

**TEACHING FOREIGN STUDENTS-PHILOLOGISTS  
RUSSIAN NATIONAL-SPECIFIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS**

*Misnyova V.V., PhD (Kharkiv)*

The given article is devoted to the research of the nationally-oriented principle in training the Russian phraseology in multinational students' audience. In phraseological units national identity of the language receives the brightest and direct manifestation as they are correlated directly with extralanguage reality. Revealing of national and cultural specifics of the phraseological units' semantics of one language can be carried out only in comparison with the phraseological unit of the student's native language, and allocation of common features of two languages promotes fast understanding of national and cultural component's semantics. Comparison of phraseological units gets a special practical sense in the linguocultural aspect which promotes not only the expansion of the students'

background and the formation of their linguocultural competence, but also allows to warn the specific mistakes caused by the interference and to eliminate the influence of the students' native language and culture.

Relying on the observations of the linguists and methodologists of Russian as a foreign language in our country and on the author's experience of teaching foreign students-philologists as well, the main differences of Russian and Eastern phraseological systems have been considered in the article; the difficulties of learning national-specific phraseological units have been described and systematized. The main attention is focused on the expedient use of the comparison of the student's native language and the target one to establish the similarity and distinction of the compared units as well as the degree of this similarity or distinction. It serves as a basis for structuring the content of training in which the nationally-oriented approach of teaching a foreign language in the definite national audience is carried out. According to the author's findings the consideration and accounting of the problems, which are solved in the article, allow to increase the efficiency and quality of training national-specific phraseological units of the Russian language to foreign students-philologists.

**Key words:** cross-cultural communication, comparison, foreign students-philologists, national-cultural component, phraseological unit.

**Місеньова В.В. Навчання іноземних студентів-філологів фразеологічних одиниць російської мови з національно-культурною специфікою.** Статтю присвячено дослідженню принципу національної орієнтації у навчанні російської фразеології в багатонаціональній студентській аудиторії. Спираючись на спостереження зарубіжних і вітчизняних лінгвістів, методистів російської мови як іноземної, а також на власний досвід навчання іноземних студентів-філологів, автор розглядає основні відмінності фразеологічних систем російської мови та східних мов; описує та систематизує труднощі, які виникають у вивченні фразеологізмів з національно-культурною специфікою. У статті наголошується на доцільному використанні співставлення мови навчання та рідної мови, з метою встановити спільність, подібність та відмінність одиниць, що порівнюються, а також ступінь виявлених відмінностей або подібності.

**Ключові слова:** іноземні студенти-філологи, міжкультурна комунікація, національно-культурний компонент, співставлення, фразеологізм.

**Мисенёва В.В. Обучение иностранных студентов-филологов фразеологическим единицам русского языка с национально-культурной спецификой.** Статья посвящена исследованию принципа национальной ориентации в обучении русской фразеологии в многонациональной

студенческой аудитории. Опираясь на наблюдения зарубежных и отечественных лингвистов, методистов русского языка как иностранного, а также на собственный опыт практической работы с иностранными студентами-филологами, автор рассматривает основные отличия фразеологических систем русского языка и восточных языков; описывает и систематизирует трудности, возникающие при изучении фразеологизмов с национально-культурной спецификой. В статье акцентируется внимание на целесообразном использовании сопоставления изучаемого и родного языков, чтобы установить общность, сходство и различие сравниваемых единиц, а также степень данного сходства или различия.

**Ключевые слова:** иностранные студенты-филологи, межкультурная коммуникация, национально-культурный компонент, сопоставление, фразеологизм.

One of the developing directions of linguoculturology is cross-cultural communication. Definition of this direction is reflected in the term itself: this is the communication of people representing various cultures [3; 5; 8; 11; 12; 14; 15]. Researches on the cross-cultural communication are widely applied not only in linguistics, but in language teaching methods as well [1; 4; 6; 16]. When training a foreign language, it is necessary to consider its connection with culture. After all it is required not only to acquire linguistic data but also to learn the national character, traditions, customs of other people, system of its norms and values.

Acquaintance with the mentioned works shows that researches on cross-cultural communication has held a firm place in linguistics by now, having received the status of the independent linguistic direction. Nevertheless, there are many issues which in the aspect under analysis have not been investigated yet. If the general questions of cross-cultural communication in a certain measure have been studied, the separate levels and systems in the specified aspect haven't been taken into consideration yet. The subject matter of studies connected with foreign language students' national culture in language teaching methods of Russian as a foreign one (RAFL) is **actual** for the time being. In modern language teaching methods and student teaching it is conventional that the most important means of the educational process optimization is nationally-oriented teaching [6]. It is the main methodical installation on the basis of which the principles of consciousness, systemacity, functionality and communicative orientation are realized, adequate forms and methods of training are defined.

Influence of the students' language system on the formation of a new language system happens in acquiring each linguistic phenomenon of any level and in the process of learning RAFL, therefore certain techniques of nationally-oriented language teaching methods can be attached to all language levels and at all levels of teaching. Comparative learning of languages has the philological nature: acquaintance with the culture of a native speakers' country is carried out in the process of learning language units with national and cultural elements in semantics. By comparison of languages national and cultural distinctions are observed practically at all levels, but they are especially bright at lexical and phraseological levels. For this reason lexicology and phraseology act as a direct object of comparative linguoculturology.

The necessity of expansion of typological studies in the field of phraseology was indicated by many scientists as "lexicological and phraseological systems of language act as the main and defining sphere of processes of languages interaction" [5]. The main object in the analysis of phraseological systems of two languages is a phraseological image, as the peculiarities of figurative thinking are more reflected in the structure of set phrases.

In phraseological units national identity of the language receives the brightest and direct manifestation as they are correlated directly with extra language reality. Revealing of national and cultural specifics of the phraseological units' semantics of one language can be carried out only in comparison with the phraseological unit of the student's native language, and allocation of common features of two languages promotes fast understanding of the national and cultural component's semantics.

Thus, the **purpose** of the given article is carrying out the comparative analysis of national-specific phraseological units in multinational groups of students.

The aim of the research led to the formulation and solution of the following **tasks**: 1) to determine the main differences of national-specific phraseological units in multinational groups of students; 2) to reveal the main difficulties while comparing Russian and Eastern phraseological pictures of the world.

The purposes of comparative representations of national phraseological units are quite obvious: "knowledge of proverbs and sayings of these or those people promotes not only the best knowledge of language, but also

the best understanding of people's views and characters" [8]. However realization of similar plans is connected with overcoming the essential difficulty which means the discrepancy or partial coincidence of phraseological units' and proverbs' semantic invariants. Comparative study of different phraseological pictures of the world, being a linguistic basis of the language teaching methods of foreign language phraseology, allows not only to predict the interference of a great number of phraseological units but also to interpret the language material methodically. Methodical interpretation of the comparative phraseology data proceeds from the purposes and problems of training. In the field of phraseology they are as follows: 1) to expand a stock of phraseological units (not only active but also passive) in the students' speech; 2) to train in adequate understanding and the use of phraseological units in different types of speech activity; 3) to develop the students' intelligence in comprehension and mastering of the phraseological pictures of the world fragments of the target language.

There are three types of skills for mastering phraseology: potential – understanding of unfamiliar phraseological units in the context on the basis of their word-for-word translation, receptive – recognition of phraseological units which had been learnt before, productive – use of phraseological units' in own speech [16]. Besides, for implementing phraseological units into the process of teaching it is necessary to define what real difficulties (lexical, grammatical, semantic, linguocultural) foreign students are able to face with. Lexical difficulties of mastering phraseological units can be caused by phraseologically-connected vocabulary, archaisms, neologisms, stylistically-marked words, proper names, terms and other words with low rate of use. Grammatical difficulties of learning phraseological units can be caused by phraseologically-connected word forms, preference of little-used forms, homonymous and repeating forms, an atypical word order, predicative structures unknown for students. Due to the inclusion of phraseological units in speech, there are some difficulties as follows: general and special means of interphrase communication, restriction and lack of compatibility according to general rules, individual rules of compatibility, statement of punctuation marks according to special rules, impossibility of the sentence parts to be included between phraseological unit components [7; 9]. Many of the specified difficulties amplify under the influence of intralingual and interlingual interferences.

Mastering of any foreign language for executing its main communicative function assumes also the formation (acquisition) of cultural competence. For example, when training Russian to the Chinese students, we face with many difficulties, because cultures of Russia and China are far from each other. This information should be considered to build up the process of teaching the Chinese students Russian so that there was a stage-by-stage formation of the students' identity, the development of their creative opportunities, awakening of interest to the Russian culture, traditions and world-view perception. Comparison of phraseological units gets a special practical sense in the linguocultural aspect which promotes not only the expansion of the students' background and the formation of their linguocultural competence but also allows to warn the specific mistakes caused by the interference and to eliminate the influence of the students' native language and culture.

The originality of the Russian national culture and its considerable differences from the Eastern ones create certain difficulties for students, therefore it is necessary to find optimum ways for improving the process of training, which can be carried out at the expense of taking into account the peculiarities of cross-cultural communication, deep and versatile entry of foreign students into national and cultural specifics of native speakers' speech behavior and culture.

It should be noted that Russian and Eastern cultures have absolutely different sources and bases. For example, in the formation of the Russian national culture the important role was played by the Christianity and paganism, whereas the Chinese culture relies on the Daoism, Buddhism and the main thing – Confucianism. The Chinese phraseological units (especially with no direct equivalents, which are difficult for Russian native speakers' comprehension) came in the Chinese language from the texts of ancient historians, philosophers, writers, poets, and reflect in the language thousand-year traditions of the Chinese: *ши хоу Чжугэ Лянь* (букв. *быть Чжугэ Лянем после события*), *цзян тайгун дяо юй, юаньчжэ шангоу* (букв. *старец Цзян ловит рыбу – сидит и ждёт, когда она сядет на крючок*), *хуа ши тьян зу* (букв. *нарисовав змею, добавить ей ноги*) [13]. The considerable part of Russian phraseological units is taken from the Bible, Greek mythology, history and folklore: *по щучьему велению, за тридевять земель, при царе Горохе, отставной козы барабанщик, метать бисер перед*

*свиньями, яблоко раздора, медвежья услуга* [11].

According to the analysis of Russian and Chinese national-specific phraseological units, spheres of the human experience generally coincide, but their content remains specific: phraseological unit reflects the realities of the national culture or is build up on the basis of national associative and figurative connotations [7]. This specific character has to be considered when training phraseological units in multinational groups of students. The results of the comparative analysis of Russian and Chinese phraseological units give us the chance to present the meaning of phraseological units more voluminous and deep according to the language reality reflected in a communication process. The research of Russian and Chinese phraseological units' correlation and the development of ways for presenting these units by the students promote the improvement of a teaching model taking into account cross-cultural communication.

As for the figurative means used in languages for the expression of moral and valuable phraseological units' meanings, difference in the "construction material" of metaphors is especially noticeable. For example, the Chinese language consciousness appeals to the nature, wild animals, while the Russian one is more often turned to the household plots, domestic animals. The other difference consists of various stylistic nuances of phraseological units and proverbs. East idioms aspire to a sublime style, poetry that corresponds to the status of moral and valuable estimates of life situations and certain behavior models of the person in them [2]. The stylistics of Russian idioms is obviously lowered, many of them are marked out by irony or frank sneers. Besides, these units are rich in colloquial (sometimes abusive) vocabulary.

Let's carry out the comparative analysis of Russian and Chinese semantic equivalents in which two main differences have been shown especially visually: *белая ворона* (кит. журавль среди кур); *оказывать медвежью услугу* (кит. вытягивать всходы руками, чтобы они лучше росли); *испытывать судьбу* (кит. дёргать тигра за хвост); *семь пятниц на неделе* (кит. утром стоят за царство Цинь, а вечером – за Чу); *не видеть дальше своего носа* (кит. уподобляться лягушке, сидящей на дне колодца и глядящей в небо) [2; 13].

It can be noticed that Russian phraseological units are characterized by the lowered stylistics of metaphors with the "construction material" –

people, everyday occurrence; Chinese phraseological units are differed by poetic metaphor coloring with the “construction material” – nature, fauna.

In Russian and Chinese languages it is possible to see the phraseological units, which have an identical or similar meaning, and can be used in identical situations. When learning such phraseological units, it is also expedient to use the comparison of the student’s native language and the target one to establish the similarity and distinction of the compared units as well as the degree of this similarity or distinction. It gives the material for organizing the content of training in which the nationally-oriented approach of teaching a foreign language in the definite national audience is carried out.

The problem of learning Russian language national specifics in the didactic purposes is based on the fundamental position that the process of learning the phraseological system has to begin with mastering interlingual phraseological compliances – equivalents which appear on the basis of life experience, universality of thinking laws and coincidence of some forms of different people’s figurative vision. Observations showed that at the selection of any equivalent the disclosure of sense and presentation of a situation have to be in the centre of attention. The detailed interpretation, phraseological units’ commenting, selection of the Chinese compliances provide penetrating into the value of Russian phraseological units, acquiring of semantic and situational restrictions of their use.

To sum up, it can be concluded that learning the system of Russian phraseology allows to do generalizations which are beyond linguistics and concern the features of national figurativeness of thinking and moral and valuable priorities existing in the culture. Experience of work in the Chinese audience confirms that students quite often inadequately perceive and use the Russian phraseological units in the speech, because they poorly possess the extralinguistic information concentrated in phraseological units. Difficulties of the extralinguistic character are caused by the difficulties arising at understanding the information concluded in the native speakers’ communication. Therefore work with national-specific phraseology is extremely important process and the efficiency of learning Russian phraseology by foreign students-philologists substantially depends on its performance.

**Further work** on this issue provides an in-depth study of finding out typical mistakes in the use of Russian phraseological units by foreign students-philologists in order to make the process of teaching more effective.



## LITERATURE

1. Верещагин Е.М. Язык и культура: лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного / Е.М. Верещагин, В.Г. Костомаров. – М. : Рус. яз., 1990. – 246 с.
2. Ветров П.П. Фразеология современного китайского языка: Стилистика и синтаксис / П.П. Ветров. – М. : Восточная книга, 2007. – 368 с.
3. Грушевицкая Т.Г. Основы межкультурной коммуникации / Т.Г. Грушевицкая, В.Д. Попков, А.П. Садохин. – М. : ЮНИТИ-ДАНА, 2003. – 352 с.
4. Добровольский Д.О. Национально-культурная специфика во фразеологии / Д.О. Добровольский // Вопросы языкознания. – 1997. – №6. – С. 37–48.
5. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология / В.А. Маслова. – М. : Изд. центр «Академия», 2001. – 208 с.
6. Минакова Е.Е. Современная русская идиоматика : учеб. пособие для иностранцев, изучающих русский язык / Е.Е. Минакова. – М. : Рус. яз., 2005. – 136 с.
7. Мисенёва В.В. Генезис образности фразеологических единиц, не имеющих соответствий в системе слов / В.В. Мисенёва // Вісник Харків. нац. ун-ту ім. В.Н. Каразіна. – № 607. Серія: Філологія. – Вип. 39 «Харківська філологічна школа і сучасність». – Харків : ХНУ ім. В.Н. Каразіна, 2004. – С. 186–190.
8. Мисенёва В.В. Фраземы, не имеющие соответствий в системе слов, в аспекте межкультурной коммуникации / В.В. Мисенёва // Вісник Харків. нац. ун-ту ім. В.Н. Каразіна. Серія: Романо-германська філологія. – 2008. – №811, вип. 55. – С. 49–55.
9. Мисенёва В.В. Теория и практика перевода с русского языка на родной язык студента. Филологический профиль : учеб. пособие для иностранных студентов / В.В. Мисенёва. – Х. : ХНУ имени В.Н. Каразина, 2012. – 148 с.
10. Семенас А.Л. Лексика китайского языка / А.Л. Семенас. – М. : АСТ : Восток-Запад, 2007. – 284 с.
11. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты / В.Н. Телия. – М. : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. – 288 с.
12. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и международная коммуникация / С.Г. Тер-Минасова. – М. : «Слово», 2000. – 261 с.
13. Щичко В.Ф. Теория и практика перевода. Китайский язык : учеб. пособие / В.Ф. Щичко. – М. : АСТ : Восток-Запад, 2007. – 223 с.
14. Bennet M. Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication. Selected Readings / M. Bennet. – Yarmouth, 1998. – 118 p.

15. Martin J. Intercultural Communication in Contexts / J. Martin, Th. Nakayama. – London. Toronto, 2000. – 145 p.
16. Paige M. Education for the Intercultural Experience / M. Paige. – Yarmouth, 1993. – 93 p.