

UDC 81'373.7-047.44

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/48-2-17>**Anna OPRYSHKO,**orcid.org/0000-0003-2214-1560

Lecturer at the English Language and Methodology Department

Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University

(Uman, Cherkasy region, Ukraine) a.opryshko@udpu.edu.ua

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF DIFFERENT STRUCTURAL LANGUAGES

The article deals with the theoretical foundations of comparing phraseological units of different structural languages, as well as highlights the problems that can be encountered in their comparative analysis. It is noted that phraseological units express a nationally reasoned attitude to the world of the system of values, lifestyle, preserving the traditions of a particular ethno-cultural community. The importance of comparing phraseological combinations for different sciences is described and the main results of this comparative study are named. The cognitive-semasiological approach to the comparative study of phraseology is characterized; the factors of semantic and formal equivalence of correlated phraseologisms in different languages are named. The article considers contrasting research as a reliable way to identify national features of concepts; describes the problems that can be encountered when translating phraseological units from one language to another. Semantic and semiotic ways of encoding socially significant and value-semantic information at the phraseological level are determined. The necessity of comparing phraseological units in a comprehensive manner, studying the various components that make up their composition, is emphasized. In the course of comparative analysis, deep differences at different levels of the phraseological concept are revealed. This type of analysis allows us to identify the specifics of phraseological concepts of different languages, as well as universal ways of their formation based on phraseological imagery. It is noted that phraseological units do not describe the world around them as much as interpret it, expressing the subjective and, as a rule, emotional attitude of a native speaker to reality. The factors that explain the semantic and formal equivalence of correlated phraseologisms in different languages are described. It is concluded that contrast research is the most reliable way to identify national features of concepts, which allows you to identify the presence and absence, coincidence or discrepancy of both the concepts themselves and the language units that serve to designate them.

Key words: comparison, phraseological units, lexical-semantic system, associative-mental processes, linguistic space, semiotization, contrast research.

Анна ОПРИШКО,orcid.org/0000-0003-2214-1560

викладач кафедри англійської мови та методики її навчання

Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини

(Умань, Черкаська область, Україна) a.opryshko@udpu.edu.ua

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ЗАСАДИ ПОРІВНЯЛЬНО-ЗІСТАВНОГО АНАЛІЗУ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ОДИНИЦЬ РІЗНОСТРУКТУРНИХ МОВ

У статті йдеться про теоретичні засади зіставлення фразеологічних одиниць різноструктурних мов, а також виокремлено проблеми, з якими можна зіткнутися при їх порівняльно-зіставному аналізі. Зазначено, що саме фразеологізми виражають національно аргументоване ставлення до світу системи цінностей, способу життя, що зберігають традиції тої чи іншої етнокультурної спільноти. Описано важливість зіставлення фразеологізмів для різних наук та названо головні результати цього зіставного дослідження. Охарактеризовано когнітивно-семасіологічний підхід до зіставного вивчення фразеології; названо фактори семантичної і формальної еквівалентності співвідносних фразеологізмів у різних мовах. У статті розглянуто контрастивне дослідження, як надійний спосіб виявлення національних особливостей концептів; описано проблеми, з якими можна зіткнутися при перекладі фразеологічних одиниць з однієї мови на іншу. Визначено семантичні та семіотичні шляхи кодування соціально значущої та ціннісно-сислової інформації на рівні фразеології. Наголошено на необхідності зіставлення фразеологічних одиниць комплексно, досліджуючи різноманітні компоненти, які входять у їх склад. В ході зіставного аналізу розкриваються глибокі відмінності на різних рівнях фразеологічного концепту. Такий вид аналізу дозволяє виявити специфіку фразеологічних концептів різних мов, а також універсальні шляхи їх утворення на основі фразеологічної образності. Зазначено, що фразеологізми не стільки описують навколишній світ, скільки інтерпретують його, виражаючи суб'єктивне і, як правило, емоційне ставлення носія мови до дійсності. Описано фактори, якими пояснюється семантична і формальна еквівалентність співвідносних фразеологізмів у різних мовах. Зроблено висновок, що контрастивне дослідження є найбільш надійним способом виявлення

національних особливостей концептів, що дозволяє виявити наявність та відсутність, співпадання чи неспівпадання як самих концептів, так і мовних одиниць, що служать для їх позначення.

Ключові слова: *зіставлення, фразеологічні одиниці, лексико-семантична система, асоціативно-ментальні процеси, лінгвопростір, семіотизація, контрастивне дослідження.*

The intensive development of phraseology in recent years is characterized by a variety of problems under consideration. Comparative study of phraseology in different languages is becoming increasingly important.

A comparative description of the lexical-semantic systems of several languages exposes the existing vocabulary gaps in each language, “white spots” in the semantic picture of the world (Kovaleva, 2001: 41). Among the urgent tasks of Comparative Study of two or more languages is the study of phraseological units that express a nationally reasoned attitude to the world, the system of values, and the way of life that preserve the traditions of a particular ethno-cultural community.

That is why, due to their bright national color, they have always attracted special attention of linguists (Kovaleva, 2001: 41). A significant contribution to the development of comparative linguistics was made by such well-known scientists as L. V. Shcherba, E. D. Polivanov, G. A. Vinokur, M. P. Kochergan, A. A. Potebnya, L. G. Verba and others. A significant comparative research in the field of phraseology was carried out by G. Gak, V. M. Mokienko, T. Z. Cherdantseva, V. V. Morkovkin, I. O. Golubovska, R. P. Zorivchak and others.

The study of stable phrases of different languages in a comparable aspect is of both theoretical and practical interest. This aspect of the analysis of phraseological units allows us to study the most typical features of lexical-semantic units, associative-mental processes that underlie their formation, and on the basis of this generalize the patterns and features of this linguistic phenomenon inherent in all languages of the world. At the same time, phraseological combinations are valuable country studies material, since ethnolinguistic components are most obvious in them (Kovaleva, 2001: 41).

The purpose of this article is to consider the theoretical foundations of the features of comparing phraseological units of different structural languages. Comparison of phraseological combinations of different languages provides important information for the theory and practice of translation, methods of teaching foreign languages, reveals the Universal origins of the formation and use of phraseological combinations (Kopylenko, Popova, 1989: 38). The main results of any comparative study, according to L. V. Kovaleva, should be:

1) identification of universals, categories and existing features relevant to the description of phraseology;

2) justification of comparing units;

3) establishment of common and distinctive features (Kovaleva, 2001: 43).

Many researchers talk about the impossibility of the existence and study of phraseology of a particular language “without comparing it to other languages”, without highlighting it in the mirror of phraseology of other languages, so any national phraseology, of course, should go to distant “horizons”, since ignoring the broader linguistic space causes incorrect conclusions. The sign expressiveness of one language is clearly explicated, manifested only against the background of another sign system (Uzhchenko, Uzhchenko, 2007: 439).

The comparative aspect of studying phraseological units is inextricably linked with the problems of their translation. Translation of phraseological combinations, according to not only scientists, but also experienced translators, causes special difficulties. The most complex questions arise due to the fact that stable phrases with figurative meaning also carry cultural and historical values and are perceived only through the worldview and perception of native speakers of a certain culture, which is often associated with a lack of understanding of the national specifics presented in them by a native speaker of another language (Kovaleva, 2001: 41). The statement that most phraseological units cannot be literally translated from one language to another has already become an axiom: literal translation does not convey the content of the phraseological unit, but only reveals its internal form and imagery (Golubovska, 2004: 86).

Lacunae also make it difficult to understand and translate phrases. Interlanguage lacunarity is an extremely interesting phenomenon that is closely related to the problem of concepts in the concept sphere of language (Kovaleva, 2001: 41).

M. F. Alefirenko's cognitive-semasiological approach to the comparative study of phraseology is characterized by a synergistic interaction of linguistic, communicative, pragmatic, mental and cultural aspects (Alefirenko, 2008: 149). At the same time, the researcher implies not only and not so much to the external conditions of everyday life of the language in society, but also to the language

Ways and means of expressing everything that is associated with the activities of a certain ethno-linguistic collective internally determined by human nature. In this respect, special attention should be paid to those linguoculturological aspects of the national-linguistic content of idioms that are based not only on the empirical, systemic, anthropological or epistemological properties of idiomatics, but also on its information and activity origins (Alefirenko, 2008: 149).

Cultural and linguistic specificity of phraseological units that are compared is caused by the fact that the semiotization of life (providing objects, events and situations with sign semantics, turning them into a source of information) at the level of phraseology is usually carried out by two ways of encoding socially significant and value-semantic information – semantically and semiotically (Alefirenko, 2008: 149).

The concept of internal form is an important tool for linguistic analysis not only at the lexical, but also at the phraseological level. The phraseological fund of the language as the most specific part of the lexicon in cultural and linguistic meaning acts as the main native speaker, in terms of Yu. S. Stepanov, “constants of culture”, transmitting culturally significant instructions of a particular ethnic group from generation to generation (Golubovska, 2004: 88).

Comparison of phraseological units should be carried out comprehensively, examining the various components that make up their composition (visual-sensory image, emotional, cultural, connotative). In the course of comparative analysis, deep differences at different levels of the phraseological concept are revealed. This type of analysis allows us to identify the specifics of phraseological concepts of different languages, as well as universal ways of their formation based on phraseological imagery. So, for example, with the same basic lexemes of phraseological combinations describing the same visual-sensory image and having the same meanings at the denotative level, significant differences are observed in them at the levels of phraseology (Kovaleva, 2001: 42).

For a contrasting analysis of the phraseology of different languages, the classification of phraseological units based on their unmotivation is important when there is nothing more behind the phraseological unit, except for the actual phraseological meaning, then the only criterion for equivalence will be expressiveness and stylistic marking (Verba, 2008: 147).

The conceptual background of phraseological units in different languages mostly coincides typologically, although the specific lexical content is somewhat specific. Such units are referentially non-identical,

but explicitly show “interlanguage-intercultural invariance”, so they belong to the general abstract model (Mizin, 2007: 125).

As you can see, phraseological units do not describe the world around them as much as interpret it, expressing the subjective and, as a rule, emotional attitude of a native speaker to reality.

Phraseological units are characterized by two types of idiomaticity: intra-language and inter-language. The first is manifested in the inability to distinguish the meaning of a phraseological unit from the direct meanings of its lexical elements and the meaning of the syntactic construction that forms it. The second is that it is impossible to literally translate the phraseology into another language.

Addressing the content and formal aspects of phraseological compounds, that is, semantic invariants and figurative forms of their language implementations in a comparative contrastive plan can contribute both to the identification of universal formal-semantic features of multilingual phraseologies, and to the definition of culturally marked meanings and national peculiarities of their language embodiment (Golubovska, 2004: 89).

The semantic and formal equivalence of correlated phraseologisms in different languages is explained by two factors:

- 1) the similar action of different ethnic linguistic consciousnesses, which manifests itself in the categorization of reality according to similar schemes;
- 2) language contacts that lead to interlanguage borrowings (Golubovska, 2004: 89).

Thus, the most reliable way to identify national features of concepts is through a contrasting study, which allows you to identify the presence and absence, coincidence or discrepancy of both the concepts themselves and the language units that serve to designate them. Identifying the national specifics of semantics makes it possible to trace the national features of the linguistic consciousness of peoples and can be used to model concepts as units of the national conceptosphere. In addition, the national-specific features identified in such studies are interpreted as a reflection of national-specific features that correspond to national concepts and allow modeling the concept with the allocation of its national-specific features (Kovaleva, 2001: 44).

Phraseological units fill speech with deep freshness, give it artistic sound, lexical and syntactic refinement, perfection. While contrasting phraseological units of different languages one should pay attention to the following criteria:

- 1) knowledge of the language and the country itself;

- 2) communicative value;
- 3) connection with grammatical and lexical minimums;
- 4) the ability to interpret the phrase concisely and in familiar words, transparent internal form;
- 5) presence of a match in the native language;
- 6) orientation on modern reality;
- 7) the frequency of using phraseological units (Scira, 2020: 166).

So, the comparison of phraseological units of different structural languages provides valuable material that allows us to speak about the national and cultural specifics of the figurative worldview of a particular people. By studying phraseological units, you can dive deep into the consciousness of the people, understand the historical conditions in which they lived, feel the color of the nation and carry out a comparative analysis of the mentality of different nationalities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Алефиренко Н. Ф. Фразеология в свете современных лингвистических парадигм : монография. М. : ООО Изд-во «Элпис», 2008. 271 с.
2. Верба Л. Г. Порівняльна лексикологія англійської та української мов. Вінниця : Нова Книга, 2008. 248 с.
3. Голубовська І. О. Етнічні особливості мовних картин світу: Монографія, 2-е вид., випр. і доп. К. : Логос, 2004. 284 с.
4. Ковалева Л. В. Фразеологизация как когнитивный процесс. Воронеж : Изд-во Воронеж. ун-та, 2004. 184 с.
5. Копыленко М. М., Попова З. Д. Очерки по общей фразеологии: (фразеосочетания в системе языка). Воронеж : Изд-во Воронеж. ун-та, 1989. 191 с.
6. Мізін К. І. Компаративна фразеологія: Монографія. Кременчук : ПП Щербатих О. В., 2007. 168 с.
7. Сціра М. Фразеологізм як об'єкт вивчення в іншомовній аудиторії (доцільність використання й критерії добирання). *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia*, vol. VIII/1: 2020, Познань. 2020. С. 157–166
8. Ужченко В. Д., Ужченко Д. В. Фразеологія сучасної української мови : навч. посіб. К. : Знання, 2007. 494 с.

REFERENCES

1. Alefirenko N. F. Frazеolohiya v svete sovremennykh linyvystycheskykh paradyhm [Phraseology in the world of modern linguistic paradigms: monograph]. Moscow : Elpis Publishing House, 2008, 271 p. [in Russian].
2. Verba L. G. Porivnialna leksykolohiia anhliiskoi ta ukrainskoi mov [Comparative lexicology of English and Ukrainian languages]. Vinnytsia : Nova Kniga publ., 2008, 248 P. [in Ukrainian].
3. Golubovska I. A. Etnichni osoblyvosti movnykh kartyn svitu [Ethnic features of language pictures of the world: monograph], 2nd ed., ed. and add. Kyiv : Logos publ., 2004, 284 P. [in Ukrainian].
4. Kovaleva L. V. Fraezolohyzatsiya kak kohnytyvnyi protsess [Fraesologization as a cognitive process]. Voronezh: Voronezh publishing house, 2004, 184 p. [in Russian].
5. Kopylenko M. M., Popova Z. D. Ocherky po obschei frazeolohyy: (frazeosochetanyia v systeme yazyka) [Outlines on general phraseology: (phraseological combinations in the language system)]. Voronezh : Voronezh publishing house, 1989, 191 p. [in Russian].
6. Mizin K. I. Komparatyvna frazeolohiia [Comparative phraseology: monograph]. Kremenchug : PE Shcherbatykh O. V., 2007 – 168 P. [in Ukrainian].
7. Scira M. Frazеolohizm yak ob'iekt vyvchennia v inshomovnii audytorii (dotsilnist vykorystannia i kryterii dobyrannia) [Phraseology as an object of study in a foreign-language audience (expediency of use and selection criteria)]. *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia*, vol. VIII / 1: 2020, Poznan. 2020. Pp. 157–166 [in Ukrainian].
8. Uzhchenko V. D., Uzhchenko D. V. Frazеolohiia suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy [Phraseology of the modern Ukrainian language: textbook.] Kyiv : Znannia publ., 2007, 494 p. [in Ukrainian].