

### Operational phraseology as a paradigm for studying e.g. segmentless phraseologisms

The most prominent Polish phraseological theories (Bąba 2009; Chlebda 2003; Lewicki 2003; Skorupka 1967) do not account for or describe language facts which are segmentless. The fundamental operational concept used in these theories, the *phraseologism*, necessitates that objects studied be verbal. As a result, descriptions ignore such elements of *langue* as the matrix *czyjś<sub>-i</sub> ktoś<sub>-j</sub>* – 'equivalent *j* belonging to community *i*', whose textual realisations in Slavic languages can assume such forms as *polski Jim Carrey*, *český Elvis Presley*, *hrvatski Churchill* and *русский Пелё*. The phraseology research paradigm which renders it possible to register nonlexical and phraseologised, i.e. semantically and/or grammatically irregular, language system constituents is operational phraseology (based on the operational grammar framework developed by Bogusławski), the theoretical foundations of which I will present in my speech (and which are presented in my paper).

The main concept used in operational phraseology is the *phraseologism-generating matrix*, which I define as an irregularly-functioning language unit in the form of a syntactic-prosodic schema partially filled with lexical content or containing no segmental indicators, featuring stable semantic content, fundamentally adapted to be actualised in texts by filling it with various lexical units belonging to open substitution classes. The function of fixed open spaces in the unit (spaces which must be filled with lexical constituents during a communicative event) is not limited to accepting constituents attested by regular collocation mechanisms.

This definition requires elaboration: a language unit is, according to Bogusławski (1978), a part of *langue*, – a minimal, formally and functionally distinctive, complete, bilateral (constituting a combination of form and meaning) language quantity used for creating syntactic groups and sentences. A syntactic-prosodic schema is a syntactic schema, that is part of a formal unit (cf. Chlebda 2005: 28), which carries the meaning and suprasegmental values which are realised by speakers when using the unit in communicative situations. That a syntactic schema may carry a stable semantic value has already been noted by Wierzbicka (1987) and Stefanowitsch (2007: 40-41), for example. So construed, a schema – as an invariant – becomes part of the code via its textual realisations (cf. Мокиенко 1980:13), which I term *actual phraseologisms* (in this sense, a phraseologism-generating matrix generates actual phraseologisms). A non-closed substitution class is a set of elements which can be characterised in general and which can be substituted with one another in texts. For example, the first opening in the matrix *czyjś<sub>-i</sub> ktoś<sub>-j</sub>*, marked by the quasi-variable *czyjś<sub>-i</sub>*, represents the open class of 'adjective referring to the membership of the referent to a particular community' (in speech, this space may thus be occupied by words such as *polski* or *hrvatski*), while the pronoun *ktoś<sub>-j</sub>* refers to the general class of 'a noun phrase which is a proper noun' (which can be filled with such nouns as *Presley* or *Пелё*). Matrices generate series of actual phraseologisms, resulting in the appearance that systemic lexico-semantic collocation rules are being exploited. In actuality, however, the open spaces in the matrix *czyjś<sub>-i</sub> ktoś<sub>-j</sub>*, for example, are filled with regular words, but the resulting syntagmas are irregular, i.e. they violate the rules of lexico-semantic collocation – *polski Jim Carrey* is not *Jim Carrey* who is Polish.

Prosodic idiosyncrasies can for example be found in the matrix  $\parallel w \mid ' ' w \downarrow \parallel$ , which was first described by Dobaczewski et al. (2018: 201-203) and whose meaning is 'the speaker unambiguously clears an uncertainty expressed by another speaker, indicating that the solution should be treated as something obvious' (prosodic indicator symbols:  $\parallel$  – phonological phrase boundary;  $\mid$  – rhythmic unit boundary;  $'$  – contrastive sentence stress;  $\downarrow$  – cadence). The unit in question (the researchers referenced here do not use the term *phraseologism-generating matrix*) generates such actual phraseologisms as *przyjdę, przyjdę* ('I'm coming, I 'm coming', in response to the question '*przyjdiesz w piątek na imprezę?*' – 'are you coming to the party on Friday?') and *śpiewaj, śpiewaj* ('sing, sing!', in response to

the utterance '*chyba już wystarczająco rozgrzałem głos*' – 'I think I've warmed up my voice enough by now'). A spectral analysis conducted in Praat for the purpose of verifying Dobaczewski's findings (2018: 113-116) concluded that, in line with his results, contrastive stress is actually placed on the stressed syllable of the repeated element (with a high syllable tone), and the final syllable features a sharp intonation drop, resulting in a cadence-like melody in the final rhythmic unit (medium syllable tone). The intonation of the first constituent of the actual phraseologisms *przyjdę, przyjdę* and *śpiewaj, śpiewaj* is markedly lower and weaker compared to the second constituent. This interpretation applies exclusively to variants which are realised within a single phonological phrase. As an example, the sequence *przyjdę, przyjdę*, when uttered as two separate phrases, does not fit the aforementioned matrix (and so does not necessarily clear the doubts expressed by the original speaker), does not feature a special intonation contour, is a textual combination of two separate units and is thus of more research interest for construction grammar, for example.

The set of phraseologism-generating matrices does not include the construction  $N_{nom}$  w  $N_{acc}$ , – 'what we are referring to in the sentence occurs in such a way that two or more objects we are referring to are next to one another', which has also been described by Dobaczewski et al. (2018: 253-254). This construction generates such sequences as *obaj zawodnicy **bold** w **bold** pokonywali trzy zakręty* (both racers made it past three turns neck and neck) and *ramię w ramię stoją oparci w oknie* (they are leaning in the window shoulder to shoulder). The meaning ascribed to this construction is not, contrary to scientific consensus, arbitrary in the Saussurean sense. When we apply Lakoff and Johnson's rule of more form = more meaning (1980: 126), the iconic motivation of the unit emerges: the short distance between the word forms *ramię* (nominative) and *ramię* (accusative) on the textual level symbolises the short physical distance between the two referents described by the expression. The violation of systemic lexico-semantic collocation rules (the meaning of the sequence *ramię w ramię* is not equal to the sum of the meanings of its constituents) has been accepted in the usus as it offers users of Polish cognitive value unavailable by other means (cf. Grice 1977; Sperber, Wilson 1986). The iconic motivation is what makes the construction a textual realisation (and not part of *langue*).

In conclusion, operational phraseology studies constructions which do not feature segmental indicators, for example. Its primary unit is the phraseologism-generating matrix (an element of the language system), which generates actual phraseologisms. The criteria for constituting a matrix include multicomponentality (components include formal, semantic, pragmatic and prosodic), which manifests on the surface of the text in the form of multi-word sequences (I agree with the thesis on the primacy of sound substance in language); semantic and/or grammatical irregularity; social dissemination and reproducibility. The examples used in this outline come from the Monco, Sketch Engine and National Corpus of Polish corpora. The expressions analysed in Praat are part of a private collection of Polish utterance recordings.

#### References

- Bąba S. 2009. *Frazeologia polska. Studia i szkice*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo "Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne".
- Bogusławski A. 1978. Towards on Operational Grammar. *Studia Semiotyczne* VIII (pp. 29-90).
- Grice H. P. 1977. Logika i konwersacja, *Przegląd Humanistyczny* 6 (pp. 85-99).
- Chlebda W. 2003. *Elementy frazeologii. Wprowadzenie do frazeologii nadawcy*. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem.
- Chlebda W. 2005. *Szkice o skrzydlatych słowach. Interpretacje lingwistyczne*. Opole: Wydawnictwo UO.
- Dobaczewski A. 2018. *Powtórzenie jako zjawisko tekstowe i systemowe*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Dobaczewski A. et al. 2018. *Słownik reduplikacji i powtórzeń polskich*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK.
- Lakoff G., Johnson M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewicki A. M. 2003. *Studia z teorii frazeologii*. Łask: Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem.
- Skorupka S. 1967. *Słownik frazeologiczny języka polskiego*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Sperber D., Wilson D. 1986. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stefanowitsch A. 2007. Wortwiederholungen im Englischen und Deutschen: eine korpuslinguistische Annäherung. In A. Ammann & A. Urdze (Eds.), *Wiederholung, Parallelismus, Reduplikation: Strategien der multiplen Strukturanwendung*, Diversitas Linguarum (pp. 29-45). Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Wierzbicka A. 1987. Boys Will Be Boys: 'Radical Semantics' vs. 'Radical Pragmatics'. *Language* 63, 1 (pp. 95-114).
- Мокиенко В. М. 1980. *Славянская фразеология*. Москва: Высшая школа.