

UDC 811.163.6'373.7

Erika Kržišnik

Faculty of Arts, Ljubljana

## THE USE OF SEMANTIC POTENCY OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

The article presents basic terms which enable the explanation of textually conditioned creative interventions in the established structure and/or meaning of phraseological units. By comparing the state of research with foreign, primarily German and Russian, phraseological literature, we are trying to find the properties which would allow us to distinguish between phraseological modifications and the incorrect use of phraseological units on the one hand, and phraseological renewals on the other. The beginnings of this stylistic procedure in Slovene texts are also briefly mentioned.

V prispevku so predstavljeni temeljni pojmi, s katerimi je mogoče pojasniti besedilno pogojene kreativne posege v ustaljeno strukturo in/ali pomen frazeoloških enot. Ob primerjavi s stanjem raziskav v tuji, predvsem germanistični in rusistični, frazeološki literaturi se poskuša najti lastnosti, na podlagi katerih bi frazeološke modifikacije ločili na eni strani od napačne rabe frazemov in na drugi od frazeoloških prenovitev. Na kratko se omenja tudi začetke tega stilističnega postopka v slovenskih besedilih.

**Key words:** Phraseology, semantic potency of a phraseological unit, modification, (phraseological) renewal, remotivation, literalization

**Ključne besede:** frazeologija, semantična potencia frazema, modifikacija, (frazeološka) prenovitev, remotivacija, podobesedenje

### 1 Semantic Potency of a Phraseological Unit

Phraseological units are secondary linguistic signs composed of other linguistic signs (words)<sup>1</sup> bearing meaning. Their »forms« therefore exist at two levels, i.e. at the level of free combination (FC)\*, whose meaning is the sum of meanings of its component elements as independent dictionary entries – this meaning is often referred to as the »literal« meaning, and at the level of a phraseological word combination (PWC) with a phraseological meaning. Besides the meanings of FC and PWCs, a third level also appears in any creative innovative interventions in phraseological units, namely the level of a relationship (tension) between both meanings. This relationship can be activated to different degrees, primarily depending on whether it is (at least partially) semantically motivated, possibly also motivated »anew« by so-called »folk etymology« (cf. the connection between *mavra* in *pijan kot mavra* 'very drunk' and *krava*, phraseological unit *pijan kot krava*, instead of the connection with – etymologically

---

\* PWC – word combination (WC) with a certain degree of idiomaticity, FC – free combination.

<sup>1</sup> The components of a phraseological unit are actually not words, since they are grammatically and semantically depleted. An extreme example is monocollocational components, i.e. components that do not appear outside the phraseological unit and are therefore not part of the lexical system of the given language but only part of its phraseological system.

suitable – *mavrica*: *mavra1* 'black or black spotted cow'; *mavra2* 'rainbow'), or unmotivated, regardless of whether the motivatedness has been lost because of a linguistic or some other (e.g. broader culture-specific, etc.) development (e.g. *iti rakom žvižgat*) or has not existed altogether (e.g. in phraseological units taken over from other languages). It is all these three elements that compose the entire **semantic potency of phraseological units**, and which make it so very dynamic. In connection with the concept of semantic potency, we should also mention two partially overlapping terms, the so-called »double reading« and »inner form«, which appear in phraseology. The former originates from the Germanic and the latter from the Russian phraseological theory.

»**Double reading**« is one of the »ways of reading« (Lesart) typical of phraseological units. The term is quoted from Burger (in Burger 1998: 59–66; the same in Burger 2003) and refers to the relationship between both levels of syntagm (FC and PWC) from the viewpoint of the »activity of the language user« in the formation or comprehension of texts: the user realizes one semantic level of syntagm or the other (or both). Regarding the manner of reading they allow, phraseological units may be subdivided into those that have only a single reading and those with a double reading or a mixed (combined) type:

- The phraseological units with monocollocational components have a single reading, e.g. *pri ti na kant, ne reči ne bev ne mev, poznati do obisti, ucvreti jo*.<sup>2</sup>
- The double reading is of two types: disjunctive and synchronic.

The syntagms that realize their meaning as FCs and as PWCs have a disjunctive double reading; the relationship between them can be homonymous, e.g. *dati košarico komu, iti rakom žvižgat*, or it can be connected with a semantic transfer, most frequently metaphorically and metonymically, e.g. *metati polena pod noge komu, nočni ptič* ('night owl'), *noč in dan* ('night and day'). The third type of disjunctive double reading mentioned by Burger is the double reading of a syntagm, whose realization as a FC is limited by the highly unlikely notion it contains, e.g. *vzeti noge pod pazduho, odpreti svoje srce, biti na psu* ('to be on the dog' meaning 'to be in a bad state').<sup>3</sup> – The syntagms which are permanent descriptions of gestures and the phraseological units (originating from them) have a simultaneous double reading, with both meanings realized simultaneously in a text, e.g. *zmajevati z glavo* ('to shake one's head' meaning 'to express one's astonishment, surprise, outrage', *skomigniti z rameni*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> If all WCs are regarded as part of phraseology, the group of syntagms with a »single reading« consists of WCs with a zero degree of idiomaticity, which have only a »literal« reading, e.g. *rdeča mušnica, levi prilastek, spalna srajca* ('nightgown').

<sup>3</sup> Actually, this group is the most transitional one in both directions, i.e. towards a single (only phraseological) reading as well as towards other types of disjunctive double reading. Consequently, the phraseological unit *kdo biti za luno* ('to be behind the moon' meaning 'to be stupid, naive') has, for example, moved from this group to the group with a homonymous relationship due to the technical achievements of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>4</sup> Most certainly, this group does not consist of all phraseological units that have originated from the permanent descriptions of gestures, e.g. in such an extreme case as *vreči rokavico* ('to throw down the gauntlet') the (culturally conditioned) gesture has been forgotten and only the phraseological unit has remained. Therefore this syntagm does not allow a synchronic double reading (but only the homonymous disjunctive one). Similarly, in the combinations such as *rivati si lase* ('to pull one's hair'), *lasje gredo pokonci komu* ('somebody's hair goes straight'), the realization of the gesture is fairly if not completely unlikely.

- The mixed (combined) type of reading is represented by phraseological units where some component elements appear in the dictionary meaning and others have a double reading, e.g. *zaljubljen do ušes* ('in love up to one's ears' meaning 'madly in love'), *obljubljeni zlate gradove*.<sup>5</sup>

The »inner form« (vnutrennaja forma) of phraseological units is an established<sup>6</sup> term in Russian phraseology and represents a motivating meaning<sup>7</sup> and the »picture« of a syntagm which is a type of derivational base of phraseological unit.<sup>8</sup> The term itself is constant, while its contents, however, vary slightly in accordance with the authors' comprehension of semantics. Generally, two viewpoints can be traced, both of which have also been discussed in *Slovar' russkoj frazeologičeskoj terminologii* (1993, headword *Vnutrennaja forma*). In this dictionary, a »wider« comprehension of the inner form is more topical.<sup>9</sup> It distinguishes between a simple and complex inner form:

Мотивирующая образность языковой единицы, основанная на деривационных связях ее значения со значением прототипа. Внутренняя форма может быть простой или осложненной. Простую внутреннюю форму имеют ФЕ, образованные на базе переменных сочетаний (см.) (*плыть против течения, сидеть на шее* у кого); осложненную – ФЕ, образованные на базе пословиц (*стреляный воробей ← стреляного воробья на мякине не проведешь*) или в результате конденсаций в своей семантике содержания различных легенд, поверий, исторических фактов, художественных произведений и т.п. (*вольный казак, последний из могикиан*).

Among other things the inner form therefore consists of the whole cultural connotation of a phraseological unit.<sup>10</sup>

Regardless of the partial dissimilarity in connection with the comprehension of the inner form, a comparison of the Germanic »double reading« and Russian »inner form« reveals certain connections. In both cases, the semantic potency of phraseological units is emphasized. The potency lies in the fact that besides the phraseological meaning another meaning exists in parallel, which can be activated in a text in one way or another. The difference between the two types of comprehension of semantic potency lies in a temporal cross section and the perception of its nature: double reading is about synchronic comprehension and the presence of this duality in the speakers'/writers' and hearers'/readers' mental lexicon, whereas the inner form is (for the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader) a recognizable or unrecognizable relationship

<sup>5</sup> According to the semantic classification by Vinogradov (1947) the so-called *frazeologičeskie sočeta-nija*, in Slovene terminology (according to Toporišič 1973/74) *skupi*.

<sup>6</sup> It has been used for a long time – cf. e.g. in Žukov 1978: 6.

<sup>7</sup> Sometimes also referred to as the »etymological meaning«.

<sup>8</sup> The term **derivational base of a phraseological unit** is used in this sense also by Wotjak (1992) in her phraseology.

<sup>9</sup> Several authors are quoted, the references are more recent.

<sup>10</sup> The authors of this terminological dictionary quote here the Russian phraseologist V. N. Telija and her work on a connotative aspect of the semantics of the naming units (Telija 1986). More on the culture-specific aspect of phraseology can be found in Part III of her *Russkaja frazeologija* (Telija 1996: 214–269), according to which the concept of cultural connotation is represented in Kržišnik 2005: 67.

that exists synchronically or diachronically. From the synchronic point of view, the inner form can be present or absent in the phraseological unit, whereas the possibility of double reading depends solely on the compatibility of the component elements of a phraseological unit: if they are compatible, the syntagm enables one of the types of double reading. When talking about the use of semantic potency of the phraseological units in texts, we are talking about a synchronic view only. It is, therefore, sensible, at least at the beginning, to differentiate between the FC which is the inner form of a phraseological unit – referred to as the **derivational FC** – and the FC which is not the inner form of a phraseological unit (at least from the synchronic point of view) – referred to as the **source FC**.

### 1.1 »Picturesqueness« of a phraseological unit

When discussing the use of the semantic potency of phraseological units (especially from the point of view of »perception« and comprehension of this use) the term »picture« that is evoked by the phraseological unit is usable and often used. The term is used in the definition of the inner form. Because we distinguish between the derivational FC and the source FC in phraseological units, we have to determine this term precisely. The »picture« of a phraseological unit is mentioned in connection with two different characteristics, i.e. its figurative (transferred) meaning and its sensory clarity (imaginability). A. Buhofer (1988) warns us of this imprecision and explains:<sup>11</sup> the sensory clarity, i.e. the characteristic of the language also possessed by words, refers to the ability of a person to imagine the linguistic expression visually – this is the reason that phraseological units which are rarely or no longer motivated can produce an effect with the power of a picture; when talking about the figurative character which refers to metaphors and among them also metaphorical phraseological units, the term should be understood as a picture for something else and this 'something else' should be made accessible with the establishment of a connection – if, of course, this connection is not conventionalized, as is the case with phraseological units. Figurative ways of expression can also be clear<sup>12</sup> and clear expressions are not at all necessarily figurative (e.g. *dati košarico* 'to give somebody the basket' meaning 'to turn somebody down'). The differentiation is essential from the psycholinguistic point of view, since the clarity of expression makes its comprehension easier, whereas the figurative character makes it more difficult. – Within the framework of the inner form of a phraseological unit, the »picture« refers to the semantic relationship between the derivational FC and the phraseological unit, whereas besides this, the »double reading« also regards the relationship between the »pictures« of the PWC and the source FC without the motivating relationship.

<sup>11</sup> In German, two similar terminological expressions exist which are frequently confused. These two terms are *bildlich* 'figurative' and *bildhaft* 'clear (from the sensory point of view), imaginable'.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the contrast between the abstract character of the meaning 'to control' and the concrete sensory clarity of the component elements of the phraseological unit *gledati pod prste komu* ('to look under somebody's fingers').

In connection with the figurative character of phraseological units, Burger (1989: 27) says that the metaphorical connection in phraseological units is not simply semantically »given« in the sense that »in the metaphorical process the phraseological meaning would so to speak naturally originate from the literal meaning« (the meaning of the PWC ← the meaning of the FC) – in reality it is truer that the »reading« of a FC gives a wide range of interpretative possibilities, of which only one is actually lexicalized in the language. This can be seen fairly easily when comparing phraseological units in different languages. Burger lists the following examples: in German *jdm. einen Floh ins Ohr setzen* 'to say something which does not give a person any peace; to arouse suspicion with what one has told' and in English *to send someone off with a flea in his ear* 'to scold somebody'. Cf. in Slovene *ne imeti dlake na jeziku* (literally 'not to have a hair on one's tongue') 'to tell something unpleasant openly', in French *avoir un cheveu sur la langue* (literally 'to have a hair on one's tongue' – without the negative word!) 'to talk unclearly' and in German *Haare auf den Zähnen haben* (literally 'to have hairs on one's teeth' – without the negative word!) 'to defend one's point of view in a determined way' – the meaning of the German non-negated phraseological unit is closer to the Slovenian negated than to the French non-negated one.<sup>13</sup>

## 2 The modified use of the phraseological unit

### 2.1 The modifications of a phraseological unit as a deviation from the norm

As is true for all other linguistic units, phraseological units are subject to a linguistic norm – the latter is a consequence of their conventionalized character which is necessary to make them accessible to the users of the given language community in their mutual communication. In phraseological units, the norm is more difficult to determine and is looser, since their multi-component structure and the syntactic relations between the components enable frequent and diverse variants (Kržišnik 1996: 133–135). This is becoming increasingly obvious as extensive corpora of texts are now available bringing enormous quantities of data on actual uses (on this topic Gantar 2003 and 2004). Despite this, the norm in phraseology cannot be excluded. It is therefore justifiable to talk about the breaking of the norm or about incorrect uses when faced with deviations from the norm, which go beyond the limits of the established variants and are not functional in the text. Incorrect uses of phraseological units are recognized (noticed) neither by the speaker/writer nor (mostly) by the hearer/reader (compare the data in Kržišnik 1998 and 2004).

On the contrary, modification refers to changed uses of forms and/or meanings of a phraseological unit in a text which are mostly conscious, although they may not always be intentional;<sup>14</sup> in a text, they are functional, and therefore noticeable and

<sup>13</sup> Dobrovol'skij (1997: 38) also lists two phraseological units in German and Russian that are close to each other according to the inner form and component elements, but are not translational equivalents: Russian *postaviti na kartu čto-l.* and German *etw. aufs Spiel setzen*.

<sup>14</sup> Particularly in free speech the modification can take place spontaneously, but also in this case the speaker is (retrospectively) aware of it and the listener can recognize it.

recognizable.<sup>15</sup> It is important that the text contains functionally used deviations from the norm, since even the modifications that are intentional, but play no role in the text, are inappropriate innovations close to incorrect use.<sup>16</sup> Recognition of the modification is not always achieved by the hearer/reader, since several conditions should be met; at least two of them must necessarily be fulfilled: the knowledge and understanding of the source phraseological unit or (at least intuitive) knowledge and understanding of the procedure of linguistic innovations. In this regard, it is possible to claim that incorrect uses are mostly not recognized as a deviation from the norm, whereas modifications are mostly understood as such.<sup>17</sup>

## 2.2 Modifications and renewals (actualizations) of phraseological units

The term phraseological modifications is used primarily in Germanic phraseology – a more detailed treatment can be found in Elspaß 1998: 152. In Slovenian phraseological discussions, the term **phraseological renewals** has been used rather than the term modifications; before the introduction of this term, the term **renovations** was used. Toporišič discusses the renewals of clichés – among other things phraseological ones – as a stylistic procedure in artistic texts as early as 1964 in his monograph on the literary texts of F. S. Finžgar (Toporišič 1964, in several places, e.g. p. 260). Toporišič's term renovations was adopted by Korošec (1978) to refer to the modified use of phraseological units and various quotations in newspaper headlines. Korošec did not find this term sufficient to describe all types of changes; besides the term 'renovation' he, therefore, introduced the term **repetitions**. The different terms were used to formally differentiate procedures; renovations are formal modifications and repetitions are without formal changes. The term renewals first appeared in 1987 in two articles (Kržišnik 1987a and 1987b). Kržišnik (1987a) emphasizes especially that renewal is an innovative change that does not refer only to phraseological units, but also to linguistic units at all meaning bearing levels (this topic is further discussed under 3). In footnote 5 Kržišnik (1987b: 529) describes the history of the term renewal and the reasons for the choice of this term: renewal covers the formal (expressional) as well as semantic modifications of phraseological units. Further on, some other terms are listed which were used to denote such textual procedures (e.g. breaking /of phra-

<sup>15</sup> Some linguists differentiate between the normative (usual) and accidental (occasional) variants, the latter are subdivided into modifications and mistakes (or violations) (Elspaß 1998).

<sup>16</sup> Example: /.../ ter pomagajo po svojih močeh nezaposlenim otrokom, ki **so obviseli v zraku** sedanje ureditve (Delo, Saturday Supplement, 1 April 1995, p. 30) ← *obviseti v zraku* **something** (e.g. a problem) 'to remain unsolved': **somebody** (otroci 'children').

<sup>17</sup> Among the deviations from the norm Kržišnik 1996 also lists the changes that are historically conditioned. The latter can appear as modifications in a text: as a styleme used for the temporal colouring of the text or as an incorrect use that causes incomprehension of the text. The text *Giapovi simpatizerji kajpak trdijo, da gre za spletko sedanjega vodstva, s kateri si Giap nikakor ni v komolce* (Delo, 26 January 1993) contains a phraseological unit that can still be found in Slovene dictionaries (*biti si v komolce* 'to understand each other very well'), but is no longer part of a synchronic phraseological system and the text is not understandable to a Slovene. It is impossible to say why the journalist used it, since it does not have any stylistic effects.

seological units/, re-shaped phraseological unit), however it can be claimed that the term (phraseological) renewal was established in Slovene phraseology.

Twice linguists have thought about modifications as changes which differ from renewals. First in Kržišnik (1996: 134), where the author tries to divide the modified use of phraseological units into renewed and non-renewed.<sup>18</sup> Renewals are described as the modifications of the types that have a noticeable function of (creative) linguistic innovations in a text, whereas non-renewed modification is described as a non-functional change and within the existing norm as actually a kind of incorrect use. An example listed is the phraseological unit *požreti/snesti/pojesti besedo* ('to devour one's word' meaning 'not to do what is promised, said') – it is assumed that the extension of the variants of the verbal component to comprise e.g. *pogoltniti (besedo)* ('to swallow one's word') is a relatively plausible modification without innovative effects.<sup>19</sup> In this respect, the non-renewed modifications would refer to the changes in the form of a phraseological unit that represent the establishment of the so-called potential norm, leading potentially to changes in the norm and the appearance of new variants (Kržišnik 1996: 149).<sup>20</sup> – A further possibility for the differentiation between modifications and renewals is – as a theoretically slightly different confirmation of the above-mentioned facts – presented in Kržišnik, Smolić (1999: 67, 68), within the framework of the comprehension of phraseological units as one of the conventionalized linguistic means of expression for the conceptual metaphor, as understood by cognitive semantics (e.g. Lakoff, Johnson 1980 and further works). The differentiation originates from the possibility that is offered by the explanation of a conventional metaphor as one that expresses linguistically only some parts of a conceptual metaphor. This leaves open the possibility for the linguistic extension of the use of these parts and a further extension of the use to the unused parts (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 53). Consequently, the extension of the above-mentioned variant phraseological unit *požreti/snesti/pojesti besedo* to *pogoltniti besedo* would be the modification within the conceptual metaphor WORDS ARE FOOD, whereas the substitution of *ob glasnem dnevu* 'on a noisy day' for *ob belem dnevu* ('on a white day' meaning 'publicly, not secretly') would be the renewal,<sup>21</sup> i.e. the use of the unused part of the conceptual metaphor KNOWING IS SEEING (= perceive in a sensory way → hear). This seems to be a theoretically suitable starting point for the division of modifications into re-

<sup>18</sup> »Different modified uses (non-renewed and renewed) have to be differentiated from the variants as standardized variants of the source form.«

<sup>19</sup> In the Fida corpus (<http://www.fida.net>), which is a referential corpus of modern Slovene texts, primarily from the second half of the 1990s, it is possible to find one example of such a use: *če pogoltni pa besedo* (the example is taken from the Dolenjski list newspaper from 1998) – unfortunately, the wider context is missing.

<sup>20</sup> Elspass 1998: 158 also considers such a function of modifications. – Contrary to the modifications, phraseological renewals can be a source of new phraseological units. Consequently, in Slovene the phraseological unit *slabša polovica* 'husband' was coined from the original renewal of the phraseological unit *boljša polovica* 'wife' (more about this in Kržišnik 1994b: 64).

<sup>21</sup> ZD IC VII/10 (abbreviation see note 38): *Sanjala sva o stvarih, o katerih človek ne sanja ob glasnem dnevu; kdor jih opomni v pametni družbi, opazi pred sabo začudene obraze in velike oči ... To so melodije, ki jih poslušna srce samo v samotnih nočeh, da ne vidi nepoklicano oko teh otroških smehljajev /.../.*

newed and non-renewed. One weakness is, of course, that a comprehensive list of all the conceptual metaphors and their (conventionalized) linguistic means of expression, including also phraseological units, has not been made. The possibilities for the realization of these theoretical presuppositions are lacking, but we cannot ignore the fact that two levels exist within modifications. Seen from the hearer's/reader's viewpoint and his/her reception of linguistic innovations in the text, we can basically presuppose that the changes not easily noticed by the hearer/reader are the linguistic changes that do not affect the conceptual contents of the linguistic expression and that the changes that are mostly noticed must be of the sort that affect the conventionality of the conceptual contents in one way or another. For this reason, two facts seem sensible: firstly, to differentiate between the non-renewed and renewed modifications, and, secondly, to understand the changes in the form and/or the meaning of a phraseological unit which are noticeable in the text (because they are functionally used) as renewed modifications. Further discussion will focus on renewed modifications only and the term renewal will be used to refer to them, as in all my contributions concerning this topic so far (Kržišnik 1987a, 1987b, 1988, 1990, 1994b: 60–65, 1996: 140–142).

### 3 Renewal as a linguistic innovation

Although the term renewal was established almost exclusively to name creative interventions in phraseological units, we cannot ignore the fact that very similar linguistic innovations are possible in units belonging to all levels bearing meaning from morphemes to texts. Let us provide some examples:

- a) morpheme: *S Silvijino slovenščino pa ni vse tako zelo v redu, da ne bi kak zdrsljaj pogledal skozi slepečo zaveso njenega strokovnjakarskega besedohitrstva*<sup>22</sup>  
 ← *rokohitrstvo* ('the ability of being skillful with one's hands') = *ročna* spretnost ('skillfulness with one's hands') → *besedna* spretnost ('skillfulness with words'), which is, of course, negatively evaluated;<sup>23</sup>
- b) word: *SAMA-RIT* ('the bottom-only') ← *samarit(an)* 'one who is compassionate and helpful to a person in distress' – the headline of a newspaper article on the pronounced altruism of beauty queens and printed above a large photograph showing a naked beauty;<sup>24</sup>
- c) word combination – terminology:<sup>25</sup>  
 – *Zakaj je črni ribez rdeč?*  
 – *Ker je še zelen.*  
 ← *črni ribez* ('blackcurrants'), *rdeči ribez* ('redcurrants'), *zelen* 'green' = 'unripe';
- d) sentence – quotation: *Na začetku so bila pogajanja* ← (biblical) *Na začetku je bila beseda*;<sup>26</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Delo newspaper, Literary Supplement, 3 November 1988, p. 8.

<sup>23</sup> About a person who only talks but does nothing.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. text: *Še misice nas prvič, ko čivknejo javno, poskušajo našopati, da so tam samo zato, da ne bi bilo več lačnih in žejnih.* (Slovenske novice newspaper, 1 June 2005, p. 5.)

<sup>25</sup> If the entirely motivated WCs (cf. note 2) were understood as phraseological units, that would be a phraseological renewal.

<sup>26</sup> Newspaper headline (Delo, 31 March 1995, p. 5).



e) text: renewal of the text of a TV commercial

– *Gospod doktor, a lahko?*

– *Kar naprej, kar naprej, T/tunček!*

– *Gospod doktor, jaz sem ena čisto navadna tuna, rad bi bil pa CALVO /...<sup>27</sup>*

a joke with the title *Ambiciozna tuna: Gospod doktor, jaz sem en čisto navaden Janko. Rad bi bil pa Jankovič.*<sup>28</sup>

**3.1** Since renewal is a creative procedure, the possible combinations are numerous, but it cannot be ignored that among all the renewed interventions found in texts, it is the renewals of phraseological units that are most frequently realized and appear most commonly. The reason for this – besides the establishment of units that is actually the basic condition for each renewal –<sup>29</sup> lies in the fact that they are composed of several elements, which increases the potential (e.g. in comparison with a word) for the use of the semantic potency. Another reason is also the degree of recognition of phraseological units by speakers/writers and hearers/readers (e.g. in comparison with the recognition of citational expressions and texts) which is a consequence of their relatively long presence in the language and language community.<sup>30</sup> Or as the phraseologist G. Gréciano (1987: 196) put it: »Polylexikalität ist ein Appell an die Fragmentierung, die Fixiertheit an die Variabilität, die Figuriertheit an die Literalisierung.«

The question can be asked whether such innovations have limits.<sup>31</sup> This seems to be the case, which is evident from the translations from languages spoken in far-off countries, i.e. languages whose cultural background is different from ours. For example, the following extract can be found in the Slovenian translation of the novel *The Tale of Genji*, by the Japanese author M. Shikibu (translated literally): *His chamberlains were running back and forth in confusion; the Emperor's messengers were packed »densely as legs of rain drops«.*<sup>32</sup> It is clear that the combination »densely as legs of rain drops« cannot be read as a FC due to the incompatibility between *leg* and (*rain*) *drop*. Since the semantic transfer cannot be derived from the text, this is not a creative metaphor. The only possibility left is that in the original this is a conventional metaphor, i.e. a phraseological unit or a renewal derived from it – in Slovenian the content is meaningless, it is beyond our conceptual net. It is clear from the text that

<sup>27</sup> Advertising copy for the *Calvo* cans of tuna.

<sup>28</sup> *Jankovič* – surname of the manager of the successful Slovenian company Mercator.

<sup>29</sup> It was believed in phraseology that the sequence of the component elements of a phraseological unit or their cooccurrence in texts is more frequently realized in phraseological meaning than in the meaning of a homonymous FC even before it was possible to check it in extensive corpora of texts. Today, this can be confirmed by the corpus data. Chafe (1968: 123) explains this »as determined by their semantic cogency, their usefulness to speakers of a language in frequently occurring situations«. In this way, Koller (1977: 192) explains the unreflected correction of a wrong use of phraseological units on the side of the speaker as well as on the side of the hearer. Doubts about the correctness of Chafe's claim are found in Fleischer (1983: 192). Cf. also Kržišnik 1994a: 126, 127 and 1996: 148, 149.

<sup>30</sup> Consequently, the renewal of the above-mentioned advertising copy – regarding the recognition and thus the renewal effect – has a fairly limited »shelf life«.

<sup>31</sup> Burger (1998: 154) claims that in phraseological units the border is difficult to determine as the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader assess it differently.

<sup>32</sup> The first book from the collection *Sto romanov*, 1988, p. 127.

there were many »chamberlains« (*they were packed densely*), but what is the meaning of *legs of rain drops*?

#### 4 Renewals of a phraseological unit

Here, the definition from 2.1, where modifications are described, can be attributed to phraseological renewals with a small correction: these are changed uses of form and/or of meaning of a phraseological unit which are functional in the text; they are used consciously by a speaker/writer and can be recognized by a hearer/reader.<sup>33</sup>

##### 4.1 Typology of phraseological renewals

In the literature on phraseology several typologies of renewals can be found from the very detailed to the very general.<sup>34</sup> This can be illustrated by two typologies by H. Burger, the second one written after an interval of more than 20 years. A relatively detailed typology was published in Burger, Buhofer, Sialm in 1982 (68–91) and it states:

lexical substitution (lexikalische Substitution), insertion of adjectives (Hinzufügung eines Adjektivs), change in morphemic structure of nominal component (Determinativkomposition), addition of (genitival) postmodifier (Hinzufügung eines Genitivattributs), separation (relativization) (Abtrennung), reduction (Verkürzung), co-ordination (of two phraseological units with the same component) (Koordinierung /partiell identischer Phraseologismen mit Tilgung der identischen Elemente/), affirmation <--> negation change (Wechsel Affirmation <--> Negation), references in context (Verweise im Kontext), violation of semantic conditions (Verletzung der semantischen Selektionbedingungen), violation of contextual (as well as consituational) conditions (Verletzung der textlinguistischen Bedingungen).

It would be difficult to determine a uniform criterion on which this typology is based. B. Wotjak (1992: 133–161) arranged and added to it and it now reads:<sup>35</sup>

Modifications inside phraseological unit (substitution, expansion, reduction, grammatical modifications, affirmation <--> negation change, separation, co-ordination of

<sup>33</sup> As has already been mentioned (in 2.1), at least two conditions (knowledge of a phraseological unit and of a technique of renewal) have to be satisfied. Burger (1998: 154) reports on disastrous results of a test where the recognition of modifications in advertising copy, the majority of which were probably renewals, was checked (he quotes Hemmi 1994 – unfortunately, Burger does not mention whether test subjects knew the source phraseological units or not).

<sup>34</sup> The typology in Kržišnik Kolšek 1987: 519–525 is adopted from the one used by Mlacek 1977: 90–96, the latter being one of the earliest discussions of this phenomenon in phraseology. Such linguistic innovations are called actualization of phraseological units by Mlacek. In his typology, he takes into account morphological, syntactic, lexical and contextual actualizations as well as a complex type of actualizations as a combination of the basic four types. – In Germanic phraseology Koller 1977 was one of the first authors who wrote about it – on p. 188 he mentions that E. Riesel 1970 is the only scholar who was concerned with this before him. Koller refers to the phenomenon very generally as »wordplay« but makes a distinction between wordplay inside and outside syntagm.

<sup>35</sup> It is used in several empirical studies, e.g. in Elspass 1998.

identical elements, contamination of phraseological units, substitution of verbal for non-verbal, substitution of non-verbal for verbal (supplementation of verbal with non-verbal); modification outside phraseological unit, combinations of various types of modifications.

More than 20 years after he had written his first typology, Burger (Burger 1998: 150–153, similarly in 2003<sup>2</sup>: 152–155) decided to simplify it by proposing only three types of renewals, or modifications, as he refers to them: 1. formal modification without semantic modification, 2. formal modification + semantic modification, 3. semantic modification without formal modification. The first type is actually not a renewal, but a non-renewed modification.<sup>36</sup> Burger's newer typology, however, confirms that it is wise to distinguish between non-renewed and renewed modifications: if there is no change in meaning, it is not a renewal. The difference between type 2 and type 3 concerns whether or not the structure of a phraseological unit itself is affected or not. We could, therefore, speak about renewals inside and outside a phraseological unit, even though Burger (Burger 1998: 153) considers it unimportant, since in any case it is the context which makes renovations semantically clear.

**4.1.1** Two divisions of renewals have also existed in Slovenian phraseology for a relatively long period of time: the division of T. Korošec (1978) consisting of renovations where the structure of a phraseological unit is changed one way or another and repetitions without formal changes, and the more detailed typology of E. Kržišnik. I base my typology (Kržišnik Kolšek 1988: 84–124 and Kržišnik 1990: 400–420) on the assumption that the smooth functioning of a phraseological unit as a phraseological unit (and only a phraseological unit) is possible only if the following conditions are satisfied: 1. multiple constituency (including all permanent usual variants) 2. a given syntactic structure (with foreseeable possible transformations), 3. a given (outside a phraseological unit) structural and semantic collocability, and 4. the incorporation of a phraseological unit into a compatible environment, i.e. into context, which enables the recognition of a phraseological unit as a phraseological unit. Regarding these conditions a further distinction is made between single-stage renewals (where one of the conditions is not met) and multi-stage renewals (where several conditions are simultaneously not satisfied). Considering the degree to which the form of a phraseological unit is affected single-stage renewals can be subdivided into renewals inside

<sup>36</sup> He gives an example (Burger 1998: 151): *!.../ Noch vor kurzem herrschte zwischen den beiden Bergländern politische Spannung, begründet durch die Angst, man werde unfreiwillig zuviel Transitverkehr aufgedrängt bekommen. Der politische Schnee von gestern scheint jetzt zu tauen, Bundesrat Moritz Leuenberger will nach der Sommerpause sichtlich neuen Drive in die Verkehrsverhandlungen mit der EU bringen.* In Slovene an equivalent example would be (from the Fida corpus): *Začela je pripovedovati. S tisto ljubko neokretnostjo, s katero so se ji zatikali pisani jeziki peresnika, je njen jezik stekel brez ovinkov in zadržkov. Ni se branila, ni se znala braniti; znala je napasti starega s kaktusovim cvetom, vse, kar je bilo zanjo **grd lanski sneg**, ne pa tistega, kar je prišlo nadnjo z užitek in brez nejasnosti. Prišla je iz svoje vasi s poročeno sestrično; dali so jo v isto sobo, ločeno s premično steno. ← brigati/zanimati se/zmeniti se za kaj kot za lanski sneg;* the Fida corpus shows the increasing independence of the combination *lanski sneg* 'a thing forgotten because of its unimportance' – 15 out of 43 hits prove it. It could be a modification if not a new phraseological unit.

a phraseological unit (where the form of a phraseological unit, i.e. its componential and syntactic structure, is changed) and into renewals outside a phraseological unit (without formal changes). According to the type of formal changes, renewals inside a phraseological unit are divided into componential ones – from phonetic, through morphological, word formational to verbal/componential – and syntactic ones; renewals outside a phraseological unit are divided according to collocability<sup>37</sup> and (true) context. In multi-stage renewals the procedures differ; depending on whether these procedures are apparent or not apparent, the renewals are divided into composed, which are a combination of several derived single-stage procedures, and decomposed (decompositions), where the procedure of the derivation of the renewal from the source phraseological unit is not apparent. At the intermediate stage between single- and multi-stage renewals there is contamination of two or rarely more phraseological units as well as PWCs and FCs – the contamination surpasses single-stage renewals together with simultaneous changes at several levels. As it is also one of the partial procedures in multi-stage renewals, it is, therefore, also one of the basic procedures.

The comparison of this typology with that of Wotjak's reveals advantages and disadvantages. The advantage of my typology from the 1980s is that it follows more precisely the procedures to which phraseological units are subject in the process of renewal; e.g. types of expansion, reduction, partial separation (*Abtrennung*), etc. can be counted as syntactic renewals. Its main disadvantage is that my typology was based on the analysis of artistic texts only and on just one author from the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>38</sup> This is the reason the possibilities of extratextual actualizations, be it situational (consituational) or multimedial (nonverbal, pictorial), cannot be observed. Such renewals are frequent in non-artistic texts from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, such as caricatures in journalism, cartoons and various advertisements. By also taking these types into account, we get the typology shown in Diagram 1; each type is illustrated with an example.

#### 4.1.2 The effect of phraseological renewals

The division of modifications into non-renewed and renewed ones and the distinction between modifications and renewals is justified also from the point of view of a consequential effect in the text. In contrast to (non-renewed) modifications where a phraseological unit – basically in the case of a formal change within the potential norm – realizes only its phraseological meaning in the text (cf. 4.1, the first of Burger's three types of modifications), there is always an interaction between the meanings of PWCs and FCs in renewals in the text. The relationship between both of them varies and depends on each concrete textual realization: the meaning of a PWC may be in the foreground, whereas the meaning of a FC is an accompanying association (1);

<sup>37</sup> Collocational renewals are actually an intermediate stage or connection between renewals inside and outside a phraseological unit, since they represent part of a systemic (dictionary) image of a phraseological unit as a valency element.

<sup>38</sup> Prose texts of Ivan Cankar, collected in the *Zbrana dela slovenskih pesnikov in pisateljev* (abbreviated as ZD IC ), books VI–XXIII.

both meanings may be realized simultaneously (2); or the meaning of a PWC is in the foreground and the meaning of a PWC in the background (3).

(1) Joke

*Prijatelj se pritožuje prijatelju:*

- *Najin sodelavec Zvone je pa res nesramen.*
- *Kako to misliš?*
- *Zadnjič **sem** pri njem **delal kot konj**, pa sem dobil le sendvič.*
- *Zares je nesramen. Jaz bi ti gotovo dal pol vreče ovsa...*

← PWC: *delati kot konj* 'to work like a horse' meaning 'to work very hard, to slog'; the meaning of a FC: a horse feeds on oats not on a sandwich;<sup>39</sup>

(2) **Prešeren: Mornar (Sailor)**

First stanza:

*Nezvesta, bodi zdrava!  
Čolnič po mene plava,  
na barko kliče strel.  
Po zemlji varno hodi,  
moj up **je šel po vodi**,  
mi drug te je prevzel.*

Last stanza:

*Po morju barka plava,  
Nezvesta, bodi zdrava,  
Sto tebi sreč želim!  
Po zemlji srečno hodi;  
moj up **je šel po vodi**,  
le jadrajmo za njim.*

← PWC: *kaj iti po vodi komu* 'to go along the water' meaning 'to not be realized, to fail'; FC: *jadrati* 'move on water (using sails)';

(3) ZD IC IX/36

»Vi torej mislite: – kar culo na ramo!«

»E, tako ne mislim! Ne smete vzeti besede, kakor je; obrnite jo malo! To sem hotel reči, da ni nič čudnega in krivičnega, če morate prenašati ... življenja boj ...«

Okrenil se je na stolu; začutil je pač na tihem, da **si je bil odpel suktnjo** malo pre-globoko. Dostavil je s previdnim, ne zelo prijaznim glasom:

»Jaz sem vam naposled rad na uslugo.«

In nato nadaljeval hitro:

»Toda moje zveze, veste, niso take, da bi mogel storiti kaj posebnega. Ali ste že bili pri gospodu Koprivniku?«

← *odpreti srce komu* 'to open somebody's heart' meaning 'to express one's feelings, thoughts' – Dictionary of the Slovene Standard Language: *odpreti* ('to open') 1.

<sup>39</sup> As a phraseological meaning is in the foreground, the joke is hidden enough to make a hearer/reader react strongly but not immediately.

'to place in such a position, b) that the inside becomes accessible'; *odpeti* ('to undo') 'to place something in such a position that it is not tied or attached to something' + sound similarity *odp(r)eti*.

The interaction between the meaning of a PWC and that of a FC is present even in the case where the renewal is not indirectly supported by the context. The title of a short commentary *Čas rani vse cele* 'time hurts all the unhurt' (Delo newspaper, 12 December 1996, p. 1) is an example of such an effect; it is a renewal of a phraseological unit *čas celi vse rane* ('time heals all wounds'), which is the result of a combination of sound and componential substitutions. There are no concrete incentives or derivations in the text, so that it is merely a play on the surface (especially because it is not a remotivation – discussed later); but in spite of that it evokes the meaning of a PWC as well as the meaning of a FC.

#### 4.2 The choice of phraseological units for renewal

The inclusion of more contemporary artistic and non-artistic texts in the analysis of phraseological renewals shows that the possibilities concerning the choice of phraseological units suitable for a renewal are basically unlimited. Based on the analysis of prose texts of the Slovenian classic author Ivan Cankar (at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century – Slovene modern arts) Kržišnik Kolšek (1988: 82, 83) establishes<sup>40</sup> that the choice of phraseological units is doubly limited to phraseological units with a derivational FC, i.e. the phraseological units with the so-called inner form (cf. section 1) and an apparent semantic core component. The renewals in contemporary texts do not confirm this finding. In these texts – artistic and even more so in non-artistic ones – renewals of phraseological units with a source (homonymous) FC only, i.e. the ones without an inner form, are not rare at all. Cf. the examples of two renewals from the phraseological unit *iti rakom žvižgat* 'to go to the crabs and whistle to them' meaning 'to fail, to die', whose meaning is completely idiomatic; this is the reason why it can only be a homonymous FC:

*Morda se je v postelji obnašal kot pobeteženi M. Jackson, ker ga prej nisem pošteno spitala. Brez jela ni dela, kdo ve, enostavno ga nisem znala oceniti, pa tudi časa mi ni pustil veliko: med ogledom znamenite Sintre si je moj žigolo pogumno zvil joint in potem je kraljevsko koračenje šlo **Mavrom** žvižgat. Po prodnatih stezicah, ki so vijugale skozi čudovite vrtove, se je spotikal kot ugonobljen zvodnik, ki še hoditi ne zna več. Za konec je dejansko padel na nos, skrajno nerodno. (From A. Morovič's novel *Vladarka*, 1997: 148.)*

*Za kaj takega ni več časa, Zig! Sam boš moral opraviti, sicer lahko **gre** naša invazija **žon-zom** žvižgat! (From the *Fida corpus*: Miki Miška, 1996.)*

Even the renewals of phraseological units which have an inner form are not necessarily oriented to the inner form but rather to a homonymous FC – the above-mentioned newspaper title *Čas rani vse cele* serves as an example.

<sup>40</sup> These findings are also supported by the analysis of renewals in other artistic texts in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Kržišnik 1994b) and the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Kržišnik 1987b).

**4.2.1** Based on the findings mentioned above the conclusion can be drawn that two different processes take place in renewals: **remotivation** or actualization of the inner form, i.e. the meaning of a derivational FC, and **literalization** or actualization of a homonymous FC, i.e. the meaning of a source FC.<sup>41</sup> From here on the possible differences between both processes can be sought either in the observation of changes in phraseological units themselves or in the possibility of use of renewals in texts. To carry out the former, very precise statistical analyses would be needed.<sup>42</sup> Only the results of the analysis of remotivational renewals (in artistic texts) are available to me; in this analysis I establish among other things that in this procedure phraseological units with a verbal categorial meaning (61 %) are most frequently used; in these phraseological units a nominal component (Kržišnik Kolšek 1988: 135–154) is renewed (its form is changed or it is only actualized synonymously).<sup>43</sup> Very precise statistical analyses can be found in Elspaß (1998: 202–216),<sup>44</sup> but they do not make a distinction between renewed and non-renewed modifications nor between remotivation and literalization.

So far no-one has thought about different possibilities in the use of remotivation and literalization of phraseological units in texts, but textual use seems to be varied. The process of literalization remains at the level of wordplay – interaction between two meanings which are independent of each other; the interaction is noticeable and efficient due to this discrepancy. Cf. example 7 *streljati kozle* 'to make big mistakes, to demonstrate incredible stupidity' : *streljati* 'to kill with firearms' *kozel* 'billy goat (= a small domestic animal ...)'. This is the reason that literalization is a process used mostly in non-artistic texts, particularly in journalism. In the process of remotivation the procedure of demetaphorization is employed which makes new metaphorization possible (the possibilities of new metaphorization may be used or not) – the latter is the case primarily in artistic texts. Example 12 *odpreti srce komu* 'to express one's feelings, thoughts' may serve as an illustration:

- demetaphorization: the source phraseological unit *odpreti srce komu* 'to open somebody's heart' first undergoes a syntactic change (*srce je odprto* 'the heart is open') and a morphological substitution of plural for singular (*srca* 'hearts'), which causes a change in the meaning *srce* = abstr. (symbolic meaning) → concr. (human organ, object), the meaning of a derivational FC is thus established;
- a FC is a starting point for the development of a text: what can be open is a room (*srce* 'heart' = *izba*: 'room' »hearts, previously locked rooms«); they freely open the door (»the door of the heart«), the door can be closed, locked or unlocked;
- new metaphorization: the heart as a room with all attributes is a room of emotional relationships between people, the door to the heart is opened by either »a storm«

<sup>41</sup> Wotjak (1992: 123) already distinguishes between them, but Burger (1989: 27/28) was probably the first to draw attention to this difference.

<sup>42</sup> Dictionaries of uses per authors exist for Russian phraseology (Melerovič, Mokienko 1987 and 1997; quoted in Eismann 2005), on the basis of which it would be possible to establish prevailing tendencies.

<sup>43</sup> Formally, a nominal component is changed in 63 % of cases, verbal in 27 %, adjectival in more than 9 %, whereas the changes in components of other parts of speech can be found only in individual renewals.

<sup>44</sup> His analysis confirms greater openness of phraseological units with a verbal component to all types of modifications (Elspaß 1998: 210, 214).

(»Kadar pa buti v vrata vihar« 'When the storm bangs on the door') or by »a warm spring wind«.

Originally, the procedure of phraseological renewals could be found – as probably each stylistically effective innovative linguistic procedure – in artistic texts, from where it then spread to non-artistic ones. Regardless of the state of Slovenian phraseological research, it can be claimed with certainty that the procedure of renewals can be traced back to Baroque texts. Janez Svetokriški (1648–1714) used them in the texts of his sermons to create parable, so it comes as no surprise that his renewals are often based on proverbs. An example from the first volume of the preacher's handbook *Sacrum promptuarium* (1691), the sermon *Na tretjo nedelo po veliki noči*:<sup>45</sup>

Kaj se bojiš ti žlahtni gospod? – Jest se ne bojim drugiga, semuč eniga neprijatelja mojga, zakaj jest imam eno težko pravdo. Inu deslih vse pisma sem v moje roke prpravil, de ta drugi nima neč pokazat (priča bodo tudi prsegli, kakor je meni všeč, besednikom sem uže tudi dobru usta pomazal, tem, kateri imajo soditi, sem uže lepe šenkinge poslal, zatoraj se troštam pravdo udobiti, dokler moje kula sem dobru pomazal; se troštam, de naprej poteko inu **mojmu bližnimu sem uže jamo prpravil**.), eniga samiga neprijatelja se bojim, kateri per le-tej pravdi v priče se bode našel inu vej, de ta drugi ima prav. – Ah, pravi s. Bernardus, kadar bi jest v taki viži z mojim bližnim andlal, bi se ne bal ni rihtarja ni obeniga neprijatelja, temuč bi se bal Boga, kateri za vse tu dobru vej, de bi on ne prpustil **ravnu v taisto jamo mene pokopati, katero mojmu bližnimu sem prpravil**.

← *kdor drugemu jamo koplje, sam vanjo pade* 'he who digs a hole for somebody else, falls into it himself' meaning 'misfortune sb plans for sb else usually boomerangs on them'.

Although the creative use of phraseological units can be observed in all periods since then, it should, however, be stressed that renewal as a stylistic procedure realized according to a literary programme became established in the texts written in the period of Slovenian modern arts at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, especially in the prose texts of Ivan Cankar (Kržišnik 1988).

As far as the use of renewals in Slovenian newspaper texts is concerned it can be claimed that they have been used since the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Example:<sup>46</sup> *.../Dunajčan, ki je pred kratkim časom odpotoval v Zedinjene države. Tudi on bo ugriznil v dolarsko jabolko /.../ ← ugrizniti v kislo jabolko* 'to start doing something unpleasant, disagreeable'. In the analysis of two Slovene newspapers (issues over a two week period) one from 1929 and the other from 1939, 13 renewals (mostly contextual ones) were found<sup>47</sup>, which is not a lot if compared with the use of this procedure in contemporary newspaper texts. As far as the function of renewals in texts generally and newspaper texts in particular is concerned, it is important to note that this procedure is found only very rarely in the Slovenian newspapers in the first few years after

<sup>45</sup> Cited in accordance with the 1937 publication, p. 19, paragraph 10.

<sup>46</sup> *Slovenec*, 6 January 1929, p. 8.

<sup>47</sup> M. A. Vižintin, *Frazemi v slovenskem narodu in Slovencu ob prelomnih zgodovinskih obdobjih*, BA dissertation, 2005, p. 13.




the Second World War; in the analysis of three newspapers over a one week period, only three renewals were found<sup>48</sup> in a newspaper that was published in the Free Zone of Trieste (which means outside Yugoslavia) – obviously, it was too serious a time to »play with the language«.

There are, however, no appropriate studies into the appearance and function of renewals in Slovenian advertising and popular science texts as well as in spoken language.

V angleščino prevedla  
*Marjeta Vrbinc.*

---

<sup>48</sup> The newspapers *Ljudska pravica* and *Slovenski poročevalec* were published in Ljubljana, whereas *Primorski dnevnik* was published in Trieste.



### Examples of renewals:

- 1) *Koritnikov Jazzy ga!* v *Mengšu* ← *jebi ga* 'used to show that the person talking does not mind' (pragmatic phraseological unit) (*Jazzy ga!* proper name).  
*O, kanta simplicitas, kamor mečemo povolilne olupke* ← *sankta simplicitas (sveta preproščina); kanta* 'kind of vessel' (Delo newspaper, Saturday Supplement, 9 July 2005, p. 19)  
*tema kot v Rogu* ← *tema kot v rogu* 'very dark' (rog 'horny or bony growth on the head of some animals'; Rog = Kočevski Rog – seat of the headquarters of the Slovene partisan units during the war) (quoted after Gjurin 1982: 128)  
*Lenko Fuks* ← *len ko(t) fuks* 'very lazy'; *Zdravko Dren* ← *zdrav ko(t) dren* 'very healthy' (names of persons in Improliža, Ana Monro Theatre)
- 2) *Jakuza, japonska mafija, uporablja povsem drugačne metode in ne dreza v sršenja gnezda* ← *dregniti/dregati (drezati) v sršenje gnezdo* 'to give cause for severe mass excitement'; substitution of plural for singular (Republika, 31 March 1995, p. 15)

- 3) *KRONOS: Brez skrbi, še zmeraj vas vse uženem v kozlovi rog!* ← *uognati v kozji rog koga* ('to drive somebody into a goat's horn' meaning 'to be better than (somebody)') (in the performance Kronos had horns – he was kozel 'billy goat') (E. Filipič, Ujetniki svobode, Problemi 1982/2, 1–17)
- 4) *Sveže gobe razrežemo čez klobuk in kocen tako, da dobimo rezine v obliki črke T. Če vam te posebne oblike ne gredo od noža, lahko naredite navadne koščke. iti od noža 'to go from the knife' ← kaj iti od rok komu 'to go from the hands' meaning 'somebody to do something quickly and skilfully' (M. Pečjak, Kuharska umetnost Azije, 1977, p. 18)*
- 5) *(...) na pet gospodarjev razdeljeno gostinstvo, tisoč in en propadli načrt o gradnji prenočitvenih zmogljivosti večjega obsega in svojo večno neuskajenost – ob čemer bi utegnil kdo še pomisliti, da je prav to tisti grm, v katerem tiči pravi mozirski zajec. ... that this is the bush in which the real Mozirje rabbit hides' ← v tem grmu tiči zajec 'a rabbit hides in this bush' meaning 'here lies the core of the problem, the essence of a thing' (Delo newspaper, Polet, 7 February 2002)*  
*Vsi vemo, kaj ostane od ljubezni, ki gre skozi želodec* 'We all know what remains from love that goes through the stomach.' ← syntactic *ljubezen gre skozi želodec* 'love goes through the stomach' meaning 'to retain love it is necessary to have good food' (E. Jurič, Grizem aforizem, 1995, p. 71)
- 6) *Vzemite Zdravje v svoje roke!* 'Take Health into your hands!' ← *vzeti v svoje roke kaj* 'to take something into one's hands' = abstract (*zdravje*) : concrete (*Zdravje* magazine) (radio commercial)
- 7) *Čudež pred cekajem*  
 »Verjetno nihče ne ve, kako sta se koza in njen mladič znašla v parku pred stavbo centralnega komiteja ZK Jugoslavije.« je začudeno napisal Tanjugov fotoreporter v podpisu k sliki, ki jo je poslal v svet.  
*Že res, ampak ob gornjem se zastavlja še pomembnejše vprašanje: kako neki sta oba sploh preživela čisto blizu stavbe – kjer tako množično streljajo kozle?* (Delo newspaper, Pa še to column, 23 March 1990) ← *streljati kozle* 'to make big mistakes, to do foolish things' (Delo newspaper, Pa še to column, back page, 23 March 1990)

8) VRZI



← *vreči oko na koga/kaj* 'to throw one's eye on sb/sth' meaning 1. 'to look at', 2. 'to show interest in sb/sth' (print on a T-shirt – advertisement for Kolosej cinema)

#### NA dobre filme

← *Že teh manj kot 10 odstotkov kazni je podatek, da grejo človeku lasje pokonci (če jih ima).* 'The information about less than 10 per cent of the fine makes a person's hair go straight (if he has any).' (The caption beneath the photo of the author, who is bald) (Delo newspaper, 10 October 2000, p. 12)

9) *Seveda ni nič narobe, če rečem, da si vlada puli lase, vendar ni lepo, če vsi vemo, da je ministrski predsednik daleč od idealnega beatla. Toda stvar postane neprijetna, če rečem, da so se poslanci smejali ministrici v brk.* ← *puliti si lase* 'to be very sad, desperate' (beate 'a young boy with long hair'); *smejati se v brk komu* 'to laugh insolently, impertinently' (brk 'a line of hair on one's upper lip'; men have a moustache) (Delo newspaper, 21 June 1993, p. 3):

10) *Človek mora včasih misliti s tujo glavo, da bi ohranil svojo.* ← *PWC<sub>1</sub> misliti s svojo glavo* 'to think with one's own head' meaning 'to think independently' + *PWC<sub>2</sub> odnesti celo glavo* 'to take one's whole head away' meaning 'to escape from a fight, battle, difficult situation unhurt' (Ž. Petan, 1001 aforizem, 1986, p. 49)

11) »*Se nameravaš kmalu ženiti?*«

»*Da,*« *pravim,* »*kakor hitro bo mogoče. Kakor hitro si bom lahko kupil obešalnik, omaro, posteljo, mizo, stole.*«

»*Zakaj obešalnik?*«

»*Zato da bom imel kam obesiti suknjič, klobuk, študij in strokovno prihodnost.*«

»*Ne norčuj se.*«

← contamination of *PWC* *obesiti šolo, študij na klin* 'to hang school, study on the hook' meaning 'to quit school, to stop studying ...' + *FC* *obesiti (kaj) na obešalnik* 'to hang (something) on a hanger' contextual (B. Zupancič, Grmada, 1974, p. 64)

- 12) *Mnogokdaj se primer, da se v enem trenotku odpro vsa srca in skozi široka vrata prikipi duša v lica, v oči in na jezik, tako da so si ljudje mahoma podobni kakor brat bratu; ker bratje so si v najglobljih globočinah. /.../ Časih odpadne narahlo prislonejane duri src le bežen dih; prikaže se le ozka, svetla špranja, komaj za hip, toda prikaže se. /.../ Pozdravili so se in koj so si tujci, ne poznajo se, ne mislijo več drug na drugega; svetla špranja je ugasnila, tiho so se zaprle duri. /.../*
- Kadar pa buti v vrata vihar, jih odpre siloma in sunkoma nastožaj, da zajče in se stresejo v tečajih, takrat ni več nobenih skrivnosti; kar bi drugače molčalo navekomaj, privre kvišku brez strahu. Srca, prej zaklenjene izbe, so prostrane, svetle veže, kamor stopi s ceste, kogar je volja. /.../ Čegava je bila roka, ki je samolastno odpahnila vrata zaklenjenih človeških src? /.../ Srce hrepeni in čaka željno, da bi se smelo razodeti srcu, tako da bi se zrušili vsi jezovi in bi se do kaplje prelilo drugo v drugo (...). Kmalu so si bili podobni v lica in celo po govorici in hoji; ker srca so bila odprta in so bila eno ter so ustvarila le eno podobo. Tudi kadar so se sporekli med seboj do hudega, so se sporekli bratje; ni je bilo moči, tudi v njih samih ne, ki bi bila mogla zaloputniti duri, odprte nastožaj. /.../ Ali ura pride nekoč, ko bo odprl srca tople spomladanski veter, ko si bodo obrazi enaki v veselju, ne v bridkosti, ko se bodo ljudje pozdravljali s cvetjem ovenčani in z glorio ljubezni.*
- ← *odpreti/razkriti/razodeti (svoje) srce komu 'to express one's feelings, thoughts' (ZD IC XXIII/97–99).*

## REFERENCES

- Aleksandr K. BIERICH, S. S. VOLKOV, Tatjana G. NIKITINA, 1993: *Slovar' russkoj frazeologičeskoj terminologii*. Pod redakcijej V. M. Mokienko. München: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- Harald BURGER, Annelies BUHOFER, Ambros SIALM, 1982: *Handbuch der Phraseologie*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Harald BURGER, 1989: »Bildhaft, übertragen, metaphorisch ...«. Zur Konfusion um die semantischen Merkmale von Phraseologismen. *Europhras 88. Phraséologie Contrastive*. Strasbourg. 17–29.
- 1998: *Phraseologie. Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- 2003: *Phraseologie. Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Deutschen*. 2., überarbeitete Auflage. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Dmitrij O. DOBROVOL'SKIJ, 1997: Nacional'no-kul'turnaja specifika vo frazeologii (I). *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6. 37–48.
- Wolfgang EISMANN, 2005: Zum mehrdimensionalen Spiel mit Phrasemen in den Stücken von E. Švarc. *Grani slova*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Elpis. 195–203.
- Stephan ELSPASS, 1998: *Phraseologie in der politischen Rede*. Opladen/Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Polona GANTAR, 2003: Stalnost in spremenljivost frazema v slovarju. *Współczesna polska i słoweńska sytuacja językowa / Sodobni jezikovni položaj na Poljskem in v Sloveniji*. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski – Instytut Filologii Polskiej i Opolskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk. 209–223.
- 2004: *Frazem in njegovo besedilno okolje*. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana.
- Velemir GJURIN, 1982: Slovenski slengovski frazeologemi kot besedne igre. *Nemzetközi Szlavisztikai napok*. Szombathely. 128–136.
- Gertrud GRÉCIANO, 1987: Idiom und sprachspielerische Textkonstitution. *Beiträge zur allgemeinen und germanistischen Phraseologieforschung*. Oulu. 193–206.
- Annelies HÄCKI-BUHOFER, 1989: Psycholinguistische Aspekte in der Bildhaftigkeit von Phraseologismen. *Europhras 88. Phraséologie Contrastive*. Strasbourg. 165–175.
- Werner KOLLER, 1977: *Redensarten. Linguistische Aspekte, Vorkommensanalysen, Sprachspiel*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Tomo KOROŠEC, 1978: Obnovitev v časopisnih naslovih. *Slavistična revija* 26/1. 147–160.
- Erika KRŽIŠNIK, 1987a: Prenovitev kot inovacijski postopek. *Slava* I/2. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 49–56.
- 1987b: Prenovitve stalnih besednih zvez v Kosmačevi prozi 30. let. *Obdobje socialnega realizma v slovenskem jeziku, književnosti in kulturi. Obdobja 7*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 517–532.
- 1988: *Frazeologija v moderni*. Magistrska naloga. Ljubljana.
- 1990: Tipologija frazeoloških prenovitev v Cankarjevih prozih. *Slavistična revija* XXXVIII/4. Ljubljana. 400–420.
- 1994a: *Slovenski glagolski frazemi*. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana.
- 1994b: Frazeologija v kratki pripovedni prozi druge polovice 19. stoletja. *XXX. Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Zbornik predavanj*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 53–67.
- 1996: Norma v frazeologiji in odstopi od nje v besedilih. *Slavistična revija* 44/2. Ljubljana. 133–154.
- 1998: Normativno v frazeologiji. *Zbornik Jezična norma i varieteti*. Zagreb – Rijeka: Hrvatsko društvo za primijenjenu lingvistiku. 283–294.

- 2004: »Fehler« beim Gebrauch von Phrasemen – Gründe für Entstehung und (Nicht)Erkennen. Eine empirische Untersuchung. *Europhras 2000*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag Brigitte Narr. 245–256.
- 2005: Frazeologija v luči kulture. *Večkulturnost v slovenskem jeziku literaturi in kulturi*. 41. SSJLK. Zbornik predavanj. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 67–81.
- George LAKOFF, Mark JOHNSON, 1980: *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London.
- Jozef MLACEK, 1977: *Slovenská frazeológia*. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- SSKJ = *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. I–V. Ljubljana 1970–1991.
- Veronika N. TELJA, 1986: *Konnotativnyj aspekt semantiki nominativnyh edinic*. Moskva.
- 1996: *Russkaja frazeologija. Semantičeskij, pragmatičeskij i lingvokul'turološki aspekti*. Moskva.
- Jože TOPORIŠIČ, 1964: *Pripovedna dela F. S. Finžgarja*. Ljubljana: Slovenska matica.
- 1973/74: K izrazju in tipologiji slovenske frazeologije. *Jezik in slovstvo* 19/8. Ljubljana. 295–305.
- Viktor V. VINOGRADOV, 1947: Ob osnovnyh tipah frazeoloških edinic v ruskom jazyke. Zb. A. A. Šahmatov. Moskva. 339–364.
- Barbara WOTNIAK, 1992: *Verbale Phraseolexeme in System und Text*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Vlas P. ŽUKOV, 1978: *Semantika frazeoloških edinic*. Moskva.

## POVZETEK

Semantično potenco frazema gradijo pomen proste besedne zveze (PBZ), pomen frazeološke besedne zveze (FBZ) in razmerje med obema pomenoma, ki je lahko motivirajoče – v tem primeru imenujemo PBZ podstavna PBZ (v literaturi imenovana tudi derivacijska baza), ali tudi ne – v tem primeru gre za izhodiščno PBZ (imenovana tudi homonimna). V zvezi s semantično potenco frazema se v frazeološki teoriji pojavljata dva temeljna pojma, t. i. »dvojno branje« frazema in »notranja forma« frazema, prvi v germanistični, drugi v rusistični literaturi. Pojma sta med seboj deloma prekrivna, saj oba opozarjata na lastnost frazemov kot sekundarnih jezikovnih znakov, sestavljenih iz drugih pomenonosnih znakov, in na njihovo posledično razpoložljivost za kreativne posege. Razlika med pojmovanjem semantične potence v okviru enega in drugega je časovni presek in predstava o načinu njene prisotnosti: pri dvojnem branju gre za sinhrono razumevanje, pri notranji formi za sinhrono in diahrono. Ko govorimo o kreativni izrabi semantične potence v besedilih, govorimo o tem izključno s sinhronega vidika. Podobno dvojnost izkazuje tudi razumevanje »slike« oz. »slikovitosti« frazema: figurativnost se nanaša na »sliko«, ki pomensko motivirajoče povezuje dva izraza (PBZ in FBZ), (čutna) nazornost frazema pa na »sliko« kot predstavo, ki jo evocirajo sestavine frazema (same na sebi).

Kreativni besedilni posegi v frazeme temeljijo na ustaljenosti njihove »podobe«, tj. oblike in pomena. Čeprav postaja zlasti v času, ko razpolagamo z obsežnimi besedilnimi zbirkami, ki prinašajo velike količine podatkov o realnih rabah, stalnost frazemov kot njihova definirajoča lastnost čedalje manj zanesljiva, norme v frazeologiji ni mogoče izključiti (je pa težje določljiva in v primerjavi z normo pri enobesedni leksiki tudi ohlapnejša). Eden izmed dokazov za obstoj norme je ravno dejstvo, da posegi vanjo lahko učinkujejo opazno in so funkcionalni. Napačne rabe frazemov je namreč od modifikacij mogoče odmejiti ravno na podlagi opaznosti. »Napak« so najprej v besedilu nefunkcionalne spremembe, dalje pa tudi nenamerne in nezavedne s strani tvorca in (večinoma) neprepoznane s strani naslovnika. Modifikacije pa so take spremenjene rabe oblike in/ali pomena frazema, ki so s strani tvorca večinoma zavestne, čeprav ne vedno namerne, v besedilu funkcionalne in od naslovnika prepoznane oz. lahko prepoznane,

kajti za to morata biti izpolnjena dva nujna pogoja: poznavanje in razumevanje izhodiščnega frazema ter (vsaj intuitivno) poznavanje in razumevanje postopka jezikovnih inovacij. V slovenski frazeologiji se je več kot o modifikacijah govorilo o (frazoloških) prenovitvah. Vprašanje, ki se zastavlja, je: ali preprosto preimenujemo prenovitve v modifikacije ali iskati razločevalne lastnosti. Smotrnejše se zdi drugo, kajti če tipologije upoštevajo na eni strani take modifikacije, ki temeljijo zgolj na oblikovni spremembi frazema brez kakršnekoli spremembe pomena, na drugi pa vse ostale spremembe, potem je mogoče govoriti o dveh stopnjah kreativne izrabe semantične potence frazema. Prva stopnja so modifikacije, ki se dogajajo znotraj potencialne norme frazema, ali drugače – z vidika pojmovanja frazemov kot enega od konvencionaliziranih jezikovnih izrazil za konceptualno metaforo – so take spremembe, ki ne načenjajo konceptualne vsebine jezikovnega izraza (npr. razširitev variantnega frazema *požreti/snesti/pojesti besedo* z modifikacijo *pogoltniti besedo* – ob ustreznem sobesedilu – je modifikacija znotraj konceptualne metafore BESEDE SO HRANA). Prenovitve so naslednja stopnja: zanje je ob spremenjeni ali nespremenjeni obliki frazema značilna vzpostavitev (raznoverstne) interakcije med pomenoma FBZ in PBZ, in sicer ali podstavne ali izhodiščne PBZ – v prvem primeru gre za remotivacijo, v drugem za podobesedenje. Raziskava prenovitev v slovenskih umetnostnih in neumetnostnih besedilih kaže, da je od zadnjega odvisna »globina« poseganja frazeološke enote v aktualno sobesedilo: medtem ko proces podobesedenja ostaja na ravni besedne igre, proces remotivacije preko postopka demetaforizacije lahko vodi v nove (kreativne) metaforizacije.