

Verbal Phraseological Units of the Russian and English Languages

Nurullina Aigul Gumerovna and Bilyalova Albina Anvarovna
Department of Foreign Languages, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia

Abstract: Phraseological units play a special role in the creation of the worldview. The nature of the meaning PU is closely tied with the background knowledge of a native speaker with the cultural and historical traditions of a nation speaking this language. Comparative analysis of the phraseological systems of different languages is of considerable interest both from the point of view of the development of the general theory of phraseology and to explore the common and distinctive features of the language. The study is devoted to the study in the current issue of modern linguistics, comparative study of phraseological units based on the material of the English and Russian language. In this study, analysis of structural and grammatical organization of phraseological units is realized in comparative way, namely on the material of two languages Russian and English. Structural-grammatical analysis reveals a significant similarity of a structural-grammatical organization after studying phraseological units in the Russian and English languages. The main difference between phraseological units of two compared languages with the structure of a word combination, stands means of expressing syntactic relations which can be defined with a different structure of the comparing languages. The practical significance of the study is in the possibility of using the results of the research in theoretical courses of comparative linguistics, comparative phraseology, in courses of theory and practice of translation, in the development and training special courses in phraseology, etc. The basic methods of the research are comparative-methodological method, the method of conceptual, component, etymological analysis; the descriptive method which includes methods of observation, interpretation, comparison, generalization and the elements of the statistical method.

Key words: Phraseological unit, language, analysis, comparative study, model, structure, construction

INTRODUCTION

The foreground branch of modern linguistics is the study of language in a close relationship with culture. Each language reflects a certain way of perceiving the world. The complex of knowledge about the world, captured in some form of language, linguistic worldview builds linguistic picture of the world. Phraseological Units (PU) play a special role in the creation of the worldview. According to Rosemarie (1998) a PU is a lexicalized, reproducible billexemic or polylexemic word group in common use which has relative syntactic and semantic stability, may be idiomatized and may have an emphatic or intensifying function in a text. The nature of the meaning PU is closely tied with the background knowledge of a native speaker with practical experience of the individual with the cultural and historical traditions of a nation speaking this language. Comparative analysis of the phraseological systems of different languages is of considerable interest both from the point of view of the development of the general theory of phraseology and to explore the common and distinctive features of the language.

In terms of expression PU is a certain structural and grammatical construction, created by the model of free word combinations or sentences that exists in a particular language. In the work “The phraseology of modern Russian language” (Shanskiy, 1985) distributes PU into two groups:

- PU, structurally relevant to a sentence and
- PU that structurally correspond to the word combinations

“Some of the scientists involve to the phraseology the fixed word combination of the second group only, however, this narrow understanding of the phenomena of phraseology is incorrect as phraseological turns of the first group are opposed to words and free word combinations, i.e. to the language units of other levels, as well as PU representing combinations. And, they both reproducible and are not generated in the communication process and they both overworded (different organization of words in these PU contrasts them to each other as a kind of one class but not as different to a word and the free combination of words)” (Shanskiy, 1985). The second

group of PU, in turn is divided into substantive, verbal, adverbial, adjectival ones. In the research, after V.N. Telia and E.F. Arsenyeva, we maintain a wide understanding of PU and include in their structure proverbs, sayings and fixed expressions.

In this study, analysis of structural and grammatical organization of PU is realized concerning the following features: Morphological expression of basic component of PU. In comparative terms most researchers of PU follow this criterion. Leading, independent grammatical component related to a particular part of speech is meant under the central component of the PU which is caused to function in this PU as a specific member of a sentence. A way of expressing syntactic relations (coordination, agreement, contiguity). Methods (approaches) of the expression of syntactic relations, coming as part of the structure of the language, on the one hand, reflect its typology and on the other- carry such features which make it possible to determine the typological characteristics of the language at the level of phrases. Position of the dependent component of PU towards the basic one. There are PUs with the dependent component in preposition and postposition.

In this research of PU in Russian and English languages the term “model” is used for indicating the underlying construction and the terms “structure” and “design” are used as synonyms in order to avoid repetition. By the term “model” a researcher Gyulmagomedov (1990) suggests “the possibility of the construction of some second one using the example of the first one. Noting that although there are some PUs generated by the model, through the example of another unit, modeling properties as an immanent characteristic doesn't pertain to them”.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The basic methods of the research are comparative-methodological method, the method of conceptual, component, etymological analysis; the descriptive method which includes methods of observation, interpretation, comparison, generalization and the elements of the statistical method.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The main part: The electronic media explosion of the 1990s and its implications for the processes of globalizations highlighted issues of intercultural communication. Globalization has its antithesis, as has been demonstrated by the worldwide renewal of interest in cultural origins and in exploring questions of identity (Cronin, 2000).

Every literary unit from the individual sentence to the whole order of words can be seen in relation to the concept of system. In particular, we can look at individual works, literary genres and the whole of literature as related systems and at literature as a system within the larger system of human culture (Scholes, 1974). In Great Britain as well as in other Western European countries, phraseology has steadily been developed over the last twenty years. The activities of the European Society of Phraseology and the European Association for Lexicography with their regular conventions and publications attest to the prolific European interest in phraseology. Bibliographies of recent studies on English and general phraseology are included by Cowie and Howarth (1996) whose bibliography is reproduced and continued on the internet and provides a rich source of the most recent publications in the field.

The group Verbal Phraseological Units (VPU) includes PU containing a verb, as the leading term of the control. In quantity and versatility of semantic VPU prevail over the substantive, adjectival, adverbial and modal PU. In the opinion of many scholars VPU is the most numerous part of the foundation of all of idiomatic language.

Verbal PU attracted the attention of linguists who study them from different perspectives: structure, semantics, grammatical features, their ambiguity, variability. Compared with other structural and semantic types verbal PUs are allocated more freely. The dominant role of the verbal component in such PUs has already been noted by experts in this field. E.D. Balygina noted that “referring to phraseological expressions with the verbal component we see this component of the verb as dominant, both in a constructive and in the semantic relationship. Verbal component is leading, pivotal”. Communication between the core (bearing) and dependent components of subordinating PU is objective. For further classification of PU the valence of a transitive verb should also be taken into account. As Nicholes (2005) mentions “the valence of the verb which means the ability of a verb to enter into combination with other words in the sentence is of particular importance for object phrases”. In modern linguistics the following valences are found: subjective valence, if there is an ability to combine the verb with the subject of a sentence; object valence which is understood as the ability of a verb to combine with one, two or more objects; predicative valence which means the ability of core component to be combined with another verb and to form a composite predicate along with it. If the verb is monovalent, there are allocated simple PU with the structure of a phrase, if

the verb is two or more valents- complex PUs with the structure of a phrase are distinguished. It should also be noted that if in English the way of expressing the objective connection is contiguity, in Russian it is agreement. Verbal PUs are the most numerous by definition of person's character in studied languages. As the study of Khairullina (1997) shows, in phrase building the verbs of human mental activity, of speech-cognitive activity, verbs of conduct, movement, sound, physical activity, verbs with the value of physical contact, existential verbs, verbs of change and verbs of location in space much regularly participate.

Lexical and grammatical features of VPU reflect morphological categories and type of mood. Category of form is the main grammatical category of a verb. Most VPU of Russian language form two opposed to each other forms-VPU perfect and imperfect form. Analysis of the manifestation of the category of the form of VPU shows that a significant number of researched PUs are the verbs of imperfect form: *bes podstrekaet, chert voditsja, d'javol prjachetsja*. VPU that have in its part the verbs of perfect form are: *bes djormul, vselilsja chjort*. There is a use of the category of mood, both in the English and in Russian languages-indicative, imperative and subjunctive. In analyzing the VPU in the studied languages a large number of using VPU are identified. Their forms (indicative mood, subjunctive forms and the imperative) are characterized by low frequency: devil citing Scripture "*chert citiruet Bibliju*", *imet' udachu u d'javola*; the imperative form: *ni gnevi cherta, ne perech' d'javolu*, go to the devil; subjunctive: *byt' by chertovski umnym*. In English, the subjunctive with the researched component is not revealed.

In the English language the largest number of PU of "V + N" model with different kinds of extensions is formed with such verbs as "keep", "hold", "get", "have", "put", "take", "send", "set", "make", "throw", e.g., "to keep both eyes wide open", "to have eyes in the back of one's head", etc. PUs of this model are the most productive.

In English a definite or indefinite study takes an intermediate position between the verb and the noun which is actually a component of a PU: "drop a brick" in the sense of "allow tactlessness"; "come a cropper" "to fail". Depending on the type of verb government in the Russian language there can be distinguish two subtypes of verbal PU with "V+N" structure: subtype with direct objective verb government that has an object in the accusative case, "*vit' gnezdo*". Subtype with indirect objective verb government with the object in

instrumental case: "*izvivat'sya/uvivat'sya uzhom/v'yunom*"; "*zalivat'sya solov'yom*". In a number of PU in the Russian language the reverse order of the components is not excluded: "*sobak gonyat*", "*volkom vyt*"; "*kovrom/polovikom/ stelit'sya*", group with dative verb government: "*perebirat' po peryshkam*", group with prepositional verb government: "*letat' na kryl'yakh*".

In the Russian and English languages this model is used with prepositional extension of a noun with possessive adjectives "V+Pron+N": "*osedlat' svoego kon'ka*". The study showed that in the English language nouns in this structural model can also be in normative plural forms. In this case, plural form is used for marking generality which is not singular. Sometimes the use of a noun in singular is to be observed: "to beat all creation". In these PUs, singular is used independently of number of objects on which the action is directed. In these models PUs express object adverbial relations. In the Russian language this model has the same form: "*teryat' litso*". The subclass of comparative verbal PU with the structure of "V+comp+N" is considerable in the Russian and English languages. As for the comparison element there are "like (as)" in the English language; "kak" in the Russian one: "*zatait'sya kak mysh*" "as quiet as a mouse"; "eat like a bird"; "dance like an elephant". In VPU as for a second component we often can see names of animals, real and imagined actions which were based on the comparative forms: "*sdokhnut' kak sobaka*" "die as a dog"; "bleed like a pig".

One of the most numerous subclasses forms VPU with the structure "V+Prep+N" ("verb+preposition+noun") are similar in both studied languages to *potjagat'sja s chertom*, works with the devil-*rabotat' s d'javolom*, served by the devil-*obsluzhivat'sja d'javolom*, speak of the devil-*zagovorit' o d'javole*. In English language is represented the extension of this model, "V+N+ Prep+N" ("verb+noun+preposition+noun"): *keep the devil at the door, "ne vpuskat' d'javola*". Common prepositions of this model in Russian are "c" and "k", in English "to".

Comparative analysis revealed models that are characteristic to the Russian language only: "V+N+Prep+N" ("verb+noun+preposition+noun") *svjazalsja chert s mladencem*; "V+Prep+N+N" ("verb+preposition+noun+noun"): *rabotat' v ambare d'javola*.

The study noted models that are unique to the English language: "V+N+Prep+N" ("verb+noun+preposition+noun"): *serve the devil for wages* means "*sluzhit' d'javolu za zhalovanie*"; "V+N+Prep+Pron+N" ("verb+noun+preposition+pronoun+noun"): *take the devil*

into his boat “vzjat’ d’javola v svoju lodku”; “V+N+Prep+N” (“verb+‘noun+preposition+noun”): make a pact with the devil “zakljuchite peremiries d’javolom” (Sakaeva and Nurullina, 2013).

CONCLUSION

On the whole, structural-grammatical analysis is an evidence of a significant similarity of a structural-grammatical organization after studying PU in the Russian and English languages. As for the main difference between PU of two compared languages with the structure of a word combination, stands means of expressing syntactic relations which are defined with a different structure of the comparing languages. VPU both in number and in semantic versatility prevail over substantive and adjective PU. Verbal PU attracted the attention of linguists who study them from different perspectives: structure, semantics, grammatical features, their ambiguity, variability, synonymous and antonymous relations. Also, different groups of verbs are allocated: motion, movement, dynamics, verbs with modality component, metaphorical verbs, etc. Compared with other structural and semantic types verbal PUs are allocated more freely. Verbal PUs in the Russian language have grammatical category of aspect, voice, person, number, tense and the category of gender in the past tense. These categories are implemented differently in various idiomatic expressions. Verbal PUs are the most numerous by definition of person’s character in the studied languages. The main difference between the PU of two compared languages with the structure of the word phrase is the way of expressing syntactic relations, due to different systems of these languages. Classical philology and comparative literature, lexical statics and ethnography, the sociology of class-speech, formal rhetoric, poetics and the study of grammar are combined in an attempt to clarify the act of translation and the process of “life between languages” (Bassnett, 2005).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Bassnett, S., 2005. *Translation Studies*. Routledge, London, pp: 46.
- Cowie, A.P. and P. Howarth, 1996. *Phraseology: A select bibliography*. *Int. J. Lexicogr.*, 9: 38-51.
- Cronin, M., 2000. *Across the Lines: Travel, Language*. Cork University Press, Cork, Pages: 265.
- Gyulmagomedov, A.G., 1990. *Phraseology Lezguin Language*. A.G. Gyulmagomedov, Makhachkala, pp: 8-9.
- Khairullina, A.D., 1997. *Picture of the world in phraseology*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of France Allemande.
- Nicholes, V., 2005. *Webster’s Pocket Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language*. Allied Publishing Group, India, pp: 256.
- Rosemarie, G., 1998. *The Stylistic Potential of Phraselological Units in the Light of Genre Analysis*. In: *Phraseology*, Cowie, A.P. (Ed.). Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp: 125.
- Sakaeva, L. and A. Nurullina, 2013. *Comparative analysis of verbal, adjectival, adverbial and modal phraseological units with a lexeme “devil” in English and Russian languages*. *Middle East J. Scient. Res.*, 18: 50-54.
- Scholes, R., 1974. *Structuralism in Literature*. Yale University Press, New Haven, pp: 10.
- Shanskiy, N.M., 1985. *Phraseology of Modern Russian Language*. Higher School, Russia, Pages: 160.