

## **Equivalence of Phraseological Units in English and Russian Mass Media**

**By**

**Rimma Nailevna Salieva**

Kazan Federal University, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Romance and Germanic Philology at the Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication

Mob. 89178933058

ID Scopus 57191751429

ORCID 0000-0003-0515-7245

Email: [sargus5@yandex.ru](mailto:sargus5@yandex.ru)

**Regina Maratovna Plankina**

Kazan Federal University, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at the Department of Romance and Germanic Philology at the Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication

Mob. 89276701632

ID Scopus 57216808965

ORCID 0000-0001-7238-681X

Email: [regina\\_pl@mail.ru](mailto:regina_pl@mail.ru)

**Elena Aleksandrovna Nikulina**

Moscow State Pedagogical University

Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of English Phonetics and Vocabulary

Mob. 89165253861

ORCHID 0000-0002-1269-8720

Email: [ea.nikulina@mpgu.su](mailto:ea.nikulina@mpgu.su)

### **Abstract**

The article compares phraseological units selected from the media in the English and Russian languages. Linguistic units are analyzed in detail at the semantic, structural-grammatical, component and contextual levels. The aim of the study is to identify phraseological correspondences and determine the degree of equivalence of phraseological units when translating them in two distantly related languages. The scientific novelty lies in the fact that for the first time an attempt is made to analyze and compare the phraseological microsystems of the two languages in some significant, relevant and popular media. The fulfillment of such tasks as the selection of phraseological units, detailed structural-grammatical and component analysis, the disclosure of contextual semantic connections of phraseological units, the use of appropriate methods led to the achievement of the main result of the study - the identification of the following types of interlingual phraseological relations: full and partial equivalent, full and partial analogue. Comparative and contrastive analysis of phraseological relations, characteristics of these relations when using phraseological units in the media, contextual translation of phraseological units made it possible to identify such types of interlanguage correspondences as full and partial equivalents, full and partial analogs. This is of great importance for a clear understanding of the

peculiarities of the native and foreign languages.

**Keywords:** phraseological unit, phraseological correspondence, equivalence, phraseological equivalent, phraseological analogue, semantic level, structural and grammatical level, component composition.

## 1. Introduction

The aim of the study is to identify full and partial phraseological equivalents, as well as full and partial analogues.

The main task to achieve this goal is the analysis of phraseological correspondences in the English-language and Russian-language mass media.

There are various points of view of scientists regarding the types of translation of phraseological units from one language to another. V.N. Komissarov identifies three types of correspondences in the translated language (TL): 1) phraseological equivalents - PU in TL, coinciding with the phraseological units of the original language (OL) in all parameters; 2) phraseological analogues - phraseological units, which coincide in semantics and stylistic orientation, but with a different imagery; 3) calquing (Komissarov, 1999).

The methods of translation are classified as phraseological and non-phraseological. Among phraseological methods one can distinguish phraseological equivalents and phraseological analogues. Within non-phraseological methods the following types of translation are distinguished: calquing, descriptive translation, lexical translation, combined translation, qualifying translation (Gololobova et al., 2018; de Sousa et al., 2021; Dever, Barnes, & Long, 2021).

L.K. Bayramova takes into account the stylistic, lexical, syntactic and morphological levels in the study of interlingual phraseological correspondences and identifies the following types:

1. absolute identical phraseological equivalents.
2. full phraseological equivalents.
3. incomplete or partial phraseological equivalents.
4. phraseological analogues.
5. borrowed phraseological units.

To non-phraseological methods of translation of PU, L.K. Bayramova refers to phraseological calquing, that is, word-by-word, component-wise or descriptive translation (Bairamova, 1982).

Y.E. Retsker, V.N. Komissarov and A.V. Fedorov note that the best way to convey figurative phraseology is "using the appropriate phraseological unit in the Russian language" (Yarullina et al., 2019). However, this use is not always effective, since no dictionary can provide for the use of PUs in context. Phraseology is one of the sources of

vocabulary enlargement and enrichment. It is the most colourful part of vocabulary system, and it describes peculiar vision of the world by this speaking community (Komissarov et al., 1960).

Bialek Eva introduced the concept of "text attractiveness". The attractiveness of the original text is created due to its expressive and stylistic characteristics. "For the sake of an equivalent transfer of the meaning and expressive charge of the original during translation, the choice of adequate linguistic means is required" (Bialek Eva, 2008).

In the process of translation, two languages are simultaneously compared and enriched. "Phraseological units, reflecting in their semantics a long process of development of the culture of the people, fix and transmit from generation-to-generation cultural attitudes and stereotypes, etalons and archetypes" (Kayumova et al., 2019). That is why one should take into account the peculiarities of the original text and convey the appropriate meaning.

According to E.F. Arsentieva, to identify the degree of correspondence of phraseological units between OL and TL PUs can be compared at such linguistic levels as semantic, structural-grammatical and component levels. The studied phraseological units can be divided into the following classes:

1. equivalents (full and partial).
2. analogues (full and partial).
3. non-equivalent units (Arsentieva, 2008).

The authors made an attempt to investigate the degree of equivalence of PUs at the semantic, structural-grammatical and component levels when searching for phraseological correspondences in English and Russian.

## **2. Methods**

Promising for our research were such methods as the method of phraseological identification, the method of phraseological description, the method of dictionary definitions, the method of component analysis, the comparative typological method, which made it possible to study, describe, compare and present material based on the main concepts of the phraseological theory.

## **3. Results and Discussion**

Questions of translation of a phraseological unit cause a lot of difficulties, justified by the difference in style, meaning and combination of words. Not every translation of phraseological units is a full-fledged reproduction of the original. However, this complexity reveals the specificity of phraseological units.

Methods of translation of phraseological units were studied in comparative foreign

research by: M. Baker, S. Bassnett, M. Davies, A.A. Naciscione, A. Tytler, Veisbergs; by Russian scientists: A.V. Kunin, A.V. Fedorov, Ya. I. Retsker, L.S. Barkhudarov, V.N. Komissarov, Yu.V. Medvedev, A.D. Schweitzer, Yu.P. Solodub, V.S. Vinogradov, S. Florin and S. Vlahov, by the scientists of the Kazan linguistic school: E.F. Arsentieva, L.K. Bayramova, D.N. Davletbaeva, A.R. Kayumova, N.V. Konopleva, R.A. Safina, G.R. Safiullina, F.H. Tarasova and others.

The result of the study was the identification of full and partial equivalents, full and partial analogues.

Let us consider and determine the degree of similarity of the phraseological units we are studying in English and Russian context.

PUs are considered to be full equivalents in case of complete coincidence with the original in all respects: denotative and connotative macrocomponents coincide; the structural, grammatical and component levels coincide and the images underlying them coincide. The components of the connotative macro-component (evaluative, emotive, expressive and functional-stylistic) must also coincide with the original phraseological unit.

Let's give an example of a complete phraseological equivalent and analyze it. From the news in English:

"If they *hadn't played a constructive role*, we would not have had an agreement with Iran," Kerry said (<https://www.rt.com>).

Translation in Russian: "Если бы они не сделали этого, если бы они не сыграли конструктивную роль, у нас бы не было соглашения с Ираном", - подчеркнул Керри (<https://russian.rt.com>).

The structural and grammatical organization of the phraseological units of OL and TL completely coincide they are built according to the model  $v + adj + n$ ; the author of the translation grammatically preserves the negative meaning, the perfect form and the past tense of the components in English: the components *hadn't played* is transmitted by the components *not played* in Russian. It should be noted that phraseological units *play the role* and *играть роль* in Russian and in English have identical significative-denotative macrocomponents of the meanings 'very strongly influence something'. Both phraseological units have the same expressiveness due to the intensifiers of meaning: very and strongly. Thus, we have identified the degree of correspondence of phraseological units between OL and TL, comparing them at such linguistic levels as: semantic, structural-grammatical and component.

*Partial equivalents* when comparing in two languages have the following characteristics: complete coincidence at the level of significative-denotative and connotative macrocomponents of phraseological meaning; differences at the structural and grammatical level (number, word order, etc.); differences at the component level;

complete coincidence, or partial divergence of images. We found a partial phraseological equivalent in the context of translating the following example from English into Russian:

“We need to advocate for it. We need to make our economy more competitive and involved in global competition. Only then will we confidently *stand on our feet*,” Peskov stressed (<https://www.rt.com>).

Translation: "Нужно ратовать за это, нужно сделать так, чтобы экономика была конкурентоспособной и участвовала в глобальной конкуренции. Только тогда мы будем уверенно *стоять на ногах*" сказал Песков (<https://www.vedomosti.ru>).

The English PU *stand on one's own feet*, built according to the V + on + pron + N model, has the meaning of 'stand on your feet (or stand on your feet), be (or become) independent, financially secure' and the Russian phraseological unit *стоять на ногах*, built on the V + on + N model with the meaning 'to be independent, not to need someone else's support' have a partial correspondence in the structure. In PUs of the English language there is a component - the possessive pronoun *one's own*, which is absent in the Russian language. It should be noted that the two phraseological units are based on the same image. Both phraseological units have in the structure the components *ноги* and *feet*, which have the meaning of 'an integral part of the human body'. We find a slight discrepancy in the meanings: in English - foot is the foot, the lower part of the leg. But the image is the same - a leg, a foot can replace the person himself, playing the role of support and stability.

The symbolic function of the word *foot* is enhanced by the amplifying component of meaning *уверенно* in Russian and *confidently* in English. These phraseological units are widespread in the political sphere of human activity and appear as a symbol of independence and independence.

Consider another example of a partial phraseological equivalent. From the news in English:

“If they hadn't played a constructive role, we would not have had an agreement with Iran,” Kerry said (<https://www.rt.com>).

Translation in Russian: "Если бы они *не сыграли конструктивную роль*, у нас бы не было соглашения с Ираном", - подчеркнул Керри (<https://russian.rt.com>).

The structural and grammatical organization of the OL and the TL do not partially coincide. The author of the translation grammatically preserves the negative meaning, the perfect form and the past tense of the components - verbs in English: *hadn't played* and in Russian: *не сыграли*. It should be noted that PU *play the role* and *играть роль* both in Russian and in English have identical significative-denotative macro-components of the meanings 'very strongly influence something'. Both PUs have the same expressiveness due to the intensifiers of meaning: very and strongly. We find a slight difference at the lexical level when translating a set phrase *to have an agreement* with a positive meaning

‘to agree’ in English and an ordinary phrase in Russian ‘не было бы соглашения’ having a negative meaning.

"Partial equivalents do not mean any incompleteness in the transfer of meaning, but only lexical, grammatical or lexical-grammatical discrepancies or the presence of the same meaning, the same stylistic orientation: they may have a different morphological correlation, there may be slight changes in syntactic construction" (Artemova, 2009).

Phraseologisms are considered to be a complete analogue in cases where the meaning of the original PU coincides with the meaning of PUs in another language at the level of the significative-denotative macro-component. At the same time, differences are possible in the structural and grammatical organization, in the component composition, figurative basis and functional and stylistic affiliation.

Let us consider an example of a complete phraseological analogue: *tempest in a teapot* and *буря в стакане воды*.

PUs of the Russian and English languages have the same vocabulary definition of ‘excitement, disputes over trifles’. We do not find differences at the grammatical level, but the differences are present in the composition: *a teapot and a glass of water*. In the explanatory dictionary of Ushakov, we identify the values of these components and find the point of intersection of their values. In English phraseological units, the *teapot* component means ‘a vessel with a handle and a spout for making tea or for boiling water’; in Russian, the component *glass* means ‘a cylindrical glass drinking vessel without a handle, usually containing about a third of the bottle’. The common keyword for component values is ‘vessel’. Both phraseological units have an ironic emoseme, which is achieved due to the presence of a *storm* component with the meaning of ‘on the mainland, strong wind with thunder and rain; at sea, sometimes only one cruel and prolonged wind with strong waves’ which, of course, cannot happen in a glass of water in both Russian and English. English and Russian phraseological units are colloquial.

*In partial analogues*, there is a partial coincidence in the significative-denotative and connotative meaning of macrocomponents, in the structural and grammatical organization, in the component composition and the image of phraseological units.

Let's analyze an example of a partial analogue. Information in English:

"He went on to say that terrorists that are going to Europe is part of Turkish policy, and Turkey keeps getting a slap on the hand, but they get off the hook" (<https://www.rt.co>).

The Jordanian monarch notes: "Тот факт, что террористы направляются в Европу, является частью турецкой политики, и Турцию за это бьют по рукам, но ей всё сходит с рук" (<https://russian.rt.com>).

English PU be off the hook has the definition ‘to get off the hook, to avoid danger’; Russian PU *сходить / сойти с рук* means ‘to remain unpunished (about the



actions, deeds of someone, usually reprehensible)'. The images of these PUs are different, but we managed to find a partial coincidence. The English phraseological unit is based on a metaphor: a person, like a fish caught on a hook (in English - the hook component), falls under the control of a fisherman, thereby depriving him of freedom of action. In an English sentence, the preposition off indicates removal or separation from something. So, a fish that off the hook is again independent and free in its actions, it gets away with everything. Both PUs have negative connotations and are used in colloquial speech; the structural organization coincides, since the phraseological units in the OL and the TL are built according to the model: V + prep + N. The internal form and figurativeness of the PUs coincide partially, not completely, which, when translated, allows the PUs to be attributed to the so-called partial phraseological analogs.

In the process of comparing phraseological units, the semantic criterion was the main one for distinguishing between English and Russian PUs. As a result of the search and analysis of similarities or differences in the components of the structure of phraseological meaning, lexical composition and structural - grammatical organization of the compared units, we identified two types of phraseological relations: equivalent (full and partial) and analogue (full and partial).

#### **4. Summary**

At the heart of complete equivalents, we found complete correspondences in the images of PUs; in significant - denotative, connotative meanings; at the structural - grammatical level. Partial equivalents differ at the component level and in structural and grammatical organization.

The studied material revealed the fact that phraseological units significantly fill the language of the media. We analyzed the ways of transferring the meanings of phraseological units and found that, despite the difference between the two languages, translation as close as possible to the OL is possible using equivalents and analogues in the TL. It should be considered that there are always some common and obligatory visions for all speakers of the same national cultural mentality (Sakhbullina et al., 2018).

Identifying and understanding the degree of phraseological equivalence facilitates the perception of phraseological units by the recipient; contributes to their more adequate translation, since it is more confident and error-free. The identified interlanguage similarities and differences can contribute to a more successful study and teaching of phraseology in the native and target language, also contribute to the peculiarities of national lingua cultures the study of which attracts a lot of attention nowadays (Mirgalimova et al., 2018).

#### **5. Conclusions**

Identification, description and detailed analysis of interlingual phraseological

relations in the media in two distantly related languages allows us to conclude that of the number of phraseological units studied in the media, full and partial analogs are used in large numbers, full and partial equivalents are used in a limited number.

Further comparative and contrastive analysis of interlanguage phraseological correspondences, characteristics of these relations when used in the media, contextual translation of phraseological units will be of great importance for a clear understanding of the peculiarities of the native and foreign languages, which will contribute to a more adequate translation.

## Acknowledgements

This paper is performed as part of the implementation of the Kazan Federal University Strategic Academic Leadership Program.

## References

- Arsentieva E.F. Russkaja i sopostavitelnaja filologija. - / E.F. Arsentieva. - Kazan. gos. un-t, 2008. – 176 s.
- Artemova A.F. Anglijskaja frazeologija: Spetskurs. Uchebnoje posobie / A.F. Artemova. - 2-je izd., ispr. i dop. M.: Visshaja Shkola, 2009. – 208 s.
- Bairamova L.K. Frazeologija I perevod //L.K.Bairamova // Frazeologija i sintaksis. - Kazan: KGU, 1982. - S. 3-42 (b)
- Bialek Eva. O kriterii privlekatelnosti v perevode / Eva Bialek // Devatije Fedorovskije chtenia. Universitetskoje perevodovedenje. - SPb., 2008. - S. 82.
- de Sousa, F. L., Canêdo-Pinheiro, M., Cabral, B. P., & de Sousa Ferreira, G. E. (2021). Lean management practices' effects on Brazilian firms: A quantitative and qualitative analysis. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, Economics and Finance*, 3(3), 84-108. <https://doi.org/10.33094/26410265.2021.33.84.108>
- Dever, N., Barnes, L., & Long, W. (2021). Model of Mitigation: Strategies to Utilise Unique Insider Research Opportunities. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Social Sciences*, 10(2), 75-84. <https://doi.org/10.20448/2001.102.75.84>
- Gololobova N., Arsenteva E, Nikulina E. Author's Transformations and Their Translation in "The Prussian Officer" by D.H. Lawrence // *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, Vol.8, Issue 10, October 2018. – P. 401-406. ISSN: 2251-6204 <http://mjltm.org/article-1-271-en.pdf>
- <https://russian.rt.com/article/155542>
- <https://russian.rt.com/article/157571>
- <https://russian.rt.com/article/157571>
- <https://www.rt.com/news/337252-sas-libya-king-abdullah/>
- <https://www.rt.com/news/337335-russia-anglo-saxon-media-war/>
- <https://www.rt.com/usa/338726-kerry-praises-russia-rolesyria/>
- <https://www.rt.com/usa/338726-kerry-praises-russia-role-syria/>
- <https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/news/2016/03/26/635217-peskov>



- Kayumova A.R., Konopleva N.V., Safina R.A. Linguo-cultural peculiarities of phraseological units with the component 'fire' in English, Russian, Spanish, Tatar and German // *XLinguae* 3\_2019\_5. – P. 55-65.
- Komissarov V.N., Retsker Ia.I., Tarhov V.I. Posobie po perevodu s anglijskogo na ruskij perevodu. - M.: Visshaja shkola, ch.1 - 1960.
- Komissarov, V.N. Sovremennoje perevodovedenie / V.N. Komissarov. - M.: ETS, 1999. - 192 s.
- Mirgalimova L.M., Ayupova R.A., Arsenteva E.F., Pamies-Bertrán A. Paradoxical Word Collocations in the Structure of Idioms // *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(4) (Special Issue on Area Studies), 2018. – P. 116-123. <http://kutaksam.karabuk.edu.tr/index.php/ilk> DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v7i4.1808
- Sakhibullina K.A., Ayupova R.A., Ortiz Alvarez M.L. Reproducibility in Phraseology and Ornithonym Components // *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, Special Issue. 1, 2018, pp: 13-16.
- Yarullina O.A., Tarasova F.H., Varlamova E.V., Polhovskaya E.V. Evaluation component in the phraseological units of the English and Tatar languages // *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*. - 2019. – 10 (Special Issue). - P. 1132–1138.