

ISSN 2414-4746

MODERN VECTORS OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATION  
DEVELOPMENT IN CHINA AND UKRAINE  
中国与乌克兰科学及教育前沿研究



**2022**  
**ISSUE № 8**

ISSN 2414-4746

MODERN VECTORS OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATION  
DEVELOPMENT IN CHINA AND UKRAINE

中国与乌克兰科学及教育前沿研究



**State institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University  
named after K. D. Ushynsky”**

**Harbin Engineering University**

**2022  
ISSUE № 8**

Odesa, Ukraine

Harbin, the People’s Republic of China

**SECTION I**  
**MODERN VECTORS OF TRANSLATION STUDIES, GENERAL AND**  
**CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS**

**UDC: 811.581.17**

*Natalia Havryliuk,*  
*English and Chinese teacher,*  
*Department of Translation, Theoretical*  
*and Applied Linguistics,*  
*The State institution “South Ukrainian*  
*National Pedagogical University named*  
*after K. D. Ushynsky”*  
*E-mail: [faynacentre@gmail.com](mailto:faynacentre@gmail.com)*

**CLASSIFICATION OF INTERLINGUISTIC PHRASEOLOGICAL**  
**RELATIONS IN THE CHINESE AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGES**

*The paper is devoted to the complex research of phraseological units in the Chinese and Ukrainian languages. Interlinguistic relations, based on the structural and semantic aspects, are presented as a classification including three types, which are full equivalent, partial equivalent, and non-equivalent phraseological units. The search is done from the viewpoint of the semantic and structural ones as well as anthropological aspects that promotes identification of cultural peculiarities of phraseological units in both languages. As a result, the author comes to the conclusion that partial analogues and non-equivalent units prevail over the equivalent forms in the process of phraseological studies. Thus, it indicates phraseological national identity of each language systems compared.*

**Keywords:** *phraseological unit; equivalent and non-equivalent vocabulary; contrastive linguistics; anthropocentric and system-structural approaches; linguistic world image; national and cultural specifics.*

In fact, because of its nature, contrastive linguistics reveals correspondence at all levels of linguistic structure, and moreover, it appeared to be a section of studying the types of lexical and phraseological correspondences in the two languages and revealing in these nationally appropriate the semantics of phraseological units (onwards PU). In our view, cultural identity of PU may be disclosed in an integrated, especially, the systematic / structural and anthropocentric approach to the study of phraseological system of the two languages. As nowadays for modern linguistics, it seems urgent to create a model of the language, based on the presence of a specific system of education in it, and organized interaction of internal and external determinants. Both approaches are generated by actually existing stratification of the language, which is defined as a self-adjusting system of education represented by anthropocentric components [1: 7]. According to the comparison of PU, Y.P. Solodoub marks that the phraseological systems of different languages have the property of “commensurability”, which is confirmed by the presence of interlinguistic phraseological equivalents (or typologically identical phraseologisms), that is PU, “the identity of the actual semantics of which is explained by the uniformity of the image-associative relations that underlie this transformation” [2: 9]. It allows him to identify interlinguistic phraseological equivalents (onwards IPE) of several types of combination: 1) IPE with a full correspondence of the whole units at lexical and grammatical levels; 2) IPE with the absence of a full correspondence units at a lexical level; 3) IPE absence of one correspondence of units at a grammatical level; 4) IPE of a contiguous type, in which there are differences both at lexical and grammatical levels.

In addition, the compared linguistic units can be linked with distant figurative associations that do not destroy the unity of the common phrase formed model. Let’s illustrate the PU containing the realities inherent in the Chinese language: 半斤 八两 literal “half liang and eight jing” in Ukrainian means чи “в камінь головою, чи

ГОЛОВОЮ В КАМІНЬ” (“it’s six of one and half a dozen of the other”), 白璧微瑕 literal “Dots on white jasper” - “A fly in the ointment”. And finally, the author identifies the category of Ukrainian and foreign phraseologisms associated with full (or partial) parallelism of the external structure with completely dissimilar semantics. These units are Ukrainian “That one who has not experienced grief, he cannot imagine the difficulties”. Classification of interlinguistic phraseological relations and the Chinese 不吃黄连, 不知味苦 which means “Not having trying goldthread, one won’t know how bitter its taste is”. It should be noted that, despite the impressive scope of the material (16 languages), the author has failed to present the classification of PU, which would fully reflect the differences between them.

The research of E.M. Solodoukho is also devoted to the problem of equivalence. The author proposes the classification of equivalent and non-equivalent correspondences:

1) Equivalent phrase matching: - Identical equivalents - PU, characterized by a high degree of formal, semantic and stylistic similarities (upper limit of equivalence, such as the Chinese phraseologism 禁果格外香 “forbidden fruit is sweet” and Ukrainian “заборонений плід солодкий”; 口蜜腹劍 “honey on the lips, but a sword behind the back” and the Ukrainian idiom “мед на губах, а лід у серці”); - direct equivalents - formation, characterized by full and partial semantic and stylistic coincidence correlativity (mostly by parallelism) of purely lexical components and grammatical structure (average limit of equivalence, for example, 不三不四 literal “neither fish, flesh nor good red herring” which means “dishonest, dubious”); - synonymous equivalents - PU with motivated logical-semantic base that is correlative with logic, idiomatic ideas and stylistic characteristics (lower limit of equivalence, for example, 形影不離 literal “inseparable as body and shadow” - “to follow like a shadow one after another”, “one cannot be separated with water”);

2) Non-equivalent correspondence (interlinguistic phraseological homonyms are the units that have the same sound and complete or partial semantic similarity / similarities) [3: 22]. Although this research is intended to have gradational approach to

correlating phraseologisms in foreign languages, the settings of equivalence do not reflect those of real differences, which can be seen between comparable units. To summarize, we should emphasize that the cross-language relations of PU in this work are defined by the degree of relatable common meanings and the structure of the specific PU in the Ukrainian and Chinese languages. Regarding the structural and semantic aspects, these relations are of three types: full equivalent, partial equivalents and non-equivalent units (PU gaps). We can observe complete phraseological equivalency in the languages under study; we encounter structural and semantic coincidence of phraseological units very rarely, to be more precise.

Partial phraseological equivalence represents the most significant part of the total constitution of phraseologisms, and implies the coincidence of semantics correlating phraseologisms of different structural organization. Structural difference usually causes a semantic difference of PU.

Therefore, correlated idioms are often represented by phraseological counterparts having similar or close significatum. Non-equivalent PU in both languages constitute a less significant part, in some other language they are transmitted by words, free phrases or descriptively. Most partial equivalents (phraseological analogues) and non-equivalent PU indicates the national identity of each of the phraseological systems in these two languages. The proposed classification considers the Chinese and Ukrainian idioms in an onomasiological aspect, specifically the difference between the two units is determined by differences in the choice of linguistic means of expression to refer to the same concept. To nominate pairs of phraseologisms having a similar meaning, we will use the term congruent to mean the content. We have to note that this term is actively used in phraseology today. For example, it is used in relation to both the expression and the content. Congruence is a coincidence of the capacity of values rendered by PU reinterpreted and literal prototype [4: 64]. The classification was based on the following features: community / difference of imagery, identical / non-identical structure, similarity / difference of lexical structure.

All this suggests that the prevalence in the study of phrasemica of phraseological analogues and non-equivalent units of equivalent phraseology indicates the national

identity of each of the phraseological systems of the compared languages. The thing is that in mental representation of this or that concept / notion, there is much more similarity than in verbal representation of the same concept / notion actualized through linguistic means. In the Ukrainian and Chinese languages, we can observe different ways of representing the same concept. Thus, the majority of PU of compared languages express the same concepts, but complete phraseological equivalence is rarely found in their comparison. The given classification of types of interlinguistic phraseological relations is mostly based on both the system and PU anthropocentric characteristics. Partially equivalent type of phraseologism deserves special attention because it has a dominant position in comparison with other types, but in terms of the correlation of the language and culture, together with the non-equivalent units demonstrate not only the characteristic features of language systems taken into consideration, but also reflect the cultural identity, fixed in the language.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. TROFIMOVA, E.B., 2008. Alternative linguistics. Bijsk: Publishing house BPGU University named after V.M. Shukshin, 76 p.
2. SOLODOUB, Y.P., 2015. The Russian phraseology as the object of comparative structural-typological studies (based on the phraseological units with the meaning of a personality's qualitative assessment). Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical Institute named after V.I. Lenin, 112 p.
3. SOLODUKHO, E.M., 2009. Theory of idiomatic approach (on the material of the Slavic languages, German and Roman language families). Kazan: Kazan University Press, 294 p. Classification of interlinguistic phraseological relations 73
4. GRYANKINA, E.S., 2004. Semantics of phraseological units in the minds of the native speakers of the Russian language (based on Russian and English phraseology in literal translation): Dissertation of the Candidate of philology. Barnaul, 216 p.
5. 2001. Large phrasebook chehnjuj Chinese language. Tang Shu, ed. Beijing, 1514 p.

5. ZHOUNG Ting, 2001. Selected Chinese proverbs and sayings. Urumchi, 373 p. 7.  
2004. Complete collection of Chinese proverbs and sayings “Sea of utterances” in 2  
volumes. Wen Duanchzhen, ed. Shanghai, 2386 p.

*佳夫里乌克·娜塔莉亚.*

翻译理论及应用语言系实习教师，

乌克兰国立南方师范大学，

敖德萨，乌克兰。

### 汉语和乌克兰语的语际用语关系分类

本文致力于汉语和乌克兰语中短语单位的复杂研究。语际关系以结构和语义为基础，分为完全对等、部分对等和非对等三种类型。这项研究是从语义和结构以及人类学的角度进行的，这有助于识别两种语言中短语单位的文化特征。因此，作者得出结论：在短语研究过程中，部分类比和非等价单位优先于等价形式。因此，它表明了所比较的每种语言系统的词汇民族认同。

**关键词：**短语单位；等效和非等效词汇；对比语言学；以人为中心和系统结构的方法；语言世界意象；国家和文化细节。

