

THE HISTORY OF STUDYING OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND KUMYK

(Recibido el 16-06-2017. Aprobado el 05-09-2017)

**Liliya Radikovna
Sakaeva**
Kazan Federal
University, *Institute of
International Relations,
History and Oriental
Studies*
liliyasakaeva@rambler.ru

**Marat
Ajdarovich
Yahin**
Kazan Federal
University,
*Institute of
International
Relations, History
and Oriental
Studies*

**Gulnara
Khafizovna
Bagautdinova**
Kazan Federal
University,
*Institute of
International
Relations, History
and Oriental
Studies*

**Flyuza
Gabdullinova
Fatkullina**
Bashkir State
University

**Gulzira
Kabaevna
Kenzhetayeva**
Pavlodar State
Pedagogical
Institute

Abstract. The subject of our research is the history of studying of phraseological units in multi-structural languages: Russian, English and Kumyk. Recently linguists' attention is basically focused on comparative study of language phenomena because of the fact that the process of determination of similar and specific features in different languages has peculiar significance. «Treasury of a language» (Kunin, 1996, p. 5) – it is a field of Phraseology, that is a major focus of interest of many philologists. With the help of PU one can feel special aspects of life, culture, manners and history of a nation vividly. Knowing and active usage of a language phraseological layer in speech allow for beautification of speech and better understanding of national mentality of an investigating language. Nowadays scientists intensely study the problems of cultures and nations intercourse as significance of knowing and competence in foreign languages has increased. Research of phrasicon of comparative languages acts to raise effectiveness of competence in lexis, and enriches with knowledge of cross-cultural aspect, that is a reflection of specific conditions of many spheres of life of language informants: manners, culture and others.

Key words: Language, phraseology, phraseological units, comparative study, multi-structural languages.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many linguists handled and take up problems of comparative Phraseology up to now, such as E.F. Arsenteyeva, L.R. Sakaeva, G.H. Aleeva, G.A. Bazhenov, L.V. Bazarova, L.K. Bayramova, Z.Z. Gatiatullina, U.A. Dolgoplov, I.I. Ibragimova, B.T. Kasharokov, V.M. Mokienko, Z.H. Nurizyanova, U.P. Solodub, F.H. Tarasova, etc.

Phraseology has a special position in the language system, in coherence of its interlocking micro-structures, which join together with the help of hierarchic relations – relations with stepped complexities of its meaning, function and structure. A.V. Kunin says about existence of a special layer of Phraseology in a language called «a layer of units of secondary naming unit», which has complex word structure that consists of «morphologically formalized components» and conforms to grammatical rules (Kunin, 1996). Invariability of structural-grammatical, morphological and lexical aspects – component element of PU stability.

2. METHODS

Linguistics has a great number of various methods nowadays. But we have used definite ones. The following approaches are used in this article: descriptive-analytical, culturological analysis, the method of semantic-cognitive analysis (with the elements of componental and contrary description of phenomena under analysis, and definitional analysis).

3. RESULTS

Being a serial science about set expressions with complete or incomplete rethink of meaning, Phraseology has become an independent linguistic discipline quite recently – 40 or so ago. In the late 20th years of the 20th century E.D. Polivanov highlighted origins of genesis and cause by which this discipline was distinguished as an independent field of science (Polivanov, 1968, p. 60). Later these ideas got further development in teachings of such outstanding linguists as A.I. Smirnitkiy, B.A. Larin and V.V. Vinogradov. After 10 years fruitful efforts of N.N. Amosova, V.L. Arhangelskiy, S.G. Gavrin, A.V. Kunin, I.I. Chernysheva, etc. help Phraseology to overcome a stage of juvenile development and up to the middle of the 60th years of the 20th century forming of a new subdiscipline about a language take place, which has its own object of study, research methods, problems in

functional, semantic and structural aspects. Toward the end of the 70th and 80th Russian Phraseology begins to be perceived as linguistic reality in the West. Russian School of phraseological analysis makes unchallenged triumph and has tremendous sway with global Linguistics (Häusermann, 1997). E.P. Cowie – an outstanding British lexicographer of modern times and the author of a famous Oxford dictionary of modern English idioms, writes: «Recognition of phraseology as an academic discipline within linguistics – the term itself, like the adjective «phraseological», reflects Eastern European usage – is evident not only from vigorous and widespread research activity, but also from the publication of several specialized dictionaries reflecting one theoretical perspective or another... «Classical» Russian theory, with its later extensions and modifications, is probably the most pervasive influence at work in current phraseological studies and is unrivalled in its application to the design and compilation of dictionaries» (Cowie, 1998, p. 2)

Toward the end of the 60th years researches begin to come out in line with phraseological Comparativistics: V.A. Pekler (1967), L.Ya. Orlovskaya (1968), A.S. Ragimov (1968) and others. A scholar and successor of L.V. Shcherba – an outstanding linguist and professor V.D. Arakin deals with the research in a field of linguistic typology. In the 70th and at the beginning of the 80th fundamental researches of comparative Phraseology take place in dissertations of the following linguists: of the English language – L.F. Baranova (1970), V.N. Vovk (1976), E. Babaev (1977); of the Russian language – L.P. Prosvetova (1978), N.L. Gogolitsyna (1979), U.P. Solodub (1982), etc. In these dissertations PU of long-distance related languages are compared: English, which belongs to the Germanic group of languages, and Russian – to the Slavic family of languages.

4. DISCUSSION

Problems of comparative and integrating research of languages and making global mechanism of different languages' ties, which are now more than 4000, are top priority of modern Linguistics. Top priority of this problem has appeared due to practical necessity to arrange and classify all languages of the world, and to formulate criteria of global characteristics for unification and differentiation of languages (Kolshanskij, 1985, p. 14). In this regard one can claim easily that the problem of language typology – one of the first-priority problems of Linguistics.

German linguist Wilhelm Humboldt (1767-1835) – the founder of language typology, which is a special subdiscipline of Linguistics. His linguistic broad-based knowledge was focused on experience with multi-structural languages, the languages of the Indians of America and Polynesia population, with the help of which the scientist makes structure analysis of these languages and for the first time talks about the possibility of their typological classification. In 1965 a famous Russian linguist B.A. Uspenskiy publishes the book «Structural typology of languages». Here the scientist defines typology as «systemization, inventorying of phenomena of different languages» according on grounds of structure which are essential from the perspective of definite language structure. To the middle of the 80th years of the 20th century typology is not a supplementary method, but it is an independent linguistic discipline with its subject of research and problems. This discipline is in the phase of formation.

Linguistic typology being an independent field of Linguistics has been formed nearly 200 years ago. Scientists of typology primarily relied on Morphology at the beginning of the 19th century. Later they inserted Syntax in a field of typological researches (Meshhaninov, 1985, p. 12), and language lexical characteristics became to be used actively in typology. And only at the end of the 2nd century studies of comparative research of different languages' PU come out. These works are devoted to Phraseology study of closely-related Germanic languages on genetical level: Z.Z. Gatiatullina (1968), G.S. Sveshnikova (1969), P.D. Rusakova (1970), R.A. Glazyrin (1972), A.D. Zinkov (1976) and long-distance related languages – English and Russian: U.A. Dolgoplov (1973) and others.

The following phases take place: 1) descriptive classical and descriptive field Linguistics in the region of Phraseology is seeking a solution in typological generalizations; 2) necessity in use of materials of Phraseology appears to make more complete typological language model.

Modern development of a language science proves existence of comparative Phraseology as developing course of Linguistics, where special investigative aspects are planned: contensive-typological, structural-typological, comparative-historical, contrastive and competitive, which have their specific methods, problems and procedures.

5. SUMMARY

Many dissertations are devoted to studying two or more not related languages. One of them is L.R. Sakaeva, who in her scientific work «Comparative analysis PU of anthropocentric orientation» for the first time conducts research of PU of anthropocentric orientation on the material of multi-structural languages – Russian, English, Tadjik and Tatar in comparative-typological aspect; reveals peculiarities (similarities and differences) of PU of anthropocentric orientation of studying languages in typology at multiple levels – structure-grammatical and semantic, depending on intra- and extra-linguistic factors; the linguist deals with principal questions while writing «Polylingual dictionary of PU» (Sakaeva, 2009).

It would be wise to mention here the dissertation of G.A. Bagautdinova «A person in Phraseology: anthropocentric and axiological aspects», in which the author studies Phraseology of Russian, English and Tatar in terms of some interrelate aspects: informative, cognitive, culturological and socio-linguistic. Using anthropocentric and axiological approaches the role and position of Phraseology are defined in linguistic systems of studying languages (Bagautdinova, 2007).

Methods of axiological and cognitive Linguistics are used by E.F. Timergaleeva in her work «Appraisive character of PU with the components of vertical area in Russian, English and French», where the linguist deals with the term «a model of the world» in different historic periods with the help of achievements of axiological Linguistics and analysis of axiological (appraisive) character of elements of the world model in Russian, English and French cultures (Timergaleeva, 2010).

Field structure of the concept and comparative analysis of national sphere of concepts play a great role in cognitive Linguistics. This theme is presented in the dissertation of L.V. Bazarova «The concept «God» in PU of English, Russian, Tatar and Turkish», where there is systematization of the main approaches of scientists-linguists to the analysis of the term «concept»; the author defines the structure of the concept in cognitive Linguistics, taking as a basis definitional analysis of a studying term (Bazarova, 2011).

There are scientific works devoted to comparative study of two and more not related, multi-systematic languages. Here we can mention the dissertation «Semantic field «work» in Phraseology» by S.M.

Yusupova. The phraseologist explores the problems of idioms' semantics, datum and approaches in comparative study of phraseological structure on the material of Foreign and Russian literature. The author deals with dictionary definition of idioms in English, German, Russian and Chechen; forms common classification of idioms, etc (Jusupova, 2011).

Speaking about Kumyk Phraseology one can mention that this field of science attracts researchers as it is by-way. Attention of phraseologists is focused on finding structural, word-forming, stylistical, semantic and functional characteristics. Therefore the following dissertations are presented in Kumyk Phraseology focused on PU studying from different perspectives. The phraseologist K.H. Daibova explores Kumyk Phraseology in descriptive aspect in her Candidate's dissertation (Daibova, 1973) and in her articles (Daibova, 1981). Her materials are presented in two dictionaries. The author for the first time shows principal problems of Kumyk Idiomatics and classifies them.

Articles by N.E. Gadzhiahmedov (Gadzhiahmedov, 1984) and N.H. Olmesov were written with the help of descriptive-synchronal aspect. In the article «The category of time of Kumyk PU» N.E. Gadzhiahmedov deals with speech usage of PU with temporal meaning forming phraseo-macrofield of time. In the article «Verbal categories of PU of Kumyk and Russian» the author works with verbal categories of PU in comparative aspect [1989]. The article by N.H. Olmesov is devoted to structure-semantic organization of somatic PU in dialect system of Kumyk. A.Z. Abdullaeva has made strong contribution into protection of Kumyk phraseological potential (Abdullaeva, 2002). The linguist summarizes systematic studying and describes Kumyk Idiomatics at large that is the first experience.

Mengisanova S.B. «Arabisms in Kumyk» highlights the problems of homonymy and polysemy in the system of Arabisms which has close connection. With the help of descriptive and synchronic analysis of Kumyk homonymy and polysemy the author reveals definite models of semantics in semantic structure of the Kumyk language, mobility or stability of definite meanings, etc (Mengisanova, 2002).

M.I. Mugidova in her «Somatic PU of Kumyk and Russian» takes up component structure of PU,

polysemy, homonymy, antonymy, synonymy of PU.

6. CONCLUSIONS

As a result nowadays there is a great number of scientific works on comparative Phraseology of English and Russian, which influenced on formation and further development of this area as an independent scientific discipline. Most of these dissertations were used as the basis for dissertations' writing and creating phraseological dictionaries. Nevertheless many problems and aspects of Phraseology haven't studied yet. They attract more and more scientists.

Thus speaking about Kumyk Phraseology it is necessary to point that over several years many linguists have been making attempts to study phraseological structure of this language, which was crowned with success. However these are only some aspects of studying phraseological layer of the Kumyk language. Phraseology of Kumyk passes through the phase of juvenile development. Many aspects of comparative research of multi-structural languages: English, Russian and Kumyk, are still open, attracting more and more scientists-linguists.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

REFERENCES

- Abdullaeva, A. Z. (2002). *Glagol'nye slovosochetaniya v kumyjskom jazyke*: dis. kand. filol. nauk, Mahachkala.
- Bagautdinova, G. A. (2007). *Chelovek vo frazeologii: antropocentricheskij i aksiologicheskij aspekty*: dis. d-ra filol. Nauk, Kazan.
- Bazarova, L. V. (2011) «*Bog*» vo frazeologicheskikh edinicah anglijskogo, russkogo, tatarskogo i tureckogo jazykov: dis. ... kand. filol. Nauk, Kazan.
- Cowie, A. P. (1998). *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Application*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Daibova, K. H. (1973). Kratkij, frazeologičeskij slovar' kumyškogo jazyka, Mahachkala.
- Daibova, K. H. (1981) Kumyško-ruskij i rusko-kumyškij frazeologičeskij slovar, Mahachkala.
- Gadžiahmedov, N. Je. (1984). Kategorija vremeni frazeologičeskijh edinic kumyškogo jazyka, Voprosy obshhej i dagestanskoj frazeologii. Mezhvuzovskij sbornik, Mahachkala.
- Häusermann, J. (1997). Phraseologie: Hauptprobleme der deutschen Phraseologie auf der Basis sowjetischer Forschungsergebnisse, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Jusupova, S. M. (2011). Semantičeskoe pole «Trud» vo frazeologii: dis. kand. filol. Nauk, Moskva.
- Kolshanskij, G.V. (1985). Universal'naja i častnaja tipologija jazyka, Lingvističeskaja tipologija, M.: Nauka.
- Kunin, A. V. (1996). Kurs frazeologii sovremennogo angliškogo jazyka, Moscow.: Vyssh. Shk.; Dubna: Feniks.
- Mengisanova, S. B. (2002) Arabizmy v kumyšskom jazyke: dis. ... kand. filol. Nauk, Mahachkala.
- Meshhaninov, I. I. (1985). Tipologičeskie sopostavlenija i tipologija system, Nauch. dokl. vyssh. Shkoly, Filol. nauki, № 3.
- Polivanov, E. D. (1968). Stat'i po obshhemu jazykoznaniju, Moscow.
- Sakaeva, L. R. (2009). Sopostavitel'nyj analiz frazeologičeskijh edinic antropocentričeskoj napravlenosti (na materiale ruskogo, angliškogo, tadžičskogo i tatrskogo jazykov): dis. d-ra filol. Nauk, Kazan.
- Timergaleeva, E. R. (2010). Očenočnyj harakter frazeologizmov s komponentami vertikal'nogo prostranstva v ruskom, anglišskom i francuzskom jazykah: dis. kand. filol. Nauk, Ekaterinburg.