

Absurd verbal complexes as a kind of phraseological units

Complejos verbales absurdos como una especie de unidades fraseológicas

Complexos verbais absurdos como uma espécie de unidade fraseológica

¹ Gulmar Israfilova Faxraddin *

¹ Azerbaijan University of Languages. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8923-8901>

*Autor para la correspondencia: gulmar.aliyeva@gmail.com

Abstract

The article describes phraseological units with absurd semantics that are presented in cognitive linguistics as models for analyzing phraseological units and metaphors that do not have frontal descriptive power. Special attention is paid to the internal form of absurd constructions of phraseological units, which requires a distinctive attitude towards the concept of the internal form of logically "correct" and logically "incorrect" categories. It was determined that the construction of the internal form of absurd constructions presupposes the obligatory interaction of three "correlative" systems: a) false unity b) representation of images, c) understanding and consciousness. The linguistic-cognitive model of describing absurd constructions necessarily includes all the described structures (concept, internal form, linguistic image of the world, nominative and interpretive field), although they are not strictly limited to these.

Keywords: absurd verbal complexes, paremiological units, phraseological units

Resumen

El artículo describe unidades fraseológicas con semántica absurda que se presentan en la lingüística cognitiva como modelos para analizar unidades fraseológicas y metáforas que no tienen un poder descriptivo frontal. Se presta especial atención a la forma interna de construcciones absurdas de unidades fraseológicas, que requiere una actitud distintiva hacia el concepto de la forma interna de las categorías lógicamente "correctas" y lógicamente "incorrectas". Se determinó que, la construcción de la forma interna de las construcciones absurdas presupone la interacción obligatoria de tres sistemas "correlativos": a) unidad falsa b) representación de imágenes, c) comprensión y conciencia. El modelo lingüístico-cognitivo de describir construcciones absurdas incluye necesariamente todas las estructuras descritas (concepto, forma interna, imagen lingüística del mundo, campo nominativo e interpretativo), aunque no están limitadas estrictamente a estas.

Palabras clave: complejos verbales absurdos, unidades paremiológicas, unidades fraseológicas

Resumo (português)

O artigo descreve unidades fraseológicas com semântica absurda que são apresentadas na linguística cognitiva como modelos de análise de unidades fraseológicas e metáforas que não possuem poder descritivo frontal. Atenção especial é dada à forma interna de construções absurdas de unidades fraseológicas, o que requer uma atitude distinta em relação ao conceito de forma interna de categorias logicamente "corretas" e logicamente "incorretas". Foi determinado que a construção da forma interna das construções absurdas pressupõe a interação obrigatória de três sistemas "correlativos": a) falsa unidade b) representação de imagens, c) compreensão e consciência. O modelo linguístico-cognitivo de descrição de construções absurdas inclui necessariamente todas as estruturas descritas (conceito, forma interna, imagem lingüística do mundo, campo nominativo e interpretativo), embora não se limite estritamente a estas.

Palavras-chave: complexos verbais absurdos, unidades paremiológicas, unidades fraseológicas

Introduction

Absurd semantics pertains to linguistic expressions or statements that exhibit an unusual or perplexing quality and whose truth values are often challenging to determine (Gérard, 1982). Such expressions serve as rigorous assessments for theories of linguistic interpretation, as they put our intuitions about truth conditions to the test and can uncover deficiencies in our comprehension of

semantics and pragmatics (Singh, 2007). Instances of absurd semantics encompass for example, paradoxical proverbs, assertions related to preferences, credence, and choices, and deontic inferences that amalgamate various sentence types. In certain instances, the utility of absurd semantics extends to illustrating the constraints of formal logic and the necessity for frameworks that are many-sorted, allowing for the accommodation of the distinct logical attributes of propositions, norms, and actions (Goranko, 2021).

Absurd semantics has been the main topic of research by several scientists, such as A. N. Baranov, E. Benveniste, V. Vinogradov, Z.D. Popova, I.A. Sternin, who devoted great attention to this branch of linguistics. Due to its close connection with world culture, national, stylistic and emotionally expressive coloring, phraseology has always attracted the attention of linguists and because of that, many scientific works have been devoted to the study of phraseological units with absurd semantics. In this regard, absurd complexes are an important part of national thinking and ethno-cultural vision of the world. They are built on the basis of incorrect lexical models and have a common semantic structure "from the reverse". These phrases are universal for Russian and English, but they may have differences in figurative bases. They function within the same semantic fields, using circumstantial "determinants" and implicit negation.

These structures have a stable dominant form and are part of the socio-linguistic base. Let's add that absurd phrases can be used in different spheres of life, for example, in literature, in everyday speech or in humor. They can be used to create a comic effect exemplified by the utilization of nonsensical stock witticisms, which employ wordplay to craft illogical and absurd constructs for humorous effect (Brezolin, 2023), or to convey a certain mood. In addition, absurd phrases can be used to create new words and expressions, which is one of the ways of language development. (Baranov & Dobrovolsky, 2013) writes about this: "The logic of practical argument includes as one of the most important components of an axiological representation, i.e. a certain set of knowledge organized in a definite form about the ways of assessing situations and their parts, which is the basis of the choice of certain practical actions". Studying paremiological units from the point of view of the presented "axiological strategies", and concludes: "Proverbs and sayings are exceptional material for studying the laws of natural logic, its axiological laws and the analysis of evaluation strategies fixed in the language" (p. 80).

So, the absurd verbal complexes that we currently use are a special kind of phraseological units that fit into the common system of the language in terms of architectonics and general sense. They also express the national-cultural component of sense. They have a certain meaning and are used in various contexts. It is interesting that absurd verbal complexes can be created both intentionally and accidentally. Thus, absurd verbal combinations are an important element of language and reflect the

cultural and social characteristics of our time. Then, a comparative study of absurd paremiological units in the Russian and English languages acquires substantial theoretical and practical significance. Considering this, the purpose of this article is to analyze the main phraseological units with absurd semantics in order to explain morphological models of construction of these units in English and Russian. The insufficient number of articles devoted to the study of phraseological units with absurd semantic structures makes our research especially significant.

Materials and methods

To develop the work, various research methods were used according to the nature of the topic investigated. Among these we highlight the use of text analysis techniques (Sanders and Sanders, 2006) such as sentiment analysis, topic analysis, corpus analysis, cohesion and coherence analysis, etc. We mainly focused on corpus analysis in which it is carried out a systematic examination of texts, phrases, etc., referred to as a corpus, with the objective of acquiring insights and extracting significant information pertaining to language utilization, patterns, and structures (Huang and Yao, 2015).

On the other hand, the use of the comparative linguistic method allowed to explore how diverse cultures and languages influence the manifestation of grammatical absurdity. This examination has unveiled both cultural disparities in the formulation of humor and inherent structural distinctions in grammar. Additionally, the scrutiny of how absurd expressions are translated and adjusted when transitioning from one language to another provides a comprehensive perspective on the intricate interplay between language and culture. Ultimately, the practice of cross-linguistic comparison enhances the comprehension of absurdist semantics, thereby illuminating the extensive linguistic and cultural variations inherent in the conception and interpretation of linguistic humor. This research approach finds extensive application in disciplines such as linguistics, psychology, education, and other domains (Christiansen et al. 2022; Gozalova et al. 2022).

Results and discussion

Language is a complex object, and it can be defined not only as a way of communication, but also as an item and the basic sphere of human cognitive activity. The development of these scientific paradigms has predetermined the spread of opinion about the necessity to involve native speakers in research devoted to the study of language units at various levels. This is especially relevant for phraseology, since the appeal to the linguistic competence of informants is an essential guarantee of the explanatory of the achieved results, and also opens up new prospects in the study of a number of theoretical propositions, the answer to which cannot be obtained within the framework of traditional theory (Dobrovolsky and Karaulov, 1994).

Phraseology was first mentioned in the works of the Swiss linguist of French origin Charles Bally (1865-1947). In his book “An Essay on Stylistics”, he identified four groups of phrases : 1) free phrases - combinations deprived of stability, disintegrating after formation; 2) habitual combinations – combinations with a relatively free connection of components, where only one of the components is allowed to vary; 3) phraseological series - a group of words, in which two ordinary concepts merge almost into one; 4) phraseological unity - combination in which words have lost their meaning and express a single inseparable concept. (Bally, 2001, p. 29) Thus, Bally distinguished “combinations of words according to their degree of stability: 1) combinations that consist of a freedom of grouping of components, 2) combinations that do not have such freedom” (p. 31). Although the same author did not give a detailed description of these groups and only outlined them schematically, his ideas laid the foundation for identifying phraseological connections and developing a theory of equivalence of a phraseological unit.

Regarding the absurd phraseological units presented in analytical cognitive cognition do not have the general characteristic necessary to describe their content. A special role belongs to the internal form of absurd models of phraseological units, which requires a differentiated attitude to the concept of the internal form of the designated two large categories of phraseological units (logically "correct" and logically "incorrect"). This question is quite complicated in terms of formulation, since even the slightest diachronic changes in the formal structure of phraseological units often deprive SVC (stable verbal complexes) of the properties of semantic stability, bringing them to another semantic-figurative level, i.e., to the level of another concept and another picture of the world.

When we talk about the need for a differentiated attitude to the marked two categories of phraseological units (logically "correct" and logically "incorrect"), we mean first of all one very significant (cognitively) point, consisting of the fact that "correct" phraseological units are expressions of the so-called stating thinking (for example: to throw dust in the eyes, pull the wool over someone's eyes; to rake in the heat with someone else's hands, make a cat's-paw of other people, etc.), and "incorrect" phraseological units represent linguocreative thinking (your calf gored our wolf, the sky collapsed on its head- may heaven fall asunder, etc.) In such cases it is difficult to speak about the statement in its strict sense: it is impossible to state what does not coincide with the logic of reality, what does not exist. Here we can talk about the statement of "tall tales", lies. And in order to lie, you need to have a sufficiently high level of abstract thinking that allows you to put facts upside down.

For such intended manipulation, it is necessary to have the ability (mental) to distract from reality and move into the sphere of the virtual world, not given in experience: children, as we know from

psychology, cannot lie until the age of three because they do not have a sufficient degree of abstract thinking. And this means having the ability to create your own, new world not coincided with the real picture of the world, to create a world that does not respond to the systemic laws of not only the everyday worldview, but also the norms of dialectics. To create such a linguistic world, one should have a large safety margin in the sense of an intellectual "contraband" invasion into a particular area of knowledge, a creative invasion into the cognitive system of the recipient, who represents the same social world of language as the speaker-creative subject: in the verbal memory of the listener, this method of secondary nomination is fixed in the same way as in the speaker, which is the basis for the thoroughly functioning of these nomination signs.

The above allows us to draw some conclusions about the functioning of logically irregular phraseological constructions:

- a) These forms of secondary nomination are not an accidental phenomenon in the language system, they systematically correlate with logically "correct" compositions of phraseological units, determining not only their linguistic status, but also the linguistic reality the units according to the formula denoting "negative proves the reality of positive";
- b) The consistency of the marked form of the "inverted" nomination is also proved by its linguistic universality: apparently, there are no languages without a phraseological foundation, just as there are no phraseological systems without a real opposition of the two observed layers of phraseological constructions (correct and incorrect), which are special forms of lexicalization of stable verbal complexes;
- c) The multilayered nature of not only the structure, but also the content plan (especially the internal form) of the observed units requires a special, specific modeling of their cognitive and linguocognitive analysis, as the previously known models of frontal cognitive analysis of phraseological units turn out to be narrow enough for the linguocognitive interpretation of analytically (logically) incorrect phraseological structures;
- d) These phraseological units are more solid material for illustrating the anthropocentric principles of the linguistic field and for proving the concept that language reflects not the observable world as such, but the "artistic" world created by language, i.e., the world immersed in the system of its subjective comprehension, subjective reconstruction.

The above-mentioned "strategies" qualify constructions of cognitively irregular meanings as special linguistic means that objectify (linguistically) certain concepts in their own original way. Therefore, these constructions, in our opinion, do not quite adequately fit into the framework of the interpretive scheme proposed by representatives of semantic-cognitive research and this stage of the

linguocognitive research procedure that "translates" language data into cognitive one allows us to start to model the concept" (Popova & Sternin, 2010; Potebnya, 1976).

The method of cognitive interpretation used by the named authors description of the semantics of units of the nominative field, the establishment of the semes forming the meaning of different linguistic units nominating the concept, the system correlation of various semantic extensions of the concept and the ranking of cognitive features by zones – core, periphery and interpretative field, etc.; see Popova and Sternin (2010) does not achieve the desired goal, as the proposed model covers the sphere of normal metaphorical and phraseological constructions unambiguously perceived by the speaker/listener, in which only one of the components is used, so-called allegorical (figuratively). Allegory is always perceived as a natural applying in adequate communication conditions: "a living corpse" is perceived adequately, due to the real possibility of polysemy of the word "corpse", which very often turns out to be in the nominative field.

Apparently, the same interpretation is required by the designations "walking death", "living legend", "walking encyclopedia", etc., in the semantic structure of which there is a hint of some alogism, analytical incompatibility of semantic features. In addition, nominative units in the sense of an oxymoronic combination of features turn out to be more transparent and "readable" due to their specific correlation with a separate referent – an object, a phenomenon.

Predicative constructions with analytical absurdity of semantics are a phenomenon of a different ways of proceeding order. These are the names of a non-referential artificial "situation". This alone already makes these constructions in somehow sense unmanageable or difficult to model. The most difficult thing is to establish the nominative field of the concept presented in these statements: the lexemes included in their structure cannot participate in the definition of the nominative field of the concept, as it is customary to use it in ordinary, logically correct expressions. So, for example, the procedure for establishing the nominative field of the concept of "unity of command" in the statement "two bears in one den will not get along" is carried out on the basis of the analysis of the lexeme words included to the statement, since these lexeme words are mainly used in dictionary meanings. They are also used in several proverbial and phraseological units for example: a bear has stepped on the ear; to be afraid of a bear – do not go into the forest; like a bear bends the arc; do not go into the bear's den, etc. Such a procedure for establishing the nominative field of the concept turns out to be ineffective and far from optimality when applied to absurd concepts such as: "send him for death", "the dog bit off the tail", "slurps soup with an awl (and then shakes it off)".

As for the interpretative field of the observed absurd constructions, the procedure for identifying it (in the form in which it is usually used) also turns out to be ineffective due to the complete lack of logical correlation of a) the concept presented in absurd constructions and the concept presented in

phraseological units with similar lexical and grammatical content; b) the absence of associative connection of the semantic structure of the absurd model with the semantic field created by other statements existing in the language with the similar predicate elements. To illustrate what has been said, we refer to the procedure for establishing the interpretative field of the concept "Russian language", which Popova and Sternin (2010) offer as a model of such analysis:

1. Paremiophraseological units are involved for cognitive interpretation, which includes a complex of cognitive features;
2. The paremiophraseological meanings forming the interpretative field are also ordered according to the field principle, i.e., microfields;
3. The materials of the relevant dictionaries and collections of Russian proverbs, sayings, phraseological units are analyzed to establish the corpus of these units, in which the concept of language ("speech") is presented and objectifies such cognitive features as a) language has a great influence; b) language makes a person talkative; c) it is easier to speak than to work; d) "the most relevant for native speakers of the Russian language is the cognitive sign of the priority of silence" (p.15).

Such a multi-stage procedure is possible primarily because the concept of "Russian language" represents the semantic-field and cognitive features of the word "language" (speech, to speak), being a reference word with the related meaning in a whole complex of stable constructions. Meanwhile, the interpretative and nominative fields of absurd constructions cannot be objectified within the procedure proposed above, since constructions "just like a poker" function not due to their lexical content, but due to a model, a special construction of the collision of the meanings of words-poles (incompatible conceptual meanings) within one expression.

Consequently, a strong cognitive description of "analytically incorrect" structures, in addition to all procedures applied to ordinary logically correct structures, strictly presupposes the inclusion, of a preliminary recognition of the internal form of these structures, which differs from the internal form of correct structures by its originality, multistory. This is followed by the qualification of the features of the objectified linguistic worldview, which also reveals a specific approach to the construction of this fragment of the worldview.

The concepts presented in these constructions are of a systematic nature: they cover all (or almost all) semantic fields of the Russian language, thereby demonstrating their non-peripheral status; examples of time are (when a cancer whistles on the mountain; when a stone floats in the sea; when sand rises on a stone; when the devil dies- he hasn't been ill yet).

As it turns out, the conceptual basis of the semantics of absurd constructions is focused on negative meanings: the main specificity of these constructions lies in the explication of negative concepts, positive meanings in this sphere that does not exist. Alogism is not typical for positive evaluation strategies examples in English and Russian are:

- Place: in the middle of nowhere, where the raven's bones are, to show where wasps sting (*у черта на рогах; куда ворон костей не заносил; показать, где раки зимуют*);
- Uselessness (work, deeds); to twist a rope from sand; you need like a dead poultice (*из песка веревку вить; нужно как мертвому припарки*);
- Stupidity (speech, actions): your dog has stolen our ladder; strong with humility – rich in poverty; the poor lights a lamp to count the government's money. (*собака куцему зайцу хвост откусила; силен смирением – богат нищетой; пропали воры от добрых людей; прям как кочерга; и то бывает, что овца волка съедает; подковать было козла, чтобы мерин не падал; сани заартачились, от чего лошадь стала*);
- Lies: a good story catches the eye; not the kind to rob the naked; a good story catches the eye (*ложь (вранье), блоха проскочила, стол повалила; не из таких, чтобы грабить нагих; сорока на хвосте принесла*);
- Irony-sarcasm: the slave killed himself to hurt the master; we live with a beggar in the stewards; my father did not give me a hat, so let my ears freeze; to spite my mother-in-law, I will put out my eye so that her son-in-law was crooked (*ирония-сарказм: заживо живет: и голодной собаки выманить нечем; только и серебряной посуды, что сучки в бревнах; живем у нищего в управителях; больно ранен – и головы не нашли; сжалился волк над ягненком, покинул кости да кожу; не дал шапки отец, так пусть уши мерзнут; назло теще выколю себе глаз, чтоб у нее зять был кривой*);
- Avarice: from a flea to cut a boot; every penny (from someone) nailed with a golden nail; tear the fiber bast from the stone; remove the hemp from the dermis; there is plenty of money but no purse to put in, you can't ask for snow in the middle of winter (*из блохи голенище кроить; всякая копейка (у кого-то) алтынным гвоздем прибита; с камня лыки драть; с дерма пеньку снимать; денег много, да кошель не на что купить; среди зимы снега не выпросишь*).

Determining the parameters of the internal form of the analyzed constructions is complicated by the fact that a) here reliance on the "nearest etymological form" is not acceptable, if only because it has been completely erased and b) lexical and grammatical elements and the structure of these constructions themselves have no direct connection with the presented concept. So, for example, in the logically correct expression "stingy pays twice" *«скупой платит дважды»*, the lexeme

composition of the construction in a certain way indicates the concept of "stinginess". There is no such correlation (connection) of the lexical and grammatical composition of absurd expressions with their concept basis.

In these constructions, unlike logically correct phraseological units, the functional-semantic effect arises in the process of collision of logically inadequate, unequal entities, i.e. those who "in life" do not assume each other, who not only do not correlate semantically (they are from different semantic fields), but also cannot enter into known models of logical correlations: so, in the case of "a dog bit off a hare's tail" «собака куцему зайцу хвост откусила». This quasi-correlation consists of naive lies ("short" means "tailless" - it is impossible to bite off something that does not really exist). From the false information of irreducible entities, and in cases of "threatening a pike to drown it in a lake" «грозить щуке утонуть ее в озере», quasi-correlation causes a collision of the concept of threat (punishment) to someone by what this someone lives and breathes. The ironic effect in this case is stem precisely from the fact that the plan of punishment turns into a vital condition for the punished, i.e., a kind of encouragement, a gift from God.

Consequently, such cases of an absurd collision of entities turn out to be not the primary way for functioning the phraseology by the image, but the "image by the image": "The internal form, in addition to the actual unity of the image, also gives knowledge of this unity: it is not an image of an object, but a representation" (Potebnya, 1976, p. 147). As can be seen, A.Potebnya connects the internal form in such cases not with the etymology of the linguistic unit, but with "psychological ideas about the motivation of meaning" (Potebnya, 1976, p. 131).

Thus, modeling of the internal form of absurd constructions presupposes a mandatory correlation of three "correlating" systems: a) false, logically absurd unity of surface entities (pike – lake; tail of a short hare – biting off this tail, etc.), b) image-representation of incommensurability and, therefore, improbability of this correlation of entities and c) comprehension, awareness of this incommensurability as a secondary effect, for which phraseology is structured and thanks to what it functions in the language. With such a trinity of semantic structure parameters, logically incorrect constructions are opposed to other phraseological units in the general system of phraseology of the language. Such a complicated model of the internal form underlies the linguistic picture of the world, which is represented by the analyzed constructions.

The linguistic picture of the world, structured by absurd phraseological units, has its own specifics in the "plan of dividing reality" reflected in these units. As we have already noted on previous pages, these constructions dissect the extra-linguistic reality indirectly, i.e., according to the principle of "from the opposite". This means the representation of the world not within the objectively perceived in the spatial-temporal parameters of fragments of the world picture

characterized for logically correct phraseoconstructions, but the representation of the named world in the form of "inside out", in the form, i.e., according to the model "it doesn't happen this way, just like this". Notice that cutting tops out of fleas is a lie, an impossible idea, an absurdity, but sometimes the avarice of a person reaches such an absurdity that he/she intends to it anyway.

And the absurdity of the picture lies not so much in the fact that it is impossible to cut a boot from a flea, as in the absurdity of the desire of the miserly to benefit even from the impossible mystical. And this is the limit of avarice, which can be described in words; as they say, there is nowhere further. The maximalism of avarice, described by other linguistic units can be for example, a miser saves up for someone else; a miser is his own first enemy; the miser is not the one who knows the price of money, but the one who does not remember himself in love with money, etc. People come up with all sorts of spectacular expressions for a more emotionally imaginative representation of the concept of "stinginess" and for its logically more correct and accurate (alogism is the reverse side of a fragment of the world picture, without positive and negative) nominations. In other words, a more voluminous description of the concept is achieved by mastering the "reverse effect" model. Exactly this reverse effect forms the basis of the structuring of the picture of the world observed in absurd constructions.

If the description of the linguistic picture includes a) a description of the division of the world reflected in certain linguistic units, b) a description of national identity by semantic differences of these units and c) identification of endemic linguistic units (Popova and Sternin, 2010, p. 65), and logically stems from this corpus of requirements that separate classes of linguistic units (lexemes, combinations of metaphorical character phraseological units, paremiological units, etc.) require a differentiated attitude, the development of some general models of the representation of the linguistic picture of the world in all individual cases will involve clarification, related to the specifics of certain classes and categories of these units. Moreover, as (Popova and Sternin 2010, p. 67) rightly notes, a necessary element of the procedure for identifying the parameters of the linguistic picture of the world is the comparison of the functional and semantic parameters of the noted classes of language units with the same parameters of units from other languages. Our fragmentary involvement of Russian and English language material represents exactly these purposes.

The nominative field of a concept in absurd constructions also presupposes its identification through consideration of all linguistic – phraseological units that somehow objectify this concept. In order to restore the structure of the concept, Pimenova (2004) writes that it is necessary to investigate the entire language corpus in which the concept is represented (lexical units,

phraseology, paremiological fund), including a system of stable comparisons that capture standard images peculiar to a particular language.

Consequently, the nominative field of a concept presented in absurd constructions will consist of the totality of all linguistic units in which this concept is expressed. In this regard, absurd constructions reveal the same systemic character as other paremio-phraseological units. So, the construction "to look for (someone) in the afterlife with lanterns" «*на том свете с фонарями искать (кого-то)*», representing the concept of "(deep, feeble) old age", receives support in the conceptualization by the following linguistic units: to breathe in incense, he has been waiting for (looking for) for a long time in the next world, with one foot in the grave, for him on the other world has been receiving provisions for a long time, the angel of death forgot about him, an infirm old man who fell (slept) with forces, life (to someone) has become a burden (*дышать в ладан, его на том свете давно ждут (ищут), одной ногой в могиле стоит, для него на том свете давно провизию получают, Мафусаиловы года (лета) живет, ангел смерти про него забыл, немощный старик, упавший (спавший) с сил, жизнь (кому-то) обузой стала*).

Synonymous relations, which include the expression "they are looking for him in the afterlife with lanterns" with the marked complex of linguistic units, testifies to the consistency of the nominative field not only of the concept of "(deep) old age", but also of the most absurd expression "they are looking for him in the world with lanterns" despite its figurative structure is absurdity.

On the other hand, the interpretative field is an obligatory element of the concept structure. It includes all the cognitive features that underlie the informational content of the concept. For constructions with an absurd structure of the semantic image, the interpretive field will include:

- a) A qualification (axiological) zone combining cognitive signs and properties representing strategic concepts beautiful/ugly, kind/evil, good/bad, etc. - a week without a year (inexperienced, novice, bad);
- b) General recognition, general information zone of cognitive signs signaling the speaker's erudition and the degree of representation of the concept in information sources: - to cut a chicken that lays golden eggs (a fairy tale where a chicken laid golden eggs, a bride with a large dowry, a wife with rich relatives, fairy tales for children);
- c) The zone of prescriptive information – cognitive signs regulating actions indicated by the concept: -to share the skin of an unkillable bear (one should not get carried away with abstract ideas; one should not associate oneself with unrealistic tasks; first the fact, and then its comprehension, etc.).

d) Zone of connection of the concept with the socio-cultural and cultural way of life of the people: -to catch God by the beard; to catch the firebird by the tail, the belief in happiness, that God helps the strong.

A fairly objective qualification of the interpretative field of the concept is given in the above-mentioned book by Popova and Sternin: "The interpretative field, like air, forms the concept, completes it, fills the "place" between its structural elements – this is the least structuring part of the concept, it can even be described as a recitation of features" (p. 113).

Conclusions

Absurd complex verbs are constructions within absurd semantics in which the deliberate manipulation of words and their meanings aim to create expressions that make no logical sense or are contradictory in a given context. This manipulation is carried out for humorous, creative, or expressive purposes. Words and phrases are used in a way that challenges conventional linguistic expectations and often seeks to generate surprise or bewilderment in the recipient. The study of this field is important in the context of phraseology because it allows us to explore how language can be flexible and creative, even when it deviates from traditional rules of meaning and word structure. In addition, it allows us to learn more about how semantics works at a deeper level and how words acquire meanings based on their context and relationship with other words. It has been proven a valuable tool in comedy, literature, and poetry, allowing writers and artists to play with language in unusual and creative ways to provoke emotional or intellectual reactions in their audiences.

This work it was analyzed how the linguocognitive model of describing absurd constructions (i.e. constructions representing the world in its non-existent - impossible status) includes complex structures related to concepts, internal forms, linguistic pictures of the world, and the nominative and interpretative fields although it can also be characterized some additional qualifiers that are insignificant for them and do not constitute essential elements of the general cognitive paradigm of these constructions.

References

- Bally, C. (2001). *An Essay on Stylistics*. Editorial Board of the USSR.
- Baranov, A.N. & Dobrovolsky, D.O. (2013). *Fundamentals of phraseology (short course)*. Flint: Science.
- Brezolin, A. (2023). Brief analysis of nonsense stock witticisms in Brazilian portuguese. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, 6(3), <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejll.v6i3.416>

- Christiansen, M.H., Kallens, P.C. & Trecca, F. (2022). We need a comparative approach to language acquisition: A commentary on Kidd and Garcia (2022). *First Language*, 42(6), 751–755. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01427237221093847>
- Dobrovolsky, D.O. & Karaulov, Yu.N. (1994). *Associative Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language*.
- Gérard, J. (1982). *La sémantique des phrases absurdes*. *Semiotica*, 39(3–4), 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1982.39.3-4.285>
- Gozalova, M.R., Gazilov, M.G. & Abdulkadirov, U.U. (2022). A comparative study of Caucasian languages. *Revista EntreLinguas*, 8(1), e022015–e022015. <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v8iesp.1.16926>
- Goranko, V. (2021). How Deontic Logic Ought to Be: Towards a Many-Sorted Framework for Normative Reasoning. In Fenrong Liu, Alessandra Marra, Paul Portner, & Frederik Van De Putte (Eds.), *Deontic Logic and Normative Systems. 15th International Conference, DEON 2020* (pp. 219–238). College Publications.
- Huang, C.R. & Yao, Y. (2015). Corpus Linguistics. In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)* (pp. 949–953). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.52004-2>
- Pimenova, M.V. (2004). *Soul and Spirit: Features of Conceptualization*. KemSU Publishing House.
- Popova, Z.D. & Sternin, I. A. (2010). *Cognitive Linguistics*. (pp.15- 113). AST East-West.
- Potebnya, A. A. (1976). *Aesthetics and Poetics*. (pp. 131-147). Iskusstvo.
- Sanders, T. & Sanders, J. (2006). Text and Text Analysis. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics (Second Edition)* (pp. 597–607). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00557-5>
- Singh, R.(2007). *Assertability constraints and absurd assertions*. <https://carleton.ca/singhr/wp-content/uploads/singh-assertability.pdf>

Conflicto de intereses

El autor declara que no existen conflictos de intereses