

Viktoriia Finiv

ORCID: 0000-0001-5288-6104

Inna Varvaruk

ORCID: 0000-0002-3407-8813

UDC 81'373.7: 81'37: 81'373: 81'42

DOI: 10.31558/1815-3070.2024.47.10

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF PHRASES IN CONTEMPORARY UKRAINIAN DIALECT DISCOURSE: BASED ON THE VIDEO BLOGS OF IRYNA VYKHOVANETS (FIINKA)

Статтю присвячено розкриттю структурно-семантичних особливостей фразеологізованих одиниць, виокремлених із відеоблогів Ірини Вихованець. Описано теоретичні підходи щодо інтерпретації фразем, виокремлено їхні типологічні ознаки, систематизовано окремі тематичні групи та структурні моделі фразеологізованих одиниць у діалектному тексті, розкрито фраземи як емоційно-експресивні засоби вторинної номінації у ключі вираження імпліцитності та оцінності у текстах Фіїнки.

Ключові слова: фразема (фразеологізована одиниця), діалект, імпліцитність, аксіологічність, конотативна маркованість.

Research Scope Statement and Its Relevance. The comprehensive study of dialectal language as one of the manifestations of the national language remains a relevant task in contemporary linguistic research. Examination of the characteristics of dialectal-areal phraseology, which reflects cultural codes and national language peculiarities and conveys the artistic and imaginative world-view of the speaker is particularly significant in this context. Spoken language (“living language” (Kosmeda 2014)) is a primary source of enriching the phraseological system of the literary language. Hence, the investigation of the semantic features and structural models of dialectal phraseological units represented in the YouTube video blogs of «Lizhnyk TV» by Fiinka is justified and topical. This underpins the **relevance of the study**.

Analysis of Previous Research. It is worth noting that dialectal phraseological units have been the subject of scientific interest for many linguists (Aksonova 2010; Bevzenko 1980; Venzhynovych 2010; Greshchuk 2008; Hasanova 2022; Uzhchenko 1998, 2007 and others). However, there is still no consensus among linguists regarding the definition of the concept of the «phraseological unit» (PU). We refer to «phrasemes» as words or lexical combinations that are not coined directly during the communication process but are reproduced and decoded based on tradition. Phraseologisms are interpreted as semantically linked combinations of words, following the rules of a specific language, which, unlike syntactic structures that are similar in form, do not arise during speech but are consistently reproduced by the speakers with unchanged semantics and relatively stable component composition (Aksonova 2010: 113).

In this paper, we consider the terms «phraseologism», «phraseme», «phraseological unit», and «idiom» as partially synonymous. The study of dialectal phraseology has been the subject of numerous linguistic investigations. For instance,

the analysis of phraseological units has been carried out through the ideographic description of the Western Podillya dialects (Kovalenko 2015), an examination of Upper Naddnistrya dialects from a diachronic-synchronic perspective (Romaniuk 1999), an exploration of connotative and linguistic-cultural components of phraseological semantics in Slobizhanshchyna dialects (Pletnieva 2004), investigation of phraseologisms in terms of embodying the linguistic world-view of a specific area, and description of linguistic-cultural features of phrasemes found in literary texts (Yatskiv 2020). We consider the collection and compilation of lexicographic works, such as dictionaries of phraseologisms specific to a particular dialect, as particularly significant (Greshchuk 2008). However, it is worth noting that the term «dialectal phraseological unit» has gained popularity in scholarly usage in the process of active exploration of Ukrainian language dialects.

This article aims to uncover the structural-semantic peculiarities of phraseological units sampled from Iryna Vykhovanets' blogs.

To achieve this aim, the following **tasks** are pursued:

- elucidate the concepts of «phraseme» and «dialectal phraseological unit»;
- identify key characteristics of phraseological units;
- study phraseologisms as a means of expressing latent meaning;
- explore the functional significance of idioms in the dialectal texts of Fiinka;
- characterize the methods of phraseologization, structural models, and semantic peculiarities of phrasemes in Fiinka's blog «Lizhnyk TV»

The **object** of the research is phrasemes found in the video content of Iryna Vykhovanets' «Lizhnyk TV» channel.

The **subject** of the research is the structural-semantic peculiarities of phraseological units in dialectal discourse.

Methodology. The selection of the research methods is determined by the specific nature of the work and the tasks set. The analysis and synthesis of scientific approaches to interpreting phraseological units have been carried out using inductive and deductive methods. A descriptive method has been applied in the study to systematize and describe the collected research material. The functional-semantic analysis method has been used to uncover the lingo-cultural, functional, and stylistic peculiarities of phraseological units. Transformational analysis in various structural and semantic modifications has allowed for the identification of additional connotative layers in the identified phraseological units. Component analysis has helped outline the dominant features of Iryna Vykhovanets' original phraseological units, which are not recorded in modern phraseological dictionaries.

The research material consists of 70 video blogs from Iryna Vykhovanets' (Fiinka's) YouTube project «Lizhnyk TV». Despite the controversial and ambiguous nature of the material under study, it is worth noting that the phraseological units extracted during the research process serve as expressions of the artistic and imaginative worldview of the Hutsul people and representative examples of purely regional linguistic peculiar features. Since these phraseological units are not recorded in modern dictionaries, they are considered to be occasional (Kovalenko, 2015). Systematic research on such phraseological units and their components allows for

tracing analogous phenomena within the areas of a single language, identifying previously unrecorded occasionally generated phraseological innovations, and characterizing the idiolect-specific features of stable secondary nominations in dialectal speech.

In our research, we focus on semantic and structural peculiarities of phraseological units in the Hutsul dialect, as represented in online discourse of Iryna Vykhoivanets' blogs. Dialectal speech serves as a natural environment for the functioning of emotionally colored vocabulary, where the direct perception of the surrounding reality and its subjective evaluation by individuals are manifested. Thus, we believe it is possible to trace the interrelation between language and speech, language and culture, internet discourse, and dialectal speech.

In this research, the examples of phraseological units are provided, transliterated into the Ukrainian language, translated into English, and in some cases, wider definitions are given (e.g. *shpaka maty* – *have bats in the belfry* – *referring to someone as foolish*).

Presentation of the Main Material and Justification of Research Results.

Fixed secondary nomination (Kocherhan 2006: 352) are one of the most common ways of nomination in the literary language in general and in speech in particular. As P. Hrytsenko notes, «the act of secondary nomination is based on establishing classificatory relationships between represented phenomena as adjacent (in space, time, function) or contrasting. As a result of secondary nomination, a broader or narrower nominative field of the lexeme arises» (Hrytsenko 1990: 120). A characteristic feature of a new name is that it nominates a person, object, or specific phenomenon differently, which already has its own designation. It should be noted that the displacement of an existing lexeme by phrases or other new connotations and their substitution is less common. More often, a secondary nomination functions alongside the previous designation as a duplicate. «Under conditions of the duality of names, their functional, semantic, and stylistic differentiation is frequent», – states P. Hrytsenko (Hrytsenko 1990: 125). However, it should be noted that subsequent (secondary) nomination always involves the evaluation of what it denotes and depends on a specific communicative situation. In the spectrum of the dialectal lexical system, we distinguish the emotionally connotative coloring as characteristic feature.

The humorous project «Lizhnyk TV», broadcast to a wide audience, currently consists of 70 video blogs and covers various topics. Each video is a short story where the author, Iryna Vykhoivanets, skillfully uses the richness of the Hutsul dialect. Structurally, based on our observations, the vlog consists of the following components: a prologue address to the interlocutor, addressing the audience, highlighting certain current news of Ukraine or the world, commenting on the events, an imaginary phone conversation with a friend or relative. Optional comments from a man (mostly in the second season) may also be present.

The nature of phraseological units and the components that make up their structure is quite controversial. The meaning of phraseologisms depends on the composition of their components. Two contrasting views on the nature of phraseological units are introduced. Some scholars consider the components of phrasemes as extralexemic formations, while others recognize the verbal nature of the components (Bevzenko 1980;

Diakova 2012). Notwithstanding the fact that the components of a phraseologism do not have the characteristics of lexemes, they to some extent participate in the formation of the phraseological meaning (Kosmeda 2014; Romaniuk 1999).

Our research material has shown that we can structurally distinguish the two most productive models of phraseological units: those that correspond to collocation and those organized according to a sentence pattern. Less numerous are phraseological units that correspond to a coordinated combination of words. Additionally, it is worth noting the phraseological units that are structurally similar to comparative expressions. It should also be noted that in terms of identifying phraseological units, which were mentioned in the previous section, we can talk about the correlation of fixed secondary nominations with a single lexeme. However, this structural model is also less characteristic of the Hutsul dialect.

In phraseologisms constructed according to the collocation model, we distinguish a core (main) word and fixed or variable components. These are the most common phraseological units that conform to the structural pattern of «verb + noun»: *v sosnu vdarytysi* (to get lost in the woods), *nervy hryzty* (to bite one's nails), *polokaty mozok* (to scramble one's brain), *nabyty zhyludok* (to stuff one's stomach), *vidkynuty ratytsi* (to throw away remnants), *proskihnuty laby* (to skip around), *puda maty* (to possess a lot), *trembitaty na vso horlo* (to shout at the top of one's lungs), *shparuvatysi kolo khaty* (to roam around the house), *vpasty na holovu* (to fall head over heels). Another pattern is «adjective + noun», for example: *sporchanyi telefon* (a spoiled phone), *kizhkyi na holovu* (a madman on one's head), *vdarenyi u holovu* (a hit on the head), *liutyi kaparnyk* (a ferocious haggler).

The key component in verb phraseological combinations is the verb form. However, there is no fixed order of components, as the key component in verb phraseological combinations can often vary depending on the nature of the expression, such as person, number, tense, aspect, mood, and so on (Diakova 2012: 41).

There is also a group of phraseological units organized using comparative conjunctions such as *like* or *as if* (e.g., *iek tychka* (like a stick), *yek slup* (like a pillar), *yek bulbytsi voseny* (like small potatoes in autumn), *yek doshka* (like a board), *yek triska* (like a crack), *yek by zovtra mav vmyraty* (as if he were dying tomorrow), *yek ne vid odnoho tata* (as if not from the same father). The comparative component of a phraseological unit can be represented differently (either as a subject or a predicate, or as an object, attribute, or circumstance). These relationships can be derived directly from the expression, taking into account the literal meaning of the analyzed units. This helps determine the type of constructions that predominate in the analyzed spoken fragment.

The least productive phraseological units are those that are structurally organized according to the pattern «verb + verb» (e.g., *zabuty dumaty* (to forget to think)) and «noun + noun» (e.g., *minutka relaksu* (a moment of relaxation)). However, the categorization of these combinations as phraseological units is ambiguous.

Phraseological combinations constructed according to sentence structure patterns can be associated with simple or complex (compound, compound-complex, and non-finite) sentences. These are known as phraseological units of predicative structure. Let's examine them in more detail:

– phraseological units constructed according to the patterns of simple extended one-clause and two-clause sentences: *ne maty ni lytsa ni potylytsi* (to have no face or back of the head); *mozhe, hoch svita voda totu bidu zmyie* (maybe, even the holy water will wash away this trouble); *kolka by tebe skolola* (even if it broke you into pieces); *shche kryshky v pysku ne mav* (hasn't even grown the lids on the mouth); *vedra z vodov bilshi za sebe tarabanyt* (buckets make more noise than themselves); *to vzhe pora zemlev natyraty* (it's already time to rub the ground); *smiiesi mikh z verety* (laughing like a mule with a chicken); *dlia shmarka nema dzygarka* (for a hiccup, there's no sharp object); *nai ti kurka dzhogne* (as if you were running, you chicken);

– phraseological units organized according to the pattern of complex sentences: *Baba yak didko: nikomu ne ustupyt, khiba by yii mysh napudyla* (Grandma like devil: won't give in to anyone, unless her mouse encouraged her); *Yoi, ta ne borony, nai hrishyt, nai maie z choho kaitys* (Oh, don't defend her, let her sin, she'll have something to regret); *Vid toho, shcho budesh shchiesta zahliadaty kurtsi v sraku, vona sy skorshe ne znese* (From looking at the ass of a chicken too much, it won't lay eggs any faster); *Hutsul maie vso i pry tsemu nikudy ne honytsy* (A Hutsul has everything and doesn't rush anywhere); *Nasho to likuvaty, vy ne znaiete, sho shklenka sylnisha vid shpritsa* (Why bother treating, you don't know that a glass is stronger than a syringe); *Svita skoro kinchaitusy, a budni nadovho zachynaiusy* (The world is ending soon, but the weekdays are starting for a long time); *Piany prosypyty, a durnyi nikoly* (A drunkard will sober up, but a fool never).

Thus, we can see that the most productive model for Fiinka's vlogs is the structural model of verb-noun collocations, as well as simple one-clause and clause-complex sentences. The study of the semantics of dialectal phraseological units has been conducted quite comprehensively, but there is still no comprehensive picture of the definitions of each phraseologism. The problem lies in the quantity and variability of combinations in different areas, as well as the emergence of new patterns. This is due to the constant communication between people, their desire to use new words to describe familiar concepts or those that have just entered their sphere of life, as well as to emotionally and expressively emphasize what the speaker intends to convey.

The connotative meaning of a phraseologism is created through its components, which already have a fixed meaning and corresponding emotional attitude. Animal and plant images are used, as well as natural resources endowed with traits such as cunning, stubbornness, anger, deceit, resilience, strength, kindness, and sincerity. Adjectives and verbs are used to enhance the meaning of expression, most often denoting human qualities and actions. Also, commonly used are lexemes that denote parts of the human body, such as a *head* (intelligence of a person), *hands* (work), *mouth*, *stomach* and *face* (appearance).

To investigate the semantic peculiarities of phraseological units further, let us organize these combinations into the following thematic groups: «*human*», «*environment*», and «*abstract relations and concepts*». The reason for such phraseologism formation is primarily their active perception and extraordinary interpretation in Fiinka's vlogs. Self-description, descriptions of nature, and characteristics attributed to specific objects and phenomena are formed based on

Fiinka's visual, tactile, or auditory sensations, as well as memories of how Hutsuls interact with each other and their moral values and traditions.

The thematic group «*person*» can be categorized based on the following concepts related to the internal state, including emotions, spiritual and mental conditions, character traits, or states of a person:

kishkyi na holovu (cat on the head) – referring to someone who is sick or incomprehensible;

vpasty na holovu (fall on the head) – meaning to become mentally impaired or lose rationality;

puste i v tserkvi ne svite (empty and not shining in church) – describing someone as disobedient or lacking spiritual enlightenment;

smietsy mikh z verety (laughing like a fly with a bee) – used to illustrate people with equal abilities or talents;

perebuly y ne takie perebudem y sese (endured much and will endure more) – describing someone who is patient and resilient;

yek poklony v tserkvi biut, to zubamy tsvieki z doshok vykiehaiut (they beat with bows in church, but with their teeth they knock nails out of boards) – referring to someone who is showy, doing things merely for appearance;

mozhe, khoch svita voda z tebe tu bidu zmyie (perhaps even holly water will wash away that misfortune from you) – indicating a heavy burden or distress;

pysok ne bolyt (the mouth doesn't hurt) – describing someone who is talkative or loquacious;

shpaka maty (having a sparrow as a mother) – referring to someone as foolish or simple-minded;

plotky zbyraie (collecting gossips) – signifying someone who spreads rumors or engages in gossip;

zaduzhe dobre zhyiesi (living excessively well) – describing an excessive level of comfort or luxury;

puda maty (being afraid of something) – indicating fear or apprehension towards something;

vipyla vydro horivky (drank a bucket of horilka – felt it in the liver) – describing a negative physical condition or discomfort;

skuly khodit (walking with a frown) – indicative of someone being in a bad mood or displaying anger;

chi ny hoden sy shkarpetochky kupyty (they are not worthy to buy even a pair of socks) – describing pretended poverty or false modesty;

ne bery mene ne lyshy mene (don't take me, don't leave me) – conveying a sense of uncertainty or indecisiveness;

strilylo v holovi (arrows shot in the head) – indicating the emergence of an idea or sudden inspiration;

ity v nohu z chasom (keeping up with the times) – suggesting being modern or up-to-date.

The thematic group «*person*» can be structured according to the following concepts:

– physiological state: *nashi mama she divka* (our mother is still a girl) – a young person; *kryshky v roti ne mav* (didn't have lids in the mouth) – hungry; *vedra z vodov bilshi za sebe tarabanyt* (banging drums with larger buckets of water) – strong; *v ochi zmerzla* (eyes frozen) – feeling sleepy; *za neho vzhe davno chervaky zavdatok vziely* (worms have long taken a share for him) – an old person;

– external characteristics: *nema ni lytsia ni potylytsi* (no face or crown) – emaciated; *didko kopiiky na holovi shukav* (grandpa was searching for pennies on his head) – unkempt; *yek doshka, yek triska* (like a board, like a crack) – skinny; *vyhlidaty po-liudsky* (to look human-like) – to have a neat appearance; *yek velykodna pysanka* (like an Easter egg) – beautiful; *treba paru kapelnyts krasny postavyty* (needs a couple of drips of beauty) – unattractive.

Based on the number of examples extracted from the Fiinka` texts, we can consider this group as the most frequently used.

In the «Lizhnyk TV» videos there are also commonly used idioms that belong to the group of «abstract relationships and concepts». These expressions are used in everyday life to vividly describe states, things, and actions: *azh zvizdy z neba popadaly* (stars fell from the sky) – signifies something happening intensely or significantly; *nyni vmer, zavtra by si ne skaiv* (now he died, tomorrow he wouldn't deny) – indicates great interest or curiosity; *vso yak Boh prykazav* (everything as God commanded) – denotes correctness or adherence to rules; *sto kilometriv pishky zakusok kyshky* (a hundred kilometers on foot, intestines for breakfast) – expresses a wasted effort or futile endeavor; *robe hi na benzyni* (running on gasoline) – describes a highly active or energetic state; *hi v stanislavskim kostoli* (crowded like in the Stanislav church – suggests a tight or cramped space; *tripaty hi kylymy pered Velykodnem* (beating the carpets before Easter) – indicates doing something vigorously or energetically; *lipshe v khati yek v palati* (better in your own home than in a palace) – emphasizes the comfort and safety of one's own home; *shukaly, shukaly, a prosyly Boha aby ne naity* (searching, searching, but praying to God not to find) – describes a situation where one pretends to search but doesn't really want to find; *taka voda studena – yak nimyi zaide, to zahovore* (water so cold that when a mute comes in, they start talking) – emphasizes extreme coldness; *shcho зроблено v huzni – ne pererobyty v kuzni* (what is done in haste cannot be corrected in a forge) – indicates a poor or poorly executed task; *vidbulosy y zabulosy* (it happened and was forgotten) – refers to something that occurred a long time ago and is no longer important; *makh, makh, tai d khati* (wave, wave, and off to home) – suggests a quick or rapid movement; *yak nicho ne mala, to tam by poluchyla* (if she didn't have anything, she would have found it there) – refers to a place where everything necessary is available; *i psy, y koty dodomu pieni sy vertaly* (both dogs and cats returned home drunk) – describes a fun or enjoyable event.

We also distinguish euphemistic phrases used in the speech of Hutsuls, which are an integral part of communication. They are employed to soften or conceal certain words with taboo or obscene meanings. These expressions retain their relevance primarily in closed communication zones where long-standing traditions and beliefs have been preserved, preventing people from using forbidden expressions that could potentially affect the speaker's health, financial status, or the lives of their loved ones:

vrekty (to invoke illnesses upon someone) – to wish ill upon someone; *to vzhe pora zemleiu natyraty* (it's already time to rub with the earth) – it's time to pass away; *strashna khvoroba* (a dreadful illness) – referring to the coronavirus; *khodyty do liubasky* (to visit a loved one) – to commit adultery; *v chuzhu zhinku didko lyzhku tsukru vsypav* (grandpa sprinkled a spoonful of sugar into someone else's wife) – referring to looking at someone else's spouse with desire. These expressions maintain their significance in closed communication settings, where long-standing traditions and beliefs have preserved the prohibition of certain phrases that could affect the speaker's well-being, financial status, or the lives of their loved ones.

Among the idioms used by Fiinka, we can also distinguish procedural euphemisms. These refer specifically to actions or processes related to individuals but are expressed in a softened or indirect manner. For example: *nervy zherty* (to bite one's nails) – to feel anxious or worried; *vyletity yak posoleni* (fly like salted) – to quickly go away or leave; *drymbaty holovu, trymbaty mozghy* (drum the head, drum the brains) – to bother or pester someone; *chesaty yazykom* (scratch with the tongue) – to talk excessively; *gembu zakryty* (close the mouth) – to fall silent; *vprivaty v yasna* (crush in the chest) – to talk or eat a lot; *khochu vydity tebe v horyzontalnomu polozhenni* (I want to see you in a horizontal position) – to go to sleep; *daty tiahla* (give a pull) – to beat someone up; *tripaty hi kylymy pered Velykodnem* (beat the rugs before Easter) – to fight physically; *shparuvatysi kolo khaty* (struggle around the house) – to work hard or labor; *pechinky vyisty* (eat liver) – to annoy or irritate; *pypkov krutyty* (twist poppy) – to be ill-tempered or grouchy; *ny padaty dukhom* (not to fall in spirit) – to remain optimistic or not lose hope; *strashne banuvaty* (banish the horrible) – to feel sad or mournful; *daty v giembak* (give in the goback) – to strike or hit; *prysylytysi do luzhka* (force oneself to the meadow) – to fall asleep. These idioms are quite common in communication and, as seen from the examples provided, often carry negative connotations.

The special constructions found in Fiinka's texts (most frequently used in the series «Ahii na Bidu») are curses and negative wishes. These phrases are used to express strong negative emotions or frustrations towards someone or something. For example: *kolka by tebe skolola* (may someone break you into pieces) – an expression of strong dislike or anger towards someone; *aby tebe dveri stysly* (may the doors squeeze you) – a wish for someone to face difficulties or obstacles; *nai tebe kurka dzhohne* (may the rooster peck you) – a wish for someone to face unpleasant consequences; *nai ti kachka kopne* (may the duck kick you) – a wish for someone to experience misfortune. There are also positive wishes present, such as *aby vas posiblylo i pozolotylo* (may you be covered in silver and gold).

Conclusion. The study of the semantic characteristics of dialectal idiomatic expressions in the video blogs of Iryna Vykhovanets has allowed us to identify thematic groups such as «human» (including internal states, physiological conditions, and external characteristics), «abstract relations and concepts», and «surroundings». The most numerous are idiomatic units that are semantically related to humans. Consequently, 109 phraseological units of different kinds were analysed, among which the most productive ones are the units related to the sphere of human activities (81% – 88 units).

Less representative phraseological units are those, which refer to the environment (7% – 8 units), and abstract notions and processes (12% – 13 units).

The **perspective of further research** lies in the comprehensive analysis of the semantics and structural models of occasional phraseological expressions by Iryna Vykhoanets, the differentiation of individual authorial neologisms with idiomatic units recorded in the dictionary, and the identification of phonetic and lexical peculiarities of occasional idiomatic units.

References

1. Бевзенко, С.П. Українська діалектологія. Київ: Вища школа, 1980. 246 с.
[Bevzenko, S.P. Ukrainka dialektolohiia. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola, 1980. 246 s.]
2. Венжинович, Наталія. *Діалектна фраземіка як предмет лінгвокультурологічного аналізу*. Słowiańska frazeologia gwarowa II: monografia zbiorowa. Pod redakcją Macieja Raka i Valerija M. Mokienki. Kraków, 2020, 73–80. URL <https://books.akademicka.pl/publishing/catalog/download/62/150/141-1?inline=1>.
[Venzhynovych, Nataliia. *Dialektna frazemika yak predmet lnhvokulturolohichnoho analizu*. Słowiańska frazeologia gwarowa II: monografia zbiorowa. Pod redakcją Macieja Raka i Valerija M. Mokienki. Kraków, 2020, 73–80. URL <https://books.akademicka.pl/publishing/catalog/download/62/150/141-1?inline=1>.]
3. Грещук, Василь, Грещук, Валентина. «Словник “Гуцульська діалектна лексика та фраземіка в українській художній мові” як джерело вивчення регіональних ідіом». *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія філологія* 1(43), 2020, 100–105.
[Greshchuk, Vasyi, Greshchuk, Valentyna. «Slovnyk “Hutsulska dialektna leksyka ta frazemika v ukrainskii khudozhnii movi” yak dzherelo vuvchennia rehionalnykh idiom». *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Serii filolohiia* 1(43), 2020, 100–105.]
4. Грещук, В. «Художні функції гуцульських діалектизмів у белетристичних текстах» [В:] *Лінгвістичні студії* 17, 2008, 237–243.
[Greshchuk, V. «Khudozhni funktsii hutsulskykh dialektyzmiv u beletrystychnykh tekstakh» [V:] *Linhvistychni studii* 17, 2008, 237–243.]
5. Григоренко, О. А., Аксьонова, І. О. «Компаративні діалектні фразеологізми в говірці села Єлизаветівки Мар’їнського району Донецької області» [В:] *Вісник студентського наукового товариства Донецького національного університету*. Том 2. Вінниця: ДонНУ, 2016, 113–117.
[Hryhorenko, O. A., Aksonova, I. O. «Komparatyvni dialektni frazeolohizmy v hovirtsi sela Yelyzavetivky Mar’inskoho raionu Donetskoi oblasti» [V:] *Visnyk studentskoho naukovoho tovarystva Donetskoho natsionalnoho universytetu*. Том 2. Vinnytsia: DonNU, 2016, 113–117.]
6. Гриценко, П. Ю. Ареальне варіювання лексики. Київ: Наукова думка, 1990. 272 с.
[Hrytsenko, P.Yu. Areal’ne variuvannya leksyky. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1990. 272 s.]
7. Д’якова, Т. «Етнокультурне підґрунтя фразеології вдалого сватання в українських східнословобожанських говірках». [В:] М.Я. Плющ (ред.) *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М.П. Драгоманова. Серія 10. Проблеми граматики і лексикології української мови. Вип. 9*. Київ: НПУ імені М.П. Драгоманова, 2012, 18–20.
[D’yakova, T. Etnokul’turnepidgruntya frazeolohiyi vdaloho svatannya v ukrayins’kykh skhidnoslobozhans’kykh hovirkakh. [V:] M.Ya. Plyushch (red.) *Naukovyy chasopys Natsional’noho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni M.P. Drahomanova. Seriya 10. Problemy hramatyky i leksykolohiyi ukrayins’koymovu. Vyp. 9*. Kyiv: NPU imeni M.P.Drahomanova, 2012, 18–20.]
8. Коваленко, Н. «Актуалізація фразеологічних одиниць у діалектному тексті». [В:] *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia* 3, 2015: 127–133.

- [Kovalenko, N. «Aktualizatsiya frazeolohichnykhodynyts' u dialektnomu teksti». [V:] *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia* 3, 2015: 127–133.]
9. Космеда, Т.А. «Актуальні процеси мовлення чи «мовний смак» української сучасності?» [В:] *Мовознавство* 2, 2014: 44–55.
[Kosmeda, T.A. «Aktual'ni protsesy movlennya chy «movnyy smak» ukrayins'koyi suchasnosti?» [V:] *Movoznavstvo* 2, 2014: 44–55.]
10. Кочерган, М. П. Основи зіставного мовознавства. Київ: ВЦ «Академія», 2006. 424 с.
[Kocherhan, M. P. *Osnovy zistavnohomovoznavstva*. Kyiv: VTS «Akademiya», 2006. 424 s.]
11. Плетнева, О. «Структурно-семантичні моделі фразеології говірок центральної Слобожанщини (на матеріалі фразеосемантичного поля “Зовнішній вигляд людини”)». [В:] *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Каразіна, Серія «Філологія»*. Вип. 631, No 41.
[Pletnyeva, O. «Strukturno-semantychni modeli frazeologiyi govirok central'noyi Slobozhanshhyny (na materialі frazeosemantychnogo polya “Zovnishnij vyglyad lyudyny”)». [V:] *Visnyk Harkivskogo nacionalnogo universytetu imeni V. Karazina, Seriya «Filologiya»*. Vyp. 631, No 41.]
12. Романюк, Н.В. Семантика фразеологічних одиниць наддністрянських говірок в їх історичному розвитку. [В:] *Вісник Запорізького державного університету, Філологічні науки*. Вип 1. Запоріжжя: ЗДУ.
[Romanyuk, N.V. *Semantyka frazeolohichnykh odynyts' naddnistrians'kykh hovirok v yikh istorychnomu rozvytku*. [V:] *Visnyk Zaporiz'koho derzhavnoho universytetu, Filolohichni nauky*. Vyp 1. Zaporizhzhya: ZDU.]
13. Ужченко, В., Ужченко Д. Фразеологія сучасної української мови. Київ: Знання, 2007.
[Uzhchenko, V., Uzhchenko D. *Frazeolohiya suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyimovy*. Kyiv: Znannya, 2007.]
14. Ужченко В., Ужченко Д. Фразеологічний словник української мови. Київ: Освіта, 2007.
[Uzhchenko, V., Uzhchenko, D. *Frazeolohichni slovnyk ukrainskoi movy*. Kyiv: Osvita, 2007.]
15. Яцьків, Марія Ю. «Фраземи на позначення мовленнєвої та мисленнєвої діяльності в художніх творах Мирослава Дочинця». [В:] *Науковий вісник УжНУ Серія: Філологія*. Випуск 1(43). Ужгород : ПП Данило С. І., 2020, 313–317.
[Yats'kiv, Mariya Yu. «Frazemyna poznachennya movlennyevoyi ta myslennyevoyi diyal'nosti v khudozhnikh tvorakh Myroslava Dochyntsa». [V:] *Naukovyy visnyk Uzhnu Seriya: Filolohiya*. Vypusk 1(43). Uzhhorod : PP Danylo S. I., 2020, 313–317.]
16. Hasanova, J. (2022). Classification of phraseological units in linguistics. *Theory and practice of science: key aspects*. No 113.

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF PHRASES IN CONTEMPORARY DIALECT DISCOURSE: BASED ON THE WORKS OF IRYNA VYKHOVANETS (FIINKA)

Viktorii Finiv

The Department of Translation and Philology, Higher Educational Institution “King Danylo University”, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

Inna Varvaruk

The Department of Translation and Philology, Higher Educational Institution “King Danylo University”, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

Abstract

Background: The comprehensive study of dialectal language as one of the manifestations of the national language remains a relevant task in contemporary linguistic research and reflects cultural codes and national language peculiarities, conveys the artistic and imaginative world-view of speakers. Hence, the investigation of the semantic features and structural models of dialectal phraseological units represented in the YouTube video blogs of “TV” by Fiinka is justified and important and underpins the relevance of the study.

Purpose: The purpose of the analysis to uncover the structural and semantic features of phraseological units extracted from Iryna Vykhoivanets' blogs.

Results: Our research is designed to explore the structural and semantic features of phraseological units extracted from Iryna Vykhoivanets' video blogs. The research material consists of 70 video blogs from YouTube project «Lizhnyk TV». Despite the controversial and ambiguous nature of the material under study, it is worth noting that the phraseological units extracted during the research process serve as expressions of the artistic and imaginative worldview of the Hutsul people and representative examples of purely regional linguistic specificity.

The theoretical approaches to interpreting phrases are described, typological characteristics are identified, and specific thematic groups and structural models of phraseological units in dialectal texts are systematized. The article discusses phrases as emotionally expressive means of secondary nomination, highlighting their implicitness and evaluativeness in Fiinka's texts.

The study of the semantic characteristics of dialectal idiomatic expressions in the video blogs of Iryna Vykhoivanets has allowed us to identify thematic groups such as «human» (including internal states, physiological conditions, and external characteristics), «abstract relations and concepts», and «surroundings». The most numerous are idiomatic units that are semantically related to humans. Consequently, 109 phraseological units of different kinds were analysed, among which the most productive ones are the units related to the sphere of human activities (81 % – 88 units). Less representative phraseological units are those, which refer to the environment (7 % – 8 units), and abstract notions and processes (12 % – 13 units).

Discussion: Our research material has shown that we can structurally distinguish the two most productive models of phraseological units: those that correspond to collocation and those organized according to a sentence pattern. Less numerous are phraseological units that correspond to a coordinated combination of words. Additionally, it is worth noting the phraseological units that are structurally similar to comparative expressions. It should also be noted that in terms of identifying phraseological units, which were mentioned in the previous section, we can talk about the correlation of fixed secondary nominations with a single lexeme. However, this structural model is also less characteristic of the Hutsul dialect.

Keywords: phrase, phraseological unit, dialect, implicitness, axiology, connotative markedness.

Vitae

Viktoriiia Finiv is Doctor in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation and Philology, Higher Educational Institution “King Danylo University”, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine. Her areas of research interests include communicative linguistics, analysis of artistic text, lexical semantics.

Correspondence: viktoriiiafiniv@ukr.net

Inna Varvaruk is Doctor in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Translation and Philology, Higher Educational Institution “King Danylo University”, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine. Her areas of research interests include communicative linguistics, conceptology, semantics of word and text, modern artistic discourse.

Correspondence: inna.varvaruk20@gmail.com

Надійшла до редакції 16 січня 2024 року
Рекомендована до друку 20 лютого 2024 року