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Reorganization of meaning in the field of phraseology is one of the most debatable points in modern linguistics. We maintain that one of the peculiarities of phraseological nomination is formation of tertiary nomination units. They are formed either as a result of imageless reorganization by means of the secondary occasional nomination or as a result of imagery transformation of PU constituents by means of the usual or occasional secondary nomination. The main idea of this nomination type consists in the following points:

(1) the semantics of a phraseosemantic variant may be caused by that of the preceding variant, and the following variant is the transformation of the preceding one [Кунин, 1996, с. 151];

(2) from the phraseological units, being already the units of secondary nomination, derivative phraseological units are formed, the meaning of which appears as a result of meaning transference of their phraseological prototypes or as a result of imageless reorganization consisting in rearranging of implicit or explicit semes owing to which they are corresponded indirectly to changeable word combinations of the same lexico-grammatical structure;

(3) phraseological units are formed from the personal authors’ expressions (being secondary nomination expressions) as a result of secondary transformation;
(4) meaning transference of a phraseological unit may occur also by means of occasional usage in case it is based on the secondary meaning transference of the primary phraseological unit.

In fact, tertiary nomination is characteristic of a lot of phraseological units and besides it is a special way of an indirect representation of reality. Phraseological unit of biblical origin may serve as an example of the first type transformation: give up the ghost – испустить дух, умереть.

Well, in XX century this unequivocal phraseological unit acquired a phraseosemantic variant with the meaning перестать функционировать, выдохнуться, as a result it became a bivariant unit. “Longman Dictionary of English Idioms” gives the following definition of this phraseological unit: to stop putting any effort into doing something: he seems to have given up the ghost on his job; he isn’t trying any more. This kind of transformation differs greatly from the the secondary nomination transformation, as the prototype of the phraseosemantic variant is already semantically transformed. Hence, the secondary nomination appears (phraseological abstraction from phraseological abstraction [Fedulenkova, 2009, c. 42]), e.g.: (as) clear as crystal – 1) прозрачный, чистый как кристалл (о ручье); 2) четкий, ясный (о стиле).

As it is, the peculiarity of meaning transference in such cases consists in formation of fully transformed phraseological variant from one-literal meaning of the comparative expression.

It has been noted [Кунин, 1996, с. 152] that during the process of formation of phraseological units from phraseological units two kinds of tertiary nomination may be distinguished: an elementary and a situational one.

As to elementary nomination, it is a formation of a phraseological unit having the structure of a word combination from a phraseological unit having the structure of a word combination or a sentence, e.g.: come to the right shop – обратиться к кому (куда) следует (formed on the contrast from ‘come to the wrong shop’ – обратиться не по адресу, etc.

As to situational nomination, it is a formation of a phraseological unit having
the structure of a sentence from another phraseological unit with the same structure of a sentence, e.g.: *curiosity killed the cat* – *любопытство до добра не доведет* is formed analogically with phraseological unit *care killed the cat* – *заботы и кошку уморят* (W. Shakespeare. "Much Ado About Nothing").

Besides, semantic transformation is also characteristic of phraseological units, formed from imagery authorial expressions. The example is an imagery bible expression: *not to let one's left hand know what one's right hand does* – *левая рука не ведает, что делает правая*: What thou doest alms let not thy left hand know what thy right hand does (библ.) – у тебя же, когда творишь мимолетно, пусть левая рука твоя не знает, что делает правая, etc.

The expression is used in a positive sense in the Bible. In modern English it is transformed and, as an analogous Russian phraseological unit, is considered to be with a negative connotation.

On the other hand, transformation of phraseological unit meaning takes place also during an occasional usage of the phraseological unit, e.g.:

*a black sheep* – *паршивая овца*: Lanny told briefly about this *'red sheep'* of his mother's family. *There aren't apt to be two American painters such active reds* (U. Sinclair).

The humorous effect is achieved by substitution of the adjective *black* by *red*, which leads to destruction of usual combinability and creation of imaginary, as there is no red sheep in reality.

(e.g.1) *Be born with a silver spoon in one's mouth* – 1) *родиться в сорочке*; 2) *родиться в богатой семье*: There was no need to teach any of the men to shoot. *Most Southerners were born with guns in their hands* (M. Mitchell).

In this case the arch-seme of ‘luck’ is replaced by the seme ‘bellicosity’.

(e.g.2) *Like patience on a monument* – *как воплощение терпения* (W. Shakespear. "Twelfth Night"). *I've been watching you from over the wall* – *sitting like I'm impatience on a monument* (Th. Hardy).

And in this case the arch-seme of ‘patience’ is replaced by the occasional seme ‘impatience’.
Evidently, transformation is one of the phrase-forming means, as a result of which both phraseological units and phraseosemantical variants appear. This fact enriches the phraseological recourses of the language. Polysemy of the phraseological units is not so wide-spread as polysemy of words, but it shouldn’t be underestimated. Polysemy is a natural phenomenon, of course.

As V. Vinoradov writes, “None of the languages were able to express every concrete idea by a separate word or by root element. Concrete nature of experience is boundless, but resources of the language are limited…” [Виноградов, 1947, с. 15]. This utterance is appropriate also to phraseological units.

The main types of transformation were distinguished according to the secondary or tertiary phraseological nomination. The studying of the question has been begun recently, and, of course, will be continued.

It is accepted that meaning transference is a result of interaction of linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Meaning transference – one of ways of cognition in consciousness of the person – is connected with reproduction of real or imagined features of represented objects on the basis of establishing a connection between them. But the structure of the objects is always more complex than the names given to them, as the name reflects only some of their properties, and sometimes not the most essential ones, for example, the little corporal (etym. fr. Le Petit Caporal) – „the small corporal“ (Napoleon's nickname). Obviously, small stature is not the most prominent Napoleon's feature, etc.

It goes without saying that the major types of meaning transference are comparison, metaphor, metonymy and euphemism.

No doubt that each meaning transference is a figurative semantic reorganization, but not each semantic reorganization is a meaning transference. Meaning transference arises as an occasional semantic reorganization of a prototype of the future phraseological unit as it is in its potential stage and is not jet a language unit. When a potential phraseological unit, having got the lacking elements of its stability, becomes virtual, i.e. becomes a language unit, semantic reorganization loses
its occasional character and turns into the usual phenomenon. It is characteristic both of the formation of phraseological units and of phraseosemantic variants.

But not each usual reorganization of meaning is meaning transference. So, in set expressions with additionally-qualifying meaning like *a black cap* – *the black judicial hat* (it was put on by the judge at death verdict) meaning transference is not present, and imageless semantic reorganization with the help of meaning narrowing of a prototype takes place: *a black cap* – *a black hat*. Thus, meaning transference means a shift of meaning, and not its narrowing or widening – these are semantic processes connected with the change of the scope of the notion.

So, in the course of communication the widening of compatibility of a phraseological unit can lead to its meaning transference, i.e. the quantity turns into quality.

The main parameters of meaning transference are: full or partial shift of meaning, its dependence on character of a variable prototype or, in case of its absence, on a literal meaning of the components of a potential phraseological unit, and also occurrence within the limits of a secondary or tertiary nomination.

The techniques of meaning transference consists in that the old form is used for the secondary or tertiary nomination by transferring of names and semantic information from denotata of the phraseological prototypes or of the phraseosemantic variants accordingly onto the denotata of the phraseological units or of the phraseosemantic variants.

Logic basis of narrowing and widening of semantic processes of narrowing and widening of meaning are relations of concept submission, i.e. such relation between concepts when the scope of one notion which is called a subordinated notion, is included into scope of the other notion which is called a subordinating notion [Кондаков, 1975, с. 450].

On the other hand, logic basis of the shift of meaning is the crossing of notions. Crossing notions are such notions, substances of which are different but scopes partially coincide [Кондаков, 1975, с. 438]. This partial coincidence of notions scope is expressed by the presence of semantic invariant both in the meaning of the
phraseological unit and in the meaning of its prototype. In phraseological fusions the establishment of such invariant is possible only by means of the etymological analysis. In those cases when etymology of a phraseological unit is unknown, it is possible to assume (if to start with the understanding of the origin of the phraseological unit) that such invariant existed, but has not reached up to now.

These names are primary or secondary abstraction from names of prototypes.

The formation of phraseological units by means of meaning transference of variable word-combinations «leads to coexistence of the reflected features both of the first and the second denotata in the transferred meaning» [Каплуненко, 1979, c. 144].

This remark concerns only motivated phraseological units.

Figurative meaning transference reflects the movement from concrete meanings to more abstract ones.

Phraseological meaning transference is a very complex phenomenon, and the wish to depict all its features is doomed to failure in advance as it will transform the definition into description; that is why only the short definition characterising phraseological units as units of secondary and a tertiary nomination is given by A.V. Kunin. The formation of a phraseological unit as a result of a secondary nomination is prevailing.

So, phraseological meaning transference is a full or partial figurative reorganization of a prototype meaning of a phraseological unit or phraseosemantic variant, based on a kind of semantic shift.

To sum it up, reorganization of meaning expresses a generic notion in relation to meaning transference as it includes also an imageless change of meaning in the components, as a rule.
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