrainian].

18. Pasik N.M. (2000) Vlasni nazvy v ukrayins'kiy frazeolohiyi ta paremiolohiyi [Names in Ukrainian phraseology and paremiology] Kyiv, Ukraine: Institute of the Ukrainian language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 15 p. [in Ukrainian].
19. Pasyurkivs'ka M.V. (2009) Zoonimichna leksyka v pol's'kiy frazeolohiyi: sklad, semantyka, funktsiyi [Zoonymic vocabulary in Polish phraseology: composition, semantics, functions] Kyiv, Ukraine: Potebnya Institute of Linguistics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 18 p. [in Ukrainian].
20. SFUM: Slovyk frazeolohizmiv ukrayins'koyi movy (2008) [Dictionary of phraseology of the Ukrainian language]. Bilonozhenko, V.M. et al. (eds.). Kyiv, Ukraine: Naukova dumka, 1104 p. [in Ukrainian].
21. SFSUM: Suchasnyy frazeolohichnyy slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy (2009) [Modern phraseological dictionary of the Ukrainian language]. Yareshchenko, A.P., Bezditko, V.I., Kozyr, O.V. (eds.). Kharkiv, Ukraine: TORSINH PLYUS, 640 p. [in Ukrainian].
22. FD: The Free Dictionary (2011) Farlex, Inc., Access mode: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/>.
23. URRUFTS: Ukrayins'ko-rosiys'kyy i rosiys'ko-ukrayins'kyy frazeolohichnyy tлумachnyy slovnyk (1991) [Ukrainian-Russian and Russian-Ukrainian phraseological dictionary]. Oliynyk, I.S., Sydorenko, M.M. (eds.). Kyiv, Ukraine: Radyans'ka shkola, 400 p. [in Ukrainian].
24. Uzhchenko V.D. (1988) Narodzhennya i zhyttya frazeolohizmu. [The birth and life of a phraseological unit] Kyiv, Ukraine: Radyans'ka shkola, 279 p. [in Ukrainian].
25. Zavaryns'ka I.F. (2010) Linhvokul'turna motyvatsiya frazeolohizmiv z onimnym komponentom v anhliys'kiy, pol's'kiy ta ukrayins'kiy movakh. [Linguocultural motivation of phraseological units with an onymic component in English, Polish and Ukrainian] Kyiv, Ukraine: Drahomanov National Pedagogical University, 22 p. [in Ukrainian].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 15.04.2021
The article was received 15 April 2021