УДК 811.161.1'243:378.147.091.33 – 028.17
http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0625-6034

WAYS OF OVERCOMING DIFFICULTIES WHILE LEARNING PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN MULTINATIONAL GROUPS OF STUDENTS-PHILOLOGISTS

Misenyova V., PhD in Philology (Kharkiv)

The article deals with the description and systematization of the difficulties while learning phraseology in multinational groups of students-philologists. The author considers the comparative analysis as one of the leading directions in learning phraseology which is a linguistic basis of the language teaching methods in training foreign phraseology and allows not only to predict the interference of a great number of phraseological units, but also to interpret language material in a methodical way proceeding from specific goals and problems of training the target language. Comparison of Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units and the student's native language has allowed the author to allocate several groups of phraseological units with different degree of similarity: from full coincidence of semantics, stylistic colouring and initial image (an internal form) to phraseological units with no direct equivalents in other languages.

Relying on observations of Russian and Ukrainian linguists and methodologists and also on the author's experience of teaching foreign students-philologists, it should be noted that the difficulties in learning phraseology in foreign audience are caused by the fact that the European and Eastern language systems have distinctions at all levels: phonetic, lexical, grammatical, and also in the field of graphics. From the point of view of national consciousness typical difficulties are shown, first of all, in case of perception of verbal images of Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units. For example, for foreign students there are absolutely alien images if they don't know that these images are connected with the Russian and Ukrainian folklore. Lexical difficulties are found in perception of semantic meanings of the words with no direct equivalents in other languages.

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.

Key words: comparative analysis, foreign students-philologists, national and cultural component, phraseological units with no direct equivalents, semantization.

Місеньова В.В. Шляхи подолання труднощів вивчення фразеологічних одиниць у багатонаціональних групах студентів-філологів. У статті описуються і систематизуються труднощі, що виникають при вивченні фразеології у багатонаціональній аудиторії. Автор статті розглядає порівняльний аналіз як один із провідних напрямків вивчення фразеології, який є основою методики навчання іншомовної фразеології і дозволяє не тільки прогнозувати інтерференцію великої кількості фразеологізмів, а й методично інтерпретувати мовний матеріал, виходячи з конкретних цілей і завдань навчання мови. Зіставлення фразеологічних одиниць російської, української та рідної мови студента дозволило автору виділити кілька груп фразеологізмів, що розрізняються різним ступенем схожості: від повного збігу семантики, стилістичного забарвлення і вихідного образу (внутрішньої форми) до абсолютної безеквівалентності фразеологічних одиниць.

Ключові слова: безеквівалентні фразеологічні одиниці, зіставний аналіз, іноземні студенти-філологи, національно-культурний компонент, семантизація.

Мисенёва В.В. Пути преодоления трудностей изучения фразеологических единиц в многонациональных группах студентов-филологов. В статье описываются и систематизируются трудности, возникающие при изучении фразеологии в многонациональной аудитории. Автор статьи рассматривает сопоставительный анализ как одно из ведущих направлений изучения фразеологии, которое является основой методики обучения фразеологии и позволяет не только прогнозировать интерференцию множества фразеологизмов, но и методически интерпретировать языковой материал, исходя из конкретных целей и задач обучения изучаемого языка. Сопоставление фразеологических единиц русского, украинского и родного языка студента позволило автору выделить несколько групп фразеологизмов, различающихся разной степенью сходства: от полного совпадения семантики, стилистической окраски и исходного образа (внутренней формы) до абсолютной безэквивалентности фразеологических единиц.

Ключевые слова: безэквивалентные фразеологические единицы, иностранные студенты-филологи, национально-культурный компонент, семантизация, сравнительный анализ.

The topicality of the research. Phraseology, created as a linguistic discipline rather recently, now draws the increasing attention not only of linguists, but also experts in the field of teaching Ukrainian and Russian as foreign languages.

Phraseological units (PhU) are studied not only as proper linguistic phenomena, but also as a means of fixing experience and mentality of

ethnos, and as a means of providing extralinguistic information connected with the person and as one of the ways of the people's culture reflection. To master the foreign language, it is necessary to realize that the informant of the target language is the informant of foreign culture, and to communicate with him, it is necessary to learn his culture, as assimilation of the foreign language is, first of all, assimilation of a new culture. According to such approach language acts as its important component and a form of expression of a national view at the world [2; 3; 6; 12; 13; 14].

The degree of scientific research of the issue. 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 in semantics.

In modern practice of teaching Russian and Ukrainian to foreigners the problem of mastering phraseology was always and still remains rather difficult in the methodical relation, in spite of the fact that the considerable attention is paid to learning phraseology in multinational audience both in scientific-theoretical and practical-methodical aspects [5; 7; 8; 9; 15; 16; 17; 18]. Taking into consideration contemporary language teaching methods and pedagogical practice V. Vagner considers that the most important means of optimization of the educational process is nationally-oriented teaching/learning. It is the main methodical installation on the basis of which the principles of consciousness, systematicness, functionality, communicative orientation are implemented, adequate forms and methods of training are defined [2]. According to N. Chernova's point of view "influence of the student's native language system on the formation of a new language system takes place in mastering each linguistic phenomenon of any level and throughout learning the target language therefore nationally-oriented language teaching methods can be attached to all language levels and at all stages of teaching/learning" [16: 19].

The **purpose** of the given article is the description and systematization of the main difficulties while learning Ukrainian and Russian phraseological units in multinational groups of students-philologists.

The aim of the research led to the formulation and solution of the following **tasks**: 1) to reveal typical mistakes of using phraseological units when comparing Ukrainian/Russian and Eastern phraseological pictures of the world; 2) to expand the vocabulary fund of phraseological units (not only active, but also passive) in the foreign students' speech.

Ability to understand and to use phraseological units in speech in a correct way increases the general language culture, helps a free and figurative statement of a thought, improves the ways of translation and expands country-specific representations of foreign students. For the analysis of phraseological material in training foreign students-philologists the target language, various methods can be implemented: semantic interpretation, the linguistic-cultural comment and the comparative analysis of PhU used in the target language and the student's native language. Many linguists consider the comparative analysis as one of the leading directions of training phraseology. Comparative learning of phraseological units, being a linguistic basis of the language teaching methods of foreign phraseology, allows not only to predict the interference of a great number of PhU, but also to interpret language material in a methodical way, proceeding from specific goals and problems of the target language training.

Comparison of phraseological units of the target language and the student's native language has allowed the author to allocate several groups of PhU according to different degree of similarity: from full coincidence of semantics, stylistic colouring and initial image (an internal form) to phraseological units with no direct equivalents.

1. The first group of the compared phraseological units is formed by full equivalents. This group includes PhU, which despite some differences in component structure, has identical meaning, high degree of figurativeness, stylistic colouring and can be used in identical situations. Let's consider the way of representing in phraseology of different languages the situation in which a speaker points out the impossibility of making a certain action: *RUS. когда* ***рак*** *на горе свистнет*; *UKR. як на камені* ***пшениця*** *вродить*; *ENG. когда* ***свиньи*** *начнут летать (when pigs begin to fly)*; *CHN. в год* ***обезьяны*** *и в месяц* ***лошади***; *ARB. когда* ***осёл*** *поднимется на гору*.

Phraseological units of this group offer no special difficulties in semantization them when training Russian/Ukrainian as a foreign language. Such PhU have an identical invariant of sense and an identical internal

form, but sometimes tiny nuances of sense can be behind the absolute identity. Bilingual dictionaries provide phraseological units which can, at first sight, be carried to absolute equivalents, and only careful analysis allows noticing insignificant differences which interpretation can have unexpected and important consequences, from the point of view of understanding national mentality.

2. Partial equivalents are referred to the second group of the compared phraseological units. It is possible to find phraseological units which make identical meaning in the target language and the student's native language, but differ in various degree of figurativeness or stylistic colouring that points to the distinction of two cultures. Usually such phraseological units have identical meaning, but differ in the structure of lexical components and, therefore, an internal form. For example, in Russian and Ukrainian there is PhU *белая ворона (укр. біла ворона)* (about the person who differs from other people in the behavior, appearance). In the Russian and Ukrainian pictures of the world it can be used both in positive and negative meanings. In the Chinese picture of the world there is PhU *журавль среди кур* (*he li ji qun*) with a similar meaning, but different stylistic colouring as this unit is used only in a positive meaning. The Turkmen have the same PhU with a positive value only – *белый цыплёнок*.

Different degree of figurativeness can become the reason of difference in several phraseological pictures of the world: *CHN. цзян тайгун дяо юй, юаньчжэ шангоу (старец Цзян ловит рыбу – сидит и ждёт, когда она сядет на крючок) – RUS. ждать у моря погоды (UKR. виглядати над морем погоди)*. The image which is the foundation of the Chinese PhU is much brighter as this set phrase is tied to a legend according to which Jiang – a legendary wise man and a righteous person was a big fan of fishing and devoted to this hobby much time. At the same time fish, as if paying a tribute of his wisdom, went to him even on an empty hook. Different degree of figurativeness is caused by the fact that Eastern idioms gravitate to a sublime style, to poetry that quite corresponds to the status of moral and valuable estimates of life situations and certain behavior models of the person in them. The stylistics of the Russian and Ukrainian idioms of valuable sense is obviously lowered, many of them are noted by irony or a frank sneer, abound colloquial (sometimes abusive) vocabulary. For example: *драть как Сидорову козу* means to flog

strongly, cruelly and ruthlessly, beat somebody. Figurativeness of comparison is based on figurative senses of words Sidor (this name was often connected with the idea of an angry or quarrelsome person) and a goat (an animal with a mean character according to national representations).

Such phraseological units can be translated with difficulties as different figurativeness disturbs understanding of the meaning and when translating they are filled with other images.

3. Phraseological units which have no equivalents in other languages can be referred to the third group. In Russian and Ukrainian languages as well as in any others, there is a large number of phraseological units which have no compliances at the level of sense in other languages. Such phraseological units often remain beyond the scope of bilingual phraseological dictionaries. For this reason they have nothing to give as compliances, we can only translate them and explain their meaning. For example, in the Chinese language there are no equivalents for the Ukrainian and Russian phraseological units containing national-specific vocabulary (archaisms, toponyms, anthroponyms, etc.) in the structure: *RUS. коломенская верста, кладезь премудрости, кисейная барышня, дядя Стёпа, мальчик с пальчик*, etc.; *UKR. чугуївська верста, пупа надривати, гав ловити, підносити гарбуза, як у віночку, аж гай гуде, нате й мій глек на капусту*, etc. Such phraseological units need to be translated word-by-word, trying to keep their language features, stylistic colouring. Phraseological units which metaphors are based on the usual words having compliances in the student's native language can be also untranslatable: *RUS. заживёт как на собаке, мурашки по спине бегают, летать в облаках; UKR. виносити сміття з хати, хоч шаром покати, зуб на зуб не попаде, як курка лапою.*

So, difficulties of learning phraseological units with no direct equivalents are in the fact that people living in different social, territorial, environment conditions, having different history, religion, customs, the principles of morals, psychology, etc. even the most everyday occurrences and objects often cause unequal associations from which phraseological metaphors appear. Despite the difficulties of translation and understanding of Ukrainian and Russian phraseological units, they need to be included in the process of language training. This is one of the best ways of making foreign students more active, imparting them love to the target language,

bringing up on the examples of Russian and Ukrainian proverbs and sayings.

According to O.A. Kornilov, at the description of any phraseological unit of a foreign language it would be better to reflect the following parameters: a) meaning and internal form (literal translation of the original); b) approximate (or full) semantic equivalent in the native language (with emphasis on semantic asymmetry if it exists); c) etymology of the equivalent (if it is traced) [5].

When training Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units the role of etymology is extremely important, though isn't identical in relation to the target language and the student's native language. In Eastern languages a phraseological expression often represents the compressed in several hieroglyphs reference to a parable, legend or a historical event. In Russian and Ukrainian languages the majority of etymological references opens an internal form of phraseological fusions. For this reason for the student, who is not implemented in the historical and cultural context of Russian and Ukrainian civilization, information about the origin of this or that expression is the condition of the correct understanding of a set phrase general sense.

Thus, learning of phraseological systems allows doing generalizations which are beyond linguistics and concern the features of national figurativeness of thinking, moral and valuable priorities existing in the culture of the target language. The popular wisdom, imprinted in phraseological units and beauty of images by means of which it is expressed, is a direct reflection of beauty and wisdom of people's collective language consciousness [5].

The experience of work in multinational groups demonstrates that foreign students-philologists quite often inadequately perceive and use Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units in their speech, because they poorly possess the extralinguistic information concentrated in PhU. Difficulties of extralinguistic nature are caused by the difficulties arising in case of understanding the information concluded in native speakers' speech, therefore work at national-specific phraseology is extremely important process that depends on the ways of presenting phraseological units to foreign students.

From the point of view of national consciousness typical difficulties are shown, first of all, at perception of verbal images of the Russian and Ukrainian texts. In language teaching methods there is a fair opinion that

the foreigner who has a language competence of the literary text completely understands only literal «grammatical» sense of the phrase while the language of art is a language of images, and images develop in reader's perception only when reading of the text goes beyond literalism [4]. For example, for foreign students there are absolutely alien images *(RUS. избушка на курьих ножках, за тридевять земель, кто в лес, кто по дрова, по щучьему велению, Демьянова уха, ворона в павлиньих перьях* и др.; *UKR. лис Микита, хатка на курячій ніжці, Баба-Яга кістяна нога, дід з кикоть, а борода з лікоть, тридесяте царство, інше государство, аж дух сперло)* if they don't know that these images are connected with the Russian and Ukrainian folklore.

Conclusion. Relying on observations of Russian and Ukrainian linguists and methodologists as well as on the experience of teaching foreign students-philologists, it should be noted that the difficulties in learning phraseology in foreign audience are caused by the fact that the European and Eastern language systems have distinctions at all levels: phonetic, lexical, grammatical, and also in the field of graphics. Lexical difficulties in respect of the content, first of all, are found in perception of semantic meanings of the words with no equivalents in other languages. As a part of phraseological units, national-specific and background words denoting names of objects and phenomena of national life we meet very often. Recognition and understanding of the mentioned lexical units at the perception of Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units by foreign students are provided with not only language knowledge, but also «background» knowledge of culture of the country of the target language.

Further study can focus on the issue of the linguodidactic analysis of the text of a manual as a means of teaching foreign students-philologists.

LITERATURE

1. Бирих А.К. Словарь русской фразеологии. Историко-этимологический справочник / А.К. Бирих, В.М. Мокиенко, Л.И. Степанова. – СПб. : Фолио-Пресс, 1998. – 448 с.
2. Вагнер В.Н. Лексика русского языка как иностранного и ее преподавание: учеб. пособие / В.Н. Вагнер. – М. : Флинта, 2006. – 71 с.
3. Верещагин Е.М. Язык и культура: лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного / Е.М. Верещагин, В.Г. Костомаров. – [Изд. 4, перераб. и дополн.]. – М. : Рус. язык, 1990. – 59 с.

4. Добровольский Д.О. Национально-культурная специфика во фразеологии / Д.О. Добровольский // Вопросы языкознания. – 1997. – № 6. – С. 37–48.
5. Корнилов О.А. Жемчужины китайской фразеологии / О.А. Корнилов. – М. : ЧеРо, 2005. – 226 с.
6. Крюкова Г.А. К вопросу о формировании картины мира у иностранных студентов, изучающих русский язык / Г.А. Крюкова // Вестник Моск. ун-та. Сер. 19. Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. – 2005. – № 1. – С. 136–140.
7. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология / В.А. Маслова. – М. : Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. – 208 с.
8. Поморцева Н.В. Лингвокультурная адаптация иностранных студентов к российской высшей школе: проблемы и пути осуществления / Н.В. Поморцева // Высшее образование сегодня. – 2009. – № 6. – С. 88–90.
9. Прохоров Ю.А. Национальные социокультурные стереотипы речевого общения и их роль в обучении русскому языку иностранцев / Ю.А. Прохоров. – М. : Изд-во ЛКИ, 2008. – 224 с.
10. Семёнова Н.А. Актуальность лингвометодических исследований фразеологии в работе с иностранными учащимися / Н.А. Семёнова // Молодой учёный. – 2014. – № 14. – С. 110–112.
11. Словник-довідник з української лінгводидактики : навч. посіб. / за ред. М. Пентилюк. – К. : Ленвіт, 2015. – 320 с.
12. Солодуб Ю.П. Путешествие в мир фразеологии / Ю.П. Солодуб. – М. : Просвещение, 1981. – 64 с.
13. Стернин И.А. Модели описания коммуникативного поведения / И.А. Стернин. – [Изд. 2. испр.]. – Воронеж : Гарант, 2015. – 52 с.
14. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты / В.Н. Телия. – М. : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. – 288 с.
15. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и международная коммуникация / С.Г. Тер-Минасова. – М. : Слово, 2000. – 261 с.
16. Чернова Н.В. Русская фразеология в практике преподавания русского языка как иностранного филологам : дис. ... канд. пед. наук : 13.00.02 / Чернова Наталья Владимировна. – М., 2004. – 197 с.
17. Шаклеин В.М. Современные методики преподавания русского языка нерусским : учеб. пособие / В.М. Шаклеин, Н.В. Рыжова – М. : РУДН, 2008. – 258 с.
18. Щукин А.Н. Методика преподавания русского языка как иностранного / А.Н. Щукин. – М. : Высш. шк., 2003. – 334 с.

REFERENCES

Birih, A.K., Mokienko, V.M. and Stepanova, L.I. (1998). *Slovar rysskoi frazeologii. Istoriko-etimologicheskii spravochnik [Dictionary of Russian phraseology. Historical and etymological reference book].* SPb.: Folio-Press [in Russian].

Chernova, N.V. (2004). Russkaya frazeologiya v praktike prepodavaniya russkogo yazyika kak inostrannogo filologam [Russian phraseology in the practice of teaching Russian for foreign students-philologists]. *Candidate's thesis.* M.: N.p. [in Russian].

Dobrovolskii, D.O. (1997). Nacionalno-kyltyrnaya specifika vo frazeologii [National and cultural specifics in phraseology]. *Voprosi yazikoznaniya [Issues of linguistics], 6,* pp. 37-48 [in Russian].

Kornilov, O.A. (2005). *Jemchyjini kitaiskoi frazeologii [Pearls of the Chinese phraseology].* M.: CheRo [in Russian].

Krukova, G.A. (2005). K voprosy o formirovanii kartini mira y inostrannih stydentov, izychaushih rysskii yazik [About the question of formation of the language world picture at the foreign students who learn Russian]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo yn-ta. Lingvistika i mejkulturnaya kommynikaciya [Moscow university bulletin. Linguistics and cross-cultural communication], ser. 1*, pp. 136-140 [in Russian].

Maslova, V.A. (2001). *Lingvokulturologiya [Linguoculturology].* M.: Izdatelskiy tsentr "Akademiya" [in Russian].

Pentylyuk, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Slovnyk-dovidnyk z ukrayins'koyi linhvodydaktyky [Reference book in Ukrainian linguodidactics].* K.: Lenvit [in Ukrainian].

Pomortseva, N.V. (2009). Lingvokulturnaya adaptatsiya inostrannyih studentov k rossiyskoy vyisshey shkole: problemy i puti osuschestvleniya [Linguocultural adaptation of foreign students to the Russian higher school: problems and ways of implementation]. *Vyisshee obrazovanie segodnya [Higher education today],* 6, pp. 88-90 [in Russian].

Prohorov, Yu.A. (2008). *Natsionalnyie sotsiokulturnyie stereotipyi rechevogo obscheniya i ih rol v obuchenii russkomu yazyiku inostrantsev [National sociocultural stereotypes of speech communication and their role in training Russian to foreigners].* M.: Izdatelstvo LKI [in Russian].

Schukin, A.N. (2003). *Metodika prepodavaniya russkogo yazyika kak inostrannogo [Language teaching methods of the Russian language as a foreign one].* M.: Vyissh. shk. [in Russian].

Semyonova, N.A. (2014). Aktualnost lingvometodicheskih issledovaniy frazeologii v rabote s inostrannyimi uchaschimisya [The topicality of linguomethodical researches of phraseology when working with foreign students]. *Molodoy uchyonyiy [Young scientist],* 14, pp. 110-112 [in Russian].

Shaklein, V.M. and Ryizhova, N.V. (2008). *Sovremennyie metodiki prepodavaniya russkogo yazyika nerusskim [Modern language teaching methods of training Russian to foreigners: manual].* M.: RUDN [in Russian].

Solodub, Yu.P. (1981). *Puteshestvie v mir frazeologii [Travelling to the world of phraseology].* M.: Prosveschenie [in Russian].

Sternin, I.A. (2015). *Modeli opisaniya kommunikativnogo povedeniya [Models of the communicative behaviour description]* (2 ed., rev.). Voronezh: Garant [in Russian].

Teliya, V.N. (1996). *Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskiy, pragmaticheskiy i lingvokulturologicheskiy aspektyi [Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguoculturological aspects].* M.: Shkola "Yazyki russkoi kultury" [in Russian].

Ter-Minasova, S.G. (2000). *Yazyik i mezhdunarodnaya kommunikatsiya [Language and international communication].* M.: Slovo [in Russian].

Vagner, V.N. (2006). *Leksika rysskogo yazika kak inostrannogo i ee prepodavanie: ychebnoe posobie [Vocabulary of the Russian language as a foreign one and its teaching: manual].* M.: Flinta [in Russian].

Vereshagin, E.M. and Kostomarov, V.G. (1990). *Yazik i kyltyra: lingvostranovedenie v prepodavanii rysskogo yazika kak inostrannogo [Language and culture: culture-oriented linguistics in teaching Russian as foreign language]* (ed., rev.). M.: Rus. yazyk [in Russian].