

THE STUDY AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH THE COMPONENT “HEAD” IN ENGLISH, ARMENIAN AND RUSSIAN

S. M. AVAGYAN

Lecturer of Gavar State University

Though the research of phraseological units has quite a long tradition and has become an internationally developed linguistic discipline today, we are still far from being able to give a definite and generally accepted answer to the question “what is a phraseological unit”. Phraseological units can be described as constructions through which the exclusive and typical mentality of the whole nation can be expressed.

Phraseological unit is a non-motivated word-group that cannot be freely made up in speech but is reproduced as a ready-made unit. Differences in terminology *set-phrases*, *idioms*, and *word equivalents* reflect certain differences in the main criteria and used to distinguish types of phraseological units and free word-groups. The term set phrase implies that the basic criterion of differentiation is the stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word-groups.

Attempts have been made to approach the problems of phraseology in different ways. Up till now, however, there is a certain divergence of opinion as to the essential feature of phraseological units as distinguished from other word-groups and the nature of phrases that can be properly termed phraseological units. The complexity of the problem may be largely accounted for by the fact that the border-line between free or variable word-group and phraseological units is not clearly defined. The so-called free word-groups are only relatively free as collocability of their member-words is fundamentally delimited by their lexical and grammatical valency which makes at least some of them very close to set-phrases. Phraseological units are comparatively stable and semantically inseparable. Between the extremes of the complete motivation and variability of member-words on the one hand and lack of motivation combined with complete stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure on the other hand there are innumeral border-line cases.

However, the existing terms e.g. *set-phrases*, *idioms* or *phraseological units*, *word-equivalents*, reflect to a certain extent the main debatable issues of phraseology which centre on the divergent views concerning the nature and essential features of phraseological units as distinguished from the so-called free word-groups. The term set-phrase implies that the basic criterion of differentiation is stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word-groups. The term “idioms” generally implies that the essential feature of the linguistic units under consideration is idiomaticity or lack of motivation. This term habitually used by English and American linguists is very often treated as synonymous with the term phraseological unit universally accepted in Russia.

Our analysis of phraseological units is based on a typological method. A method is a certain way of approach to the studied phenomenon, certain complex of propositions, scientific and technical modes the use of which gives an opportunity to study a given phenomenon. That's why a method is always a system.

According to many outstanding linguists phraseological units are non-motivated word-groups that cannot be freely made up in speech but are reproduced as ready-made units and fall into three big classes: 1. Phraseological fusions, 2. Phraseological unities, 3. Phraseological collocations.

Phraseological fusions are completely non-motivated word-groups, such as *red tape*. Phraseological unities are partially non-motivated as their meaning can usually be perceived through the metaphoric meaning of the whole phraseological unit: to *show one's teeth*, to *wash one's dirty linen in public* and the like. Phraseological collocations are motivated but they are made up of words possessing specific lexical valency which accounts for a certain degree of stability in such word groups. In phraseological collocations variability of member-words is strictly limited. For instance, *bear a grudge* may be changed into *bear a malice*, but not into *bear a fancy or liking*.

We should mention that before undertaking the comparative analysis of phraseological units we must find out everything about translation.

Translation is the process to transfer written or spoken source language (SL) texts to the equivalent written or spoken target language (TL) texts. The process of translation includes two texts – the original and the translation. The language in which the original is written is called *the source language (SL)*. The language into which the translation is made is called *the target language (TL)*. This target text (TT) is not fully identical with the source language text (ST) as to the differences between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL).

Scholarly attention has been focused on the semantic, grammatical, structural and syntactic properties of phraseological units, on various approaches to their synchronic and diachronic description, on their pragmatic function in discourse. But the central difficulty that Phraseology represents is translation.

As we have already mentioned phraseological units are figurative set expressions often described as idioms. Some units have an important role to play in human communication. There are five aspects of a phraseological unit meaning that influence the translators' choice of an equivalent in the target language. They are its *figurative meaning*, *literal sense*, *motive character*, *stylistic register* and *the national colouring*. We should mention that the figurative meaning is the basic element of the phraseological unit semantics. E.g. *head and shoulders above somebody*-намного, на голову выше кого-либо., *to kick the bucket* – to die.

The learners may face different problems, while trying to use and translate phraseological units. The main difficulty is connected with fixed and partly fixed phraseological units. It is very important for the learner to be sure and exact in his use of fixed phraseological units, as an inaccurate phraseological unit may mean very little or nothing at all to a native speaker. After all, we should keep in mind that it is usually unwise to translate phraseological units into English from our own native language. And we may be happy if our native language and English happen to have the same form and vocabulary, but in most cases, the result will be bewildering to the native speaker.

We have analyzed phraseological units with the component “head” in English, Armenian and Russian. Our analyses have been undertaken in three main directions: I. Translation of phraseological units with the component “head” from English into

Armenian and Russian based on four main methods suggested by the outstanding linguist Komissarov, II. The semantic classification of phraseological units with the component “head” denoting people in English, Armenian and Russian. III. The comparative analysis of phraseological units with the component “head” in English, Armenian and Russian,

Overall 100 phraseological units with the component “head” have been defined, translated and classified into four main groups: 1. The SL phraseological unit translated by an identical TL phraseological unit (*From head to foot*- *նոքից գլուխ* - с головы до пят), 2. Phraseological units with the same figurative but a different literal meaning (*Head and shoulders above somebody*- *մեկից մի գլուխ բարձր, խելացի* - на голову выше кого-либо), 3. A word-for-word translation of the SL phraseological unit (*Carry one’s head high*- *գլուխը բարձր պահել* - высоко держать голову), 4. The explanation of a phraseological unit (*Pope’s head*- *առաստաղը մաքրող ավել* - метла для обметания потолка). It should be stated that out of 100 phraseological units, when translated into Armenian, 21 percent corresponds to the first point, 24 percent to the second one, 7 percent to the third one, 48 percent to the fourth one. So we can make a deduction that the minority of the examined phraseological units belong to the third group, and the majority belong to the fourth one.

When Russian taken as a target language, the results change slightly and they are the following: 18 percent corresponds to the first point, 24 percent to the second one, 7 percent to the third one, and 51 percent to the fourth point.

The picture in both languages (Armenian and Russian) is approximately the same.

We have also undertaken the semantic classification of phraseological units with the component “head” denoting people in English, Armenian and Russian and according to this classification they fall into four main groups: I. Phraseological units denoting actions, II. Phraseological units denoting physical and emotional state, III. Phraseological units denoting the manner of action and IV. Phraseological units denoting people and their traits.

From our analysis we can conclude that phraseological units with the component “head” denoting actions have different meanings in English, Armenian and Russian: *to strengthen, to rebel, to try to forget* and the like. E.g. *get a head*- *ուժեղանալ, գլուխ վերցնել-ապստամբել, выбросить кого-либо из головы* - стараться забыть.

Phraseological units with the component “head” denoting physical and emotional state have negative, as well as positive meanings in English, Armenian and Russian: *to be confused, to be in love with* and the like. For example: *Lose one’s head*- *գլուխը կորցնել, գլուխը տաք-բորբոքված, вскружить голову-соблазнять*.

We should mention that by saying phraseological units with the component “head” denoting the manner of action we mean the action carried out in some special way in English, as well as in Armenian and Russian: *head over heel*- *թավալզիոր, գլուխ կոտրելով –շատ արագ, из собственной головы-самостоятельно*.

We can make a deduction that phraseological units denoting people and their traits mainly have the meanings of *stupid, clever, wise* and the like. For example: *A cool head*- *սառնարյուն, գլուխ չունեցող-տգետ, светлая голова-сообразительный*.

The aim of our comparative analysis of phraseological units with the component “head” is to translate them from English into Armenian and Russian and find out in which of the two target languages the component “head” is retained or substituted.

We can conclude from our analysis that we have phraseological units with the component “head” in English during the translation of which the component ‘head’ is retained both in Armenian and Russian: *Lift up one’s head*- *նորից գլուխ բարձրացնել* -поднять голову.

We have phraseological units with the component “head” in English during the translation of which the component “head” is retained neither in Armenian nor in Russian: *Have one’s head in a tar barrel*- *ծանր դրության մեջ լինել* –попасть в тяжелое положение.

We also have phraseological units with the component “head” in English during the translation of which the component “head” is retained only in Armenian: *Head over heels*-*գլխիվայր* - кувырком.

So we can conclude that mastery of phraseological units comes slowly, through practice and experience, but we should remember: practice makes perfect and all things are difficult before they are easy.

ԳՐԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՑԱՆԿ

1. *Cowie A. P.*, “Phraseology in formal academic prose”, 1997
2. *Moon R.*, “Fixed expressions and idioms in English, 1998
3. *Eugene A.*, Nida “Theories of Translation, 2000”
4. *Bernhard Walchli*, “New Challenges in Typology”, 2007
5. *Комиссаров В.*, “Пособие по переводу с английского языка”, М., 1991
6. *Ларин Б. А.*, “О народной фразеологии, История русского языка и общее языкознание”, “Просвещение”, 1977
7. *Виноградов В. В.*, “Русский язык”, изд. 2-е, “ВШ”, М., 1972
8. *Սուքիասյան Ա. Մ.*, Ժամանակակից հայոց լեզու, Եր. համալս. հրատ., Երևան, 1989
9. *Քաղիկյան Գ.*, Ժամանակակից հայերենի դարձվածային միավորները, ՀԱՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ., Երևան, 1986
10. *Քեղիկյան Պ. Ս.*, Ժամանակակից հայերենի դարձվածաբանություն, “Լույս”, Երևան, 1973

«ԳԼՈՒԽ» ԲԱՐՁՎԱԾԱԲԱՆԱԿԱՆ ՄԻԱՎՈՐՆԵՐԻ ՈՒՍՈՒՄՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ԵՎ ՀԱՄԵՄԱՏԱԿԱՆ ՎԵՐԼՈՒԾՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ԱՆԳԼԵՐԵՆՈՒՄ, ՀԱՅԵՐԵՆՈՒՄ ԵՎ ՌՈՒՄԵՐԵՆՈՒՄ

Ս. Ս. Ավագյան

Աշխատությունը նվիրված է «գլուխ» բառով դարձվածաբանական միավորների ուսումնասիրությանը անգլերենում և նրանց համարժեք թարգմանությանը անգլերենից հայերեն և ռուսերեն:

Աշխատությունը գաղափար է հաղորդում դարձվածաբանության մասին՝ սկսած դարձվածաբանության զարգացման պատմությունից մինչև դարձվածաբանության ուսումնասիրության գործընթացը: Ուսումնասիրվել են տարբեր լեզվաբանների մոտեցումներ, որոնք նվիրված են դարձվածաբանական միավորների դասակարգմանը: Անդրադարձ է կատարվել թարգմանության տեսությանը և դարձվածաբանական միավորների թարգմանությանը: Ուսումնասիրվել են «գլուխ» բառով դարձվածաբանական միավորները անգլերենում, հայերենում և ռուսերենում: Ուսումնասիրությունները կատարվել են երեք ուղղություններով՝ I.«գլուխ» բառով դարձվածաբանական միավորների թարգմանությունը անգլերենից հայերեն և ռուսերեն, II.«գլուխ» բառով դարձվածաբանական միավորների իմաստային դասակարգու-

մը անգլերենում, հայերենում և ռուսերենում, III.«գլուխ» բառով դարձվածաբանական միավորների համեմատական ուսումնասիրությունը անգլերենում, հայերենում և ռուսերենում:

ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ С КОМПОНЕНТОМ “ГОЛОВА” В АНГЛИЙСКОМ, РУССКОМ И АРМЯНСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

С. М. Авагян

Работа посвящена исследованию фразеологических единиц со словом “голова” в английском и их эквивалентов в русском и армянском языках.

В работе дается общее представление о переводе фразеологических единиц.

Исследованы фразеологические единицы со словом “голова” в английском, армянском и русском языках. Исследования были проведены по трем направлениям: 1. Перевод фразеологических единиц со словом “голова” с английского на армянский и русский. 2. Семантическая классификация фразеологических единиц со словом “голова” в английском, армянском и русском. 3. Сравнительное исследование фразеологических единиц со словом “голова” в английском, армянском и русском языках.

HOW TO SELECT CULTURAL DATA FOR THE ENGLISH LESSON

N. BURDULI

Rapid globalization has increased the need for cross-cultural communication so that people have access to information all over the world. This growing and extending need leads to growth in the foreign language teaching profession. Many acknowledge that learning a foreign language is a requirement to survive in today's world. The English language plays an important role, because it has become the lingua franca of the world. According to Jonson (2001) there are a billion people in the world today learning English as a foreign language. If you add to this the number of individuals whose native language is English, then you realize how many people on the planet are engaged in the process of English language learning.

While understanding the necessity of English language learning, it becomes obvious, that second language acquisition is not a process that occurs in a vacuum. Students get to be involved and actually act in various sociolinguistic situations. Second language acquisition can't be isolated from the sociolinguistic and socio-cultural norms. As Seelye says (1984) “Second or foreign language learning is a socially constructed process just as are all the other socially mediated activities. Since culture is embedded within every aspect of society, language learning should not be isolated from the society that uses it.” Despite knowing this it would not be an exaggeration to say that English classes have a tendency to focus on linguistic aspects of the language and hardly ever present to the learners the lifestyle and standards of the target language community to enrich their cultural understanding and to help them build an international awareness and socio-cultural competence.