

PROF. KOONIN'S CLASSIFICATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS BASED ON THEIR FUNCTION IN COMMUNICATION

Uzbek State World Languages University
Seytimbetova Aykumar Pulatbaevna

Annotation: This article explores Prof. Koonin's classification of phraseological units based on their function in communication. It discusses the four main categories of phraseological units: nominative, nominative-communicative, interjectional, and communicative, providing examples from both English and Russian languages. The article highlights the role of phraseological units in conveying meaning, emotion, and information, emphasizing their significance in cultural and communicative contexts. The classification framework offers a deeper understanding of how fixed expressions function in language, facilitating more effective communication and reflecting cultural values.

Key words: Phraseological units, Nominative, nominative-communicative interjectional, communicative, language and culture, idiomatic expressions, linguistic classification, Prof. Koonin

Phraseological units (PhUs), also known as idiomatic expressions or fixed expressions, are fundamental components of language, facilitating communication in a compact, expressive form. These expressions carry meanings that go beyond the literal interpretation of individual words, and they serve as tools for emphasizing, illustrating, or simplifying complex ideas. Prof. A.V. Koonin, a prominent figure in the field of phraseology, made significant contributions to understanding how PhUs function in communication. He proposed a classification system based on the communicative function of PhUs, categorizing them into four distinct types: nominative, nominative-communicative, interjectional, and communicative. This article delves into each of these categories, examining their characteristics, examples, and their roles in communication.

The classification system of phraseological units suggested by Professor A.V. Koonin is based on the combined structural-semantic principle and it also considers the quotient of stability of phraseological units. Prof. A.V. Koonin defines a phraseological unit as a stable word group with wholly or partially transferred meaning. In his classification phraseological units are subdivided into classes, subclasses and types. Classes are distinguished according to their function in communication determined by their structural-semantic characteristics.

Class 1. Nominative phraseological units are represented by word-groups, including the ones with one meaningful word, e.g. *a bull in a china shop* 'a person who is careless, or who moves or acts in a rough or awkward way', and coordinative phrases of the type *wear and tear* 'the damage to objects, furniture, property, etc. that is the result of normal use', *well and good* 'quite good but not exactly what is wanted'. All units of this kind class denote objects, states, qualities and the like. The first class also includes word-groups with a predicative structure, such as *as the crow flies* 'in a straight line', and, also, partially predicative phrases of the type *see how the land lies* 'to try to discover what the situation really is before you make a decision', *ships that pass in the night* 'chance acquaintances'.

Phraseological units of this class fall into the following subclasses:

- substantive: *crocodile tears* – ‘if someone sheds crocodile tears, they seem sad, sorry, or upset, but they do not really feel this way’; *Pandora’s box* – ‘a process that, if started, will cause many problems that cannot be solved’;

- adjectival: *as mad as a hatter* ‘completely crazy’, *as cool as a cucumber* ‘calm and not nervous, upset, or excited’; *as good as gold* – ‘(informal) behaving in a way that other people approve of’; - adverbial: *by & by* ‘(old-fashioned) before long; soon’, *to and fro* ‘backwards and forwards’;

- verbal: *to go to pot* ‘(informal) to be spoiled because people are not working hard or taking care of things’.

Class 2. Nominative-communicative phraseological units include verbal word-groups which are transformed into a sentence when the verb is used in the Passive Voice, e.g. *to break the ice* ‘to make people feel more friendly and willing to talk to each other’ – *the ice is broken*.

Class 3. Interjectional phraseological units include interjectional word-groups and some interjections with predicative structure. These phraseological units which express feelings and intentions. They are neither nominative nor communicative but stable lingual units by nature, e.g. *by George!* – ‘really, indeed’, *a fine (nice, pretty) kettle of fish* – ‘used to say that a situation is very different from one that you have just mentioned’.

Class 4. Communicative phraseological units are represented by proverbs and sayings. Phraseological units of this class are sentences in form, e.g. *Queen Ann in dead!* – ‘to say well-known truths’, *What will Mrs. Grundy say!* – ‘what will people say?’

These four classes are divided into sub-groups according to the type of structure of phraseological units, whether it is unchangeable (“closed”) or changeable (“open”), that is whether the components of a phraseological unit are variable or invariable. Changeable (“open”) structures can have lexical variants, e.g. *to cross / pass the Rubicon* ‘to do something that will have extremely important effects in the future and that you cannot change’, *a Jeddy boy / girl* ‘fop, dandy’; admit normative insertion of variable elements in their structure, e.g. *smb’s better half* ‘old-fashioned, used humorously to mean your husband or wife’, *shut / slam the door in smb’s face* ‘to refuse to talk to sb or meet them, in a rude way’; can be transformed into sentences, e.g. *to lead smb. by the nose* ‘to influence someone so much that you can completely control everything that they do’. Unchangeable (“closed”) structures are characterised by absence of such possibilities, they have constant lexical components and constant syntactical structure, e.g. *a Peeping Tom* ‘(disapproving) a person who likes to watch people secretly when they are taking off their clothes’, *as old as Adam* ‘very old, world-old’.

Alongside with the structural criteria A.V. Koonin introduces a semantic one – presence of full or partial transference of phraseological meaning which contributes to idiomaticity. Full transference of meaning is often found with unchangeable (“closed”) structures, e.g. *on ice* ‘not being dealt with now; waiting to be dealt with at a later time’, *pigs in clover* ‘live the life of luxury’, *like mad* ‘very fast, hard, much’, *to kill the goose that lays the golden egg* ‘to destroy the thing that brings you profit or success’. Phraseological units with partial transference of meaning preserve their literal meaning with one of their components, e.g. *close (shut) one’s eyes to smth.* ‘to ignore something or pretend that you do not know it is happening’, *as sober as a judge* ‘completely sober’, *dormant (sleeping) partner* ‘a person who has put money into a business company but who is not actually involved in running it’, *fit smb. like a glove* ‘fit very well’.

Thus, classification by A.V. Koonin is of a comprehensive character.

There are phraseological units, expressing statement, that have the form of a complete sentence. A.V. Koonin calls them communicative. Among communicative phraseological units two groups of expressions are distinguished: proverbs and sayings.

A **proverb** is a short familiar sentence expressing popular wisdom, a truth or a moral lesson in a concise and imaginative way. Proverbs are considered to be set expressions, because their lexical components are also constant, their meaning is mostly figurative, and they are introduced into speech ready-made: *A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. A friend in need is a friend indeed. A stitch in time saves nine. The best way to a man's heart is through his stomach. The end justifies the means. Don't cry over spilt milk. Necessity is the mother of invention. Easy come, easy go. All is not gold that glitters.*

A **saying** is any common, colloquial expression, or a remark often made, that is not didactic or moralizing, e.g. *It goes without saying. Like father, like son. That's another pair of shoes. Woe betide you!*

Proverbs are usually metaphorical, e.g. *Too many cooks spoil the broth, The last straw breaks the camel's back, He who pays the piper calls the tune*, while sayings are as a rule non-metaphorical, e.g. *Where there is a will there is a way.*

Familiar quotations are different from proverbs in their origin as they come from literature but by and by they become part and parcel of the language: *The wish is father to the thought* (J. Caesar). *To err is human* (A. Pope).

Lots of quotations come from W. Shakespeare:

To be or not to be: that is the question.

Something is rotten in the state of Denmark.

Brevity is the soul of wit.

The rest is silence.

The time is out of joint.

Frailty, thy name is woman.

It out-herods Herod.

I know a trick worth two of that.

A man more sinned against than sinning.

Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown.

Many quotations and quips are from the Bible: *... neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet; ... all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. A living dog is better than a dead lion. Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.*

While Kunin's classification is widely respected, some scholars argue that it does not sufficiently address the dynamic and evolving nature of language. As PhUs adapt and change over time, Kunin's system may not account for shifts in meaning or usage across different contexts. Additionally, the system may have limitations in addressing the influence of culture on the use of PhUs in diverse social settings.

Prof. A.V. Kunin's classification of phraseological units provides valuable insight into how these units function in communication. By categorizing them based on their communicative function, Kunin's system enhances our understanding of the role of PhUs in everyday discourse. Through detailed examples and analysis, this article demonstrates how each category of PhUs contributes to the efficiency, richness, and nuance of communication. Future research could explore how Kunin's system applies in multilingual and multicultural contexts and how language evolution may affect the use of phraseological units.



The list of used literature:

1. Kunin, A. V. (1980). Phraseological Units in Russian Language. Moscow: Nauka.
2. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
3. Vinogradov, V. V. (1990). Russian Phraseology: Structure and Meaning. Moscow: Nauka.