

Comparative Analysis of Verbal, Adjectival, Adverbial and Modal Phraseological Units with a Lexeme “Devil” in English and Russian Languages

Liliya Radikovna Sakaeva and Aigul Gumerovna Nurullina

Kazan Federal University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia

Abstract: This article is devoted to the study in the current issue of modern linguistics, comparative study of phraseological units in the material of the English and Russian languages. The work is intended for students of philological and linguistic faculties. The practical significance of the work 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 reading special courses in phraseology, etc.

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 build linguistic picture of the world. Phraseological units (PU) play a special role in the creation of the worldview. According to Rosemarie G. 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 [1]. 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. This study focuses on the actual problem in modern linguistics, comparative study of the structural and grammatical organization to the component PU “devil” in languages of different structures (English and Russian).

The analysis identified the synonymic ranks of the component “devil” in the studied languages: devil / Satan / fallen angel – in the English language [2]. D'javal/satana/chert/bes/lukavyj/demon/nechistyj – in Russian.

In terms of expression PU are a certain structural and grammatical construction, created by the model of free word combinations or sentences that exist in a particular language.

In the work “The phraseology of modern Russian language” N.M. Shanskiy distributes PU into two groups: 1) PU, structurally relevant to a sentence and 2) 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 December 10, 2013free combination of words)” [3] 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, management, 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 PU with the dependent component in preposition and postposition.

Taking all these features into consideration, from our point of view, provides the most complete structural and grammatical characteristics of the component PU “devil” in the studied languages.

In this research of PU with the component “devil” in English and Russian languages is used the term “model” for indicating the underlying construction and the terms “structure” and “design” as synonyms in order to avoid repetition. By the term “model” a researcher A.G. Gyulmagomedov suggests “the possibility of the construction of some second one using the example of the first one. Noting that although there are some PU generated by the model, through the example of another unit, modeling properties as an immanent characteristic doesn't pertain to them” [4].

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.

The Main Part: The electronic media explosion of the 1990s and its implications for the processes of globalizations highlighted issues of intercultural communication. For globalization has its antithesis, as has

been demonstrated by the worldwide renewal of interest in cultural origins and in exploring questions of identity [5].

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 [6]. In Great Britain as well as 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 in 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 [7].

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.

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 PU 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 djornul, vselilsja chjort*. There is a use of the category of mood, both in English and in Russian languages – indicative, imperative and subjunctive. In analyzing the VPU in the studied languages identified a large number of using VPU which forms are indicative mood, subjunctive forms and the imperative is 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.

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 peremirie s d'javolom” [8].

Adjectival phraseological units (APU) are PU, core component of which is an adjective. According to A.V. Kunin “adjectival comparisons on a language occur because that there is a need to transfer additional information in comparison with the information transmitted by the first components of comparison taken separately” [9].

Examples of the APU with the construction “Adj + N” (“adjective + noun”) are marked in both languages: *d'javol'skaja svoloch'*, *zheltyj d'javol*, *beautiful devil*, *lucky devil* – “schastlivec”, *poor devil* – “bednjaga, neudachnik”, *dark devil* – “temnyj d'javol”.

After the E.F. Arsenyeva the study highlighted two main structural subclass of APU [10]. 1. Adjectival comparative PU, which have in its composition comparing component in the English language “as” or “like”, in the Russian language – “kak”, where as a core component acts the adjective, as a dependent component – the noun “Adj + Comp + N” (“adjective + union (as) + noun”): *uprjam kak chert*, *mračnyj kak d'javol*.

The next type of comparative constructions is, according to A.Z. Abdullaeva, a kind of deviation from the norm, since it uses as comparing union “like” instead of “as” [11]. For example, the model “like + N”: *like devil* in the sense of “chertovski”. 2. The group of noncomparative APU is represented by the following models: – “P + Prep + N” (“Participle + preposition + noun”): *bitten by the devil* – “gorjacho uvlechennyj,

oderzhimyj d'javolom/besom”, *loaded for a devil* – “obozlennyj, gotovyj razorvat’”. – “Prep + Adj + N” (“preposition + adjective + noun”): *s d'javol'skimi glazami*. Also, there are marked examples of APU with the components in reverse order – “Comp + N + Prep + Adj + N” (“compar.turn + noun + preposition + adjective + noun”): *kak chert s pisanoj torboj*.

APU has a special data for the expression of certain grammatical meanings as in their composition there are some ingredients which can be attached by the appropriate form of expression of grammatical categories. These components are genetically full or short adjectives [12]. Group of PU with a lexeme “devil”, as part of which serve both full and short adjectives are typical for Russian language and are modeled on “N + Adj” (“noun + short adjective”): *chert silen*, *bes skuden*, *bes beden*, *d'javol star*.

Adverbial phraseological units (AdvPU) is incorporated into the total value or qualitative characteristic of the action, condition, or trait. N.F. Alefirenko believes that “adverbiality of frazema can be defined by the semantic and grammatical shift of their frazemabuilding components, which is the result of interaction between different levels of the language system, deter structural types, semantic and grammatical properties of the frazemas” [13].

AdvPU are formed by the models of combination of the words analogue, representing a union of notional word with a service preposition: *mezhdju d'javolom i glubokim sinim morem*, *u d'javola na rogah*, in the English language – *a devil of a fellow* in the sense of “sushhij d'javol”, *nothing was wrong till the devil come along* in the sense of “ne bylo by pechali, tak cherti nakachali”, *between the devil and the deep blue sea* [14].

In the Russian language is marked AdvPU model in conjunction with the verb: *byt' chertovski umnym*, *pojmat' cherta za hvost*. In English – *pull the devil by the* in the meaning of “bedstvovat', sidet' bez grosha”, *with the devil at one's heels* in the sense of “kak budto za nim cherti gonjatsja” [15].

PU with a modal value express the speaker's assessment of the content of the utterance. Modal turnovers are immutable, are usually devoid of morphological characters and can not be combined with other words in the context, performing a function of introductory words in a sentence. The concept of modality covers various spheres of values: the intention, reality, unreality, the message, the fear, the question of caution, motivation, denial, desire, approval, doubt, distrust, emotional and others expressing a subjective

attitude of the speaker to the statement modal phraseological units (MPU), although they are autonomous position, but are connected with the whole sentence and sometimes function as a separate sentences [16].

The researcher R.R Zakirov in the dissertation work “Phraseological units with component color terms in English, Russian and Tatar languages” notes that the modality is expressed in a broad and narrow sense: “in the broad sense the modality is considered as the attitude of the speaker to the sense of the content and attitude of the content of the statement to the reality. With this understanding of the modality large number of phrases and all the PU should be considered as modal. In a narrow sense, modality is an expression of PU of affirmation and negation, indication of their attitude to the statement from the point of view of its accuracy, its desirability, preference and the correlation of PU with the modal words” [17].

As part of this study is considered a narrow understanding of modality. The analysis component of the MPU with the “devil” in English identified active participation of verbs: know (znat'), pull (podnazhat'), hate (nenavidet') go (iditi), play (igrat'), catch (rugat'), give (otdavat'), raise (podnimat'): *devil knows* (chert znaet), *pull devil* (podnazhat', pooshhrenie sostjazajushhihsja storon), *catch the devil for smth* (otrugat' za chto-libo), *give raise the devil* (podnimat' skandal).

In the Russian language the verbs of frequency are: vzjat', dergat', nosit', zanosit', prinosit', znat', lomat', putat', shutit', pobrat', podrat', prohodit', podskochit', poslat', teshit', razobrat', stupat', zabirat', ponjat', kljast'sja – *chert voz'mi, poslat' ko vsem chertjam, teshit' besa, sam chert ne razberet, stupaj ko vsem chertjam, chert pojmet, chertom kljanus'* etc.

The main role in the formation of MPU in Russian language plays the component “hell”, which expresses different emotional state of the speaker: *chertjam toshno, chert voz'mi, chert dergaet* - displeasure over anything. These PU expressed outrage, bewilderment about anything - *chert zanes, chert prines, chto za chert* etc, used in abusive terms, denoting evil wish – *idi k chertu, ubirajsja k chertu, stupaj ko vse chertjam, nu tebja k chertu*; utters bewilderment – *and the devil knows what / when / who* – “chert ego znaet chto”. English MPU *as the devil* expresses something “damn” terrible and extraordinary.

Another large group are MPU expressed by pronouns: *chert tebja/ego/ih/ee pobral, chert s toboj, chert ego znaet, sam chert nogu slomit, give*

the devil his due in the sense of “to do justice to the devil”, *the devil you know* in the meaning “chert ego znaet”.

In the formation of MPU with a component of “devil” there are a large number of prepositions: *s (chert s toboj), k (k chertovoj babushke, k chertu na kulichki, k chertu, k chertu na roga, k chertjam sobach'im), ko (ko vsem chertjam, za (chto za chert)*. In English the studied structure is the smallest group with the preposition *with (play the devil with smth)* in the sense of “to harm”.

It should be noted that the MPU includes within its structure negative particles that retain the tone of caution, warning: *ni odin chert, chert ne brat, ni k chertu ne goditsja*. In English the negative particles were not identified.

CONCLUSION

Thus, this structural and grammatical analysis shows significant similarity of structural and grammatical organization of the researched PU in the studied languages, which is a natural result of the unity of the world around us and the universal categories of human thought. 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” [18].

Deductions: Comparative study of structural and grammatical organization of PU promoted to general and specific features in the system of lexeme “devil” in English and Russian languages. Depending on the category of assignment of the main word, PU comprises the following types: verbal, adjectival, adverbial modal ones. The analysis revealed the most common PU of the component “devil” have the structure of word combination. Verbal PU take first place according to the number. Models are differential if there is a combination of a verb and a noun in the various case forms. There is a use of the category of mood, both in English and in Russian languages – indicative, imperative and subjunctive. The most productive in APU models are “like + N”, “Adj + Comp + N”, “Adj + N”. AdvPU include to the total composition general meaning or qualitative characteristic of action, state, or trait. AdvPU are formed

by the models of combination of the words analogue, representing a compound of notional word with service prepositions. PU with a modal value express the speaker's assessment to the content of the utterance. Modal expressions are immutable, are usually deprived of morphological features. The modality covers various spheres of the meaning: the intention, reality, unreality, message, fear, question, warning and motivation.

REFERENCES

1. Rosemarie, G., 1998. The Stylistic Potential of Phraselological Units in the Light of Genre Analysis In A.P. Cowie (ed.), *Phraseology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp: 125.
2. Oxford Dictionary of Synonyms and Antonyms., 1999. New-York, Oxford University Press Inc., pp: 572.
3. Shanskiy, N.M., 1985. *Phraseology of modern Russian language*. – M.: Higher School., pp: 160.
4. Gyulmagomedov, A.G., 1990. *Phraseology Lezguin language* / A.G Gyulmagomedov. –Makhachkala, pp: 8-9.
5. Cronin, M., 2000. *Across the Lines: travel, language, translation*. - Cork: Cork University Press., pp: 265.
6. Scholes, R., 1974. *Structuralism in Literature*. - New Haven: Yale University Press., pp: 10.
7. Cowie, A.P. and Peter Howarth, 1996. *Phraseology a Select Bibliography*. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 9(1): 38-51.
8. Webster's Pocket Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language., 2005 - New revised edition., pp: 256.
9. Kunin A.V., 2005. *The course of modern English phraseology*. / A. Kunin - Dubna: Phoenix +, pp: 335.
10. Arsenyeva, E.F., 1993. *Comparative analysis of phraseological units semantically oriented person in Russian and English and issues of creating Russian - English phrase book: Dis. ... Drs. Science* / E.F. Arsenyeva . - Kazan, pp: 476.
11. Abdullayeva, A.Z., 2002. *Phraseology kumyk language in the comparative coverage : diss Dr. sciences*. / A.Z. Abdullayeva. - Makhachkala, pp: 354.
12. Husnutdinov, A.A., 1996. *Grammar phraseological units: Dis. Dr. ... filol.nauk* . / A.A. Khusnutdinov . - St. Petersburg, pp: 152.
13. Alefirenko, N.F., 2009. *Phraseology and paremiology: textbook for undergraduate -level literary education* / N.F.Alefirenko, N. Semenko . - M. Flint : Nauka, pp: 143-144.
14. Hofstede, G., 2004. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* / G. Hofstede. - Mc.Graw-Hill, pp: 300.
15. *Concise Dictionary of Proverbs*. 2003 - Oxford University Press, pp: 364.
16. Brown, P., 1983. *Discourse analysis* / G. Brown, G. Yule. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp: 288.
17. Zakirov, R.R., 2003. *Phraseological units with component color terms in English and Russian and Tatar languages: Thesis. ... Kand.filol . Science* / R.R . Zakirov . - Kazan, pp: 127.
18. Bassnett, S., 2002. *Translation studies* - London: Routledge., pp: 46.