Comparative Study of English and Russian Phraseology: Component Theory of Identity and Difference of the Seme Organization

Natalia Ilyushchenko
Russian State Social University

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Natalia Ilyushchenko, English Language Department, Russian State Social University, Vilgelma Pika St., 4, Moscow, Rissian Federation, 129226.
E-mail: ilnatali77@mail.ru

This research is aimed at a comparative study of English and Russian phraseology and semasiology. It provides a new scientific approach to the solution of one of the most complex problems of comparative study of the phraseological material of different languages on the semantic level. This work is of great importance as it helps to define similarities and distinctions in the language picture of the world and reveal the peculiarities of different languages. It also allows for an investigation into ways of reflecting on the reality in language, providing an opportunity to study language picture of the world. Our research suggests that the component analysis method, based on the criteria of identity and difference of seme organization of phraseological units, provides a more complex and in-depth analysis of the description of the semantic structure of phraseological meaning in English and Russian. Over 1,750 phraseological units have been analysed from monolingual and bilingual phraseological dictionaries, English and Russian explanatory dictionaries to describe the structure of English and Russian phraseological units, identify stable semantic correlations between them. We further reveal three types of interlingual phraseological compliances / non-compliances: *semantic equivalents, semantic analogues* and *partial semantic analogues*. The results show a strongly expressed quantitative prevalence of *semantic analogues* over *semantic equivalents*. The quantity of *semantic analogues* exceeds the quantity of *semantic equivalents by* 0.5%, which can be explained by the peculiarities of the development of the two remotely related languages. Further study could address the comparative investigation of ways of the translation of phraseological units with no direct equivalents (culture-specific vocabulary) in other languages, which would enable translators to provide the interpretation which is more or less adequate and close to the original meaning.

Keywords: comparative research, semantic equivalents, semantic analogues, interlingual phraseological compliances, semantic structure, component theory

A characteristic feature of the present stage of development of linguistics is the intensification of comparative research. The problem of determining the types of interlingual relations is one of the most important in comparative studies of English and Russian phraseology. Current interlingual comparisons aimed at identifying phraseological compliance provide a basis for the theory and practice of phraseography. Comparative research could be an effective solution both to translation problems and defining the types of interlingual correlation of phraseological units of the compared languages. Moreover, such studies help to define similarities and distinctions in the language picture of the world to further investigate ways of reflection of reality in different languages.

In our research we refer to the fundamental works focused on studying the typology of interlingual phraseological relations of two or more closely related or remotely related languages: A. V. Kunin (1972), E. M. Solodukho (1977), A. D. Raykhstein (1979), V. G. Gak (1977), Yu. A. Gvozdarev (1981), N. Yu. Pyatnitskaya (1987), Yu. P. Solodub (1997), V. N. Telia (1995; 1996), B. Fraser (1970), A. Makkai (1972), U. Weinreich (1974), J. Strässler (1982), W. Welte (1990), L. Lipka (1992).

Lately there have appeared a considerable number of new works by M. L. Kovshova (2008), E. F. Arsenteva (2006), L. R. Sakaeva (2013), R. A. Ayupova (2004; 2013), F. Chitra (1996), A. P. Cowie (1998; 2004), R. Moon (1998), C. Chang (2004), and D. Liu (2008).

The main feature of phraseological equivalence in relation to multilingual comparative-typological analysis as E.M. Solodukho believes is the coincidence of the content aspect of correlated phraseological units (Solodukho, 1977). Such an approach to the definition of phraseological equivalence allows one, in his opinion, to extend this concept to a large number of phraseological units that are not recognized by most researchers as interlingual equivalents, that is, as not having full formal similarity. According to E. M. Solodukho, phraseological units coinciding in meaning and (in case of polysemy) in stylistic connotation are *full equivalents*. Those having partial divergences in semantic structure and/or not coinciding stylistically in one of the meanings in case of polysemy are called *limited equivalents*.

However, a significant role when determining the degree of equivalence is also played by lexical structure, figurativeness, and grammatical form of the correlated units. E. M. Solodukho proposes a classification of equivalent phraseological compliances and non-equivalent compliances, including the following categories: identical equivalents, direct equivalents, synonymous equivalents, and interlanguage phraseological homonyms. Accordingly, identical, direct and synonymous equivalents are characterized by upper, middle and lower threshold of equivalence.

In the works of Yu. P. Solodub the characteristic of equivalence of the phraseological units is limited by aspectual structural and typological orientation of the research (Solodub, 1997, pp. 43-54). According to Yu.P. Solodub, when determining the concept of interlingual phraseological equivalence based first of all on the components of the content plan, namely the meaning, the stylistic coloring and phraseological image, it is possible to deeply investigate the phenomenon itself by the analysis of the components of the expression plan. In this case all specific features of the grammatical and lexico-semantic organization of any particular language or group of related languages are manifested.

Considering a phraseological image as a necessary component of semantics of a considerable part of phraseological units, Yu. P. Solodub conducts structural and typological research of phraseological units having the meaning of qualitative evaluation of a person, revealing not only the fact of figurative proximity of units in different languages, but also defining the degree of this proximity as the degree of structural and typological convergences and divergences of Russian phraseological units with phraseological units in the compared languages. In the classification of Yu.

P. Solodub interlingual phraseological equivalents of four degrees and interlingual phrase-semantic compliances of two degrees of similarity are allocated.

The concept 'interlingual phraseological equivalents' is specific in relation to the concept 'typologically identical phraseological units'. The above indicated are phraseological units the semantic structure of which is integrated on the basis of a general model of phrase construction and so both multilingual and monolingual phraseological units can be found. Interlingual phrase-semantic compliances of the second degree of similarity are characterized only by a community of phrase formation model at various concrete and figurative forms of its implementation in each separate language.

In her PhD thesis N. Yu. Pyatnitskaya analyses several types of relations of interlingual equivalent phraseological units such as: completely coincident in the structure and semantic and stylistic properties, partially coincident in the structure, but identical in meaning and stylistic colouring, and different in structure, but identical in semantic and stylistic qualities. The observations of N. Yu. Pyatnitskaya on the impact of tarnish on phraseological images and lack of their national colouring on the interlingual equivalence of phraseological units are of great interest (Pyatnitskaya, 1987). If multilingual phraseological units, coinciding in meaning differ from national phraseological figurativeness, they belong to interlingual synonyms.

The classification of types of interlingual relations proposed by A.D Raykhstein is also of great interest (Raykhstein, 1979, p. 7). The author distinguishes the following quality types of interlingual relations: identity (full coincidence of the aspect organization and cumulative meaning); lexical variation or structural synonymy (full coincidence of cumulative sense and syntactic organization at incomplete identity of component structure); ideographic synonymy (incomplete identity of cumulative significative value due to the presence of specific semantic features in both multilingual phraseological units regardless of the aspect identity). A. D. Raykhstein also highlights the hyper-hyponymy (incomplete identity of cumulative significative meaning due to the presence in one of the compared phraseological units of additional, specifying semantic features regardless of the aspect identity), stylistic synonymy (incomplete identity of cumulative sense due to the differences in the stylistic value), homonymy and polysemy (identity of the aspect organization in case of greater or smaller differences in the cumulative sense), enantiosemy (identity of the aspect organization in case of the opposition of cumulative meaning). This detailed classification takes into account all possible divergences both in formal and semantic organization of phraseological units, and in their cumulative content. Particularly valuable

(in relation to our research) is the identification of such types of the interlingual relations as ideographic synonymy and hypero-hyponymy where we take into account the existence of additional differential semes in significative and denotative meaning of phraseological units.

In his article 'The Typology of Translation Compliances in the English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary' A. V. Kunin points out different types of translation for achieving maximum adequacy while transferring phraseological units from English into Russian (Kunin, 1984). The author points out equivalents, analogues, antonymic translation, the descriptive translation, loan translation, combined translation, as well as occasional or situational equivalents and clarifying translations used in the translation of illustrative examples.

A. V. Kunin's definition of phraseological equivalents and analogues is of great value. We agree with the author, that a Russian phraseological unit is thought to be equivalent when it coincides with the English unit in meaning, on a figurative basis and stylistic colouring. 'The equivalent is a monoequivalent, i.e. the only possible translation by means of the phraseological unit' (Kunin, 1967, p. 122). When the meaning, the stylistic colouring and close figurativeness all coincide, lexical and grammatical divergences can be observed. The term 'analogue' is used by A. V. Kunin for the definition of the Russian phraseological unit which in meaning and stylistic orientation is adequate to the English one, but differs from it in figurative value.

Thus, the semantic criterion is the cornerstone of terminological definition of the two types of interlingual compliances of phraseological units, which is the basis for the differentiation of the allomorphic and isomorphic phenomena. The classification of phraseological equivalents and other types of the translation offered by A. V. Kunin is considered multilateral and comprehensive both for the solution to translation problems and for defining the types of interlingual correlation of phraseological units of two compared languages.

We can conclude that the majority of studies, while determining the types of interlingual phraseological compliances / discrepancies, use as a basis such parameters as the coincidence of semantics, of grammatical (syntactic) organization and component (lexemic) structure of multilingual phraseological units at an unconditional primacy of semantic identity / difference or the plan of content. However, the plan of content is characterized in different ways: as cumulative content of phraseological units, as meaning, as stylistic colouring, as phraseo-logical images; as cumulative sense of the compared units; as semantic and stylistic properties of phraseological units, etc.

A component analysis method, based on the criteria of identity and difference of seme organization of phraseological units, provides a more complex and in-depth analysis of the description of the semantic structure of phraseological meaning in English and Russian. The study of interlingual phraseological compliances / non-compliances on the semantic level can help to elicit some new and useful information on the description of the structure of English and Russian phraseological meaning, identify stable semantic correlations between them and define similarities and distinctions in the language picture of the world.

Materials and Methods

Theoretical Background

Defining the types of interlingual phraseological compliances / differences in this research we focus primarily on *complex criterion* which includes semantics coincidence, grammatical (syntactic) organization and component (lexical) structure of multilingual phraseological units (at an unconditional primacy of semantic identity / difference or content plan). Semantic identity or difference of multilingual phraseological units means the identity or difference of their seme structure, of a simplified set of minimum semantic components of significative and denotative, and connotative components of phraseological meaning. The coincidence of seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent means the coincidence of integrated and differential semes in the structure of phraseological meaning of the English and Russian phraseological units. *Semantic equivalence* in our research means full coincidence of seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent and the four components of connotation: the estimating, emotive, expressive seme and the functional and stylistic component.

Some distinctions can be characteristic of component structure of phraseological meaning of multilingual phraseological units. First of all they concern a connotative macrocomponent, namely such components as functional and stylistic, and emotive components, which can differ as identical seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent. Very often, however, partial differences in seme structure of significative and denotative whole are observed (an ideographic synonymy and hypero-hyponymy, according to A. D. Raykhstein's classification), i.e. the existence of differential additional seme (or semes) in one of the compared phraseological unit or in both. In this case both coincidence and difference of the three components of connotation can be observed: of emotive, of expressive and of functional and stylistic component. Similar partial divergences with close

similarity are characteristic of *semantic analogues*.

Analysing the extensive phraseological material it was revealed that the allocated types of semantic equivalents and analogues do not incorporate all phraseological units which are outside phraseological lacunarity. Comparing similar units, certain semantic divergences concerning, first of all, their significative and denotative macrocomponent are found. These divergences which are observed not only in the differential, but also in one integral seme are characteristic of *partial semantic analogues*. In our research, allocation of such a group is therefore dictated by the needs of phraseography and, to a certain extent, is rather conditional and rarely applicable. In *partial semantic analogues* the connotation components (except for the estimating one) can either coincide, or differ.

Thus, the primacy of semantic identity / difference as identification of the types of interlingual phraseological compliances / non-compliances means that the component theory which is based on the component analysis method serves as the organizing theory when determining these types. Such an approach to the solution of the problem of criteria of identity and difference between phraseological units of the compared languages is justified when considering that, in numerous monolingual and multilingual studies of the phraseological material, the method of the component analysis is used.

Research

The objective of this research consists in the description of the structure of phraseological meaning in the English and Russian phraseological units as well as in identifying and analyzing stable semantic correlations between them. On this basis, the research aims to define certain characteristic types of English-Russian phraseological interlingual compliances / non-compliances, to identify characteristic English-Russian phraseological equivalents and analogues.

Defining the types of interlingual phraseological compliances / differences in this research we focus primarily on *complex criterion* which includes semantic coincidence, grammatical (syntactic) organization and component (lexical) structure of multilingual phraseological units. For our analysis, over 1750 phraseological units have been extracted from monolingual and bilingual authoritative English and Russian phraseological and explanatory dictionaries. Comparing phraseological units of the two languages the main attention has been given to the seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent including the four components of connotation (the estimating, emotive, expressive seme and the functional and stylistic component of phraseological meaning).

Methodology

Comparing phraseological units of the two languages, special attention in this regard has been given to their meanings, their seme structure, significative and denotative as well as macrocomponents. The semantic identity or difference of multilingual phraseological units means the identity or difference of their seme structure, of a simplified set of minimum semantic components of significative and denotative, and connotative components of phraseological meaning.

For the analysis we have compared over 1,750 English and Russian phraseological units extracted from monolingual and bilingual phraseological and explanatory dictionaries. Defining the types of interlingual phraseological compliances / differences in this research, we focused primarily on *complex criterion* which includes semantic coincidences, grammatical (syntactic) organization and component (lexical) structure of multilingual phraseological units (at an unconditional primacy of semantic identity / difference or content plan).

The primacy of semantic identity / difference at identification the types of interlingual phraseological compliances / non-compliances means that the component theory which is based on the component analysis method serves as the organizing theory when determining these types. Such an approach to the solution of the problem of criteria of identity and difference between phraseological units of the compared languages is justified upon consideration that, in numerous monolingual and multilingual studies of phraseological material, the method of component analysis is used.

The methodology of identification of semantic identity / difference of phraseological units of the English and Russian languages is divided into the following stages:
1. Representation of phraseological meaning of the English phraseological unit (or phrase-semantic option) as a set of the minimum semantic components;
2. Search for the semantic compliance in Russian;
3. Representation of phraseological meaning of the found Russian phraseological unit (or phrase-semantic option) as a set of the minimum semantic components;
4. Measurement of component (seme) structures of the English and Russian phraseological units (phrase-semantic option or options) in order to determine the identity or difference of phraseological units.

Thus, the use of component analysis in comparative studies and, especially, in the identification of the types of phraseological compliances can be justified by such realities as the universality of categories of human thinking, the known community of human experience

in the process of knowledge of the surrounding world. Being a language semantic category, a special way for human consciousness to reflect on the phenomena of surrounding reality, phraseological meaning of multilingual units is quite comparable and measurable.

Results

According to our research, three types of interlingual phraseological compliances / non-compliances have been elicited: *semantic equivalents, semantic analogues* and *partial semantic analogues*.

Semantic equivalents fully coincide in the seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponents and the four components of connotation: the estimating, emotive, expressive seme, and the functional and stylistic components. The coincidence of seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponents means the coincidence of integrated and differential semes in the structure of phraseological meaning of the English and Russian phraseological units. The first type of phraseological compliances is illustrated in Table 1 below:

Table 1
Semantic equivalents

English Phraseological Units		Russian Phraseological Units
1 significative and denotative macrocomponent	=	significative and denotative macrocomponent
2 estimating component	=	estimating component
3 emotive components	=	emotive components
4 expressive component	=	expressive component
5 functional and stylistic component	=	functional and stylistic component

Semantic equivalents can be presented in the following examples: the English phraseological unit *cast (throw) a stone (stones) at smb* and its Russian compliance (*brosat (kidat) kamnem v kogo*). Both phraseological units in this example belong to interstyle units as having a general hyperseme of 'people', the semantic components of 'personal action', 'interpersonal relations', the semes characterizing similar actions ('to condemn, to accuse', 'to blacken, to discredit'), also having a negative estimating seme, an emotive of 'disapproving relation' and lack of expressivity seme. Thus, these phraseological units are *semantic equivalents*.

The English phraseological unit *not to believe one's ears* and its Russian equivalent *ne verit' svoim usham* are also semantic equivalents. First of all, they are included in the macrogroup of the conceptual zone

of "Mental processes and personal behaviour". They both belong to interstyle units having the general hyperseme of 'people', 'people's emotions'. They also have neutral estimating seme, and they both are characterized by the lack of an emoseme in their connotative meaning.

The following examples correspond to the same component structure:

- *offer smb one's hand (and heart)* and *predlagat' ruku (i serdce) komu;*
- *the salt of the earth* and *sol' zemli;*
- *second nature* and *vtoraja natura;*
- *feed the fishes* and *kormit'ryb;*
- *Promethean fire* and *prometeev ogon';* etc.

As a rule, according to their functional and stylistic characteristic *semantic equivalents* tend to be either interstyle or bookish.

The second type of phraseological compliances, *semantic analogues,* are characterized by some distinctions in the connotative macrocomponent (namely emotive, expressive and functional and stylistic components) which can differ in terms of the identical seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent. Very often, however, partial differences in the seme structure of significative and denotative whole are observed, i.e. the existence of differential additional seme (or semes) in one of the compared phraseological units or in both. Thus, both coincidence and difference of the three components of connotation can be observed: of emotive, of expressive or of functional and stylistic components. *Semantic analogues* are presented in Table 2 below:

Table 2
Semantic analogues

English Phraseological Units		Russian Phraseological Units
1 significative and denotative macrocomponent	= or ≈	significative and denotative macrocomponent
2 estimating component	=	stimating component
3 emotive components	= or ≠	emotive components
4 expressive component	= or ≠	expressive component
5 functional and stylistic component	= or ≠	functional and stylistic component

To illustrate the second type of compliances, we are going to study the following examples. The English phraseological unit *take (lay) smth to heart* (or *to take something very much to heart*), i.e. 'to strongly endure something', and phrase-semantic option of the Russian phraseological unit *prinimat blizko k serdtsu* ('to strongly endure something') in their structure both have the seme of "people", "emotions of a person", "endurance". At the same time, they differ in their functional and stylistic components (the English example belongs to the interstyle unit whereas the

Russian belongs to colloquial phraseological unit). Thus, in this example we observe identity of significative and denotative components and of three components of connotive meaning of macrocomponents except for the functional and stylistic.

The English phraseological unit *Johnny Head-in-(the)-Air* and the Russian phraseological unit *ne ot mira sego* are also semantic analogues. We conclude it owing to the presence of the additional seme 'being unpractical' ('fail to adapt to life') in the significative and denotative macrocomponent of meaning in the Russian phraseological unit. This means that the hypero-hyponymic type of the language relations is characteristic of these examples.

The following examples correspond to the same component structure:

- *take (the) bread out of smb's mouth* and *otbivat' khleb u kogo*;
- *pop the question* and *delat' predlozhenie komu;*
- *hit smb where it hurts* and *nastupat' na mozol' komu*;
- *cry on smb's shoulder* and *plakat' v zhiletku*;
- *recover one's temper* and овладеть собой;
- *speak (talk) smb's (the same) language* and *najti obshhij jazyk;*
- *soft (touched, weak) in the head* and *mozgi nabekren' u kogo;*
- *get one's monkey up* and *metat' ikru* (to rage, make noise, to swear, quarrel), etc.

It should be noted that, if *semantic equivalents* are presented mostly by monoequivalents (there is only one possible translation of the phraseological unit), *semantic analogues,* on the contrary, can be interpreted in many ways, i.e. a Russian phraseological unit may have two or more English compliances. For example:

- *otpravljat' na tot svet kogo* and *send smb to his account*; *send smb to glory*;
- *moloko na gubah ne obsohlo u kogo* and *wet behind the ears; still green; still in swaddling clothes (swaddling-clothes)*;
- *dva sapoga para* and *birds of a feather*; *nothing /not much/ to choose between them; there is nothing to choose between them; there's/not a pin to choose between them; they make a pair.*

The third type of phraseological compliances, *partial semantic analogues,* are characterized by distinctions in the seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent and in the emotive, expressive and functional and stylistic components. Comparing similar units, certain semantic divergences concerning, first of all, their significative and denotative macrocomponent are found. These divergences are observed not only in the differential, but also in one integral seme. *Partial semantic analogues*, the third type of semantic compliances of the English and Russian phraseological units are presented below in Table 3:

Table 3
Partial semantic analogues

English Phraseological Units		Russian Phraseological Units
1 significative and denotative macrocomponent	≈	significative and denotative macrocomponent
2 estimating component	=	estimating component
3 emotive components	= or ≠	emotive components
4 expressive component	= or ≠	expressive component
5 functional and stylistic component	= or ≠	functional and stylistic component

The English phraseological unit '*carry the ball*' ('to be active, to work, play the major role, to bear the main responsibility') and the Russian phraseological unit 'igrat pervuyu skripku' ('to be the main thing in any business') have a coinciding hyperseme 'people', the seme 'position of a person in any business' and concretizing seme 'the main situation'. The English unit also has an integral seme of 'action', differential semes of 'image of action' (actively) and 'responsibility' (the main situation or role in this case). Differences in the functional and stylistic component (i.e. phrase-semantic option of the phraseological unit 'carry the ball' is colloquial) can also be observed.

The English phraseological unit *shut, (stop) of smb's mouth* ("to make someone silent; to make someone stop talking) and Russian unit *ne davat 'rta raskryt' komu* ("not to allow anyone to talk, to express one's opinion") are also considered to be *partial semantic analogues.* The English example includes a specific seme of verbal influence of one person on another "to make someone stop talking" in the significative and denotative macrocomponent, whereas this seme is absent in the Russian phraseological unit. We observe here that the coincidence of the functional and stylistic component in both units is colloquial.

The ambivalent neutral estimating seme is presented in the connotation of both units: on the one hand, one may not allow someone to tell the truth, something valuable, on the other hand, one may "shut someone's mouth", to make the traitor silent and thereby save someone's life.

The following example also corresponds to the same component structure:

dip into one's pocket (purse) "to spend money; show a bit of generosity" and Russian unit *ne schitat' deneg (rublej)* "to have a lot of money, to spend money, without thinking or counting it".

In determining the levels of semantic compliance of multilingual phraseological units semantic scaling must also be addressed. The level of semantic compliances taking into account the increasing component divergences is characteristic of each type of interlingual compliances, as illustrated below in Table 4:

Table 4
Semantic scaling

Types of interlingual phraseological compliances	The level of semantic compliances
1 semantic equivalents	upper level of semantic compliances
2 semantic analogues	middle level of semantic compliances
3 partial semantic analogues	lower level of semantic compliances

Discussion

A comparative analysis is of great importance today as it helps to define similarities and distinguishing features in the English and Russian language picture of the world. Consequently, it enables an investigation into different ways of reflecting on reality in language and reveals the peculiarities of different languages and cultures.

Defining the types of interlingual phraseological compliances / differences in this research, we focus primarily on *complex criterion* which includes semantics coincidence, grammatical (syntactic) organization and component (lexical) structure of multilingual phraseological units (at an unconditional primacy of semantic identity / difference or content plan).

Semantic equivalence (identity of the seme organization of phraseological meaning of the English and Russian phraseological units) means full coincidence of seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent and the four components of connotation: the estimating seme, the emotive seme, the expressive seme and the functional and stylistic component. As a rule, according to their functional and stylistic characteristics, semantic equivalents are either interstyle or bookish, and they are characterized by *upper level of semantic compliances*.

In the group of *semantic analogues* those phraseological units which differ only in the connotative macrocomponent have much higher semantic compliances. It should also be noted that there are divergences in the terminological designation of the types of interlingual relations, as well as in highlighting various aspects of coincidences of phraseological units in the course of interlingual comparisons, which leads to a certain ambiguity in the definition of phraseological equivalents and analogues. According to our analysis, *semantic analogues* are distinguished by the most various range of compliances / divergences in their structural-grammatical organization and lexemic structure. In this semantic group either full coincidence or approximate similarity of the structural-grammatical organization can be observed. Their lexemic structure can either coincide or completely differ. Therefore,

semantic analogues are characterised by a *middle level of semantic compliances*. Moreover, if *semantic equivalents* are presented mostly by monoequivalents (there is only one possible translation of the phraseological unit), *semantic analogues,* on the contrary, can be interpreted ambiguously; i.e., a Russian phraseological unit may correspond to two or more English compliances.

The allocated types of *semantic equivalents* and *analogues* do not incorporate all phraseological units which are outside phraseological lacunarity. Comparing similar units, certain semantic divergences concerning, first of all, their significative and denotative macrocomponent are found. These divergences are observed not only in the differential, but also in one integral seme.

Allocation of a similar group of *partial semantic analogues* has therefore been dictated by the needs of phraseography and to a certain extent is rather conditional and rarely applicable. The connotation components (except for the estimating one) can either coincide, or differ. It should be also noted that there are divergences in the terminological designation of the types of interlingual relations, as well as in highlighting various aspects of coincidences of phraseological units in the course of interlingual comparisons, which leads to a certain ambiguity in the definition of phraseological equivalents and analogues. Partial semantic analogues are characterised by low level of semantic compliances and therefore it is necessary to emphasize that this group of phraseological compliances is quantitatively rather limited.

Considering *semantic equivalents, semantic analogues* and *partial semantic analogues* as well as levels of semantic compliances of multilingual phraseological units, we have further developed semantic scaling (*upper, middle and lower levels*) which is characteristic of each type of interlingual compliances. Naturally enough the given scale represents the schematic model to a certain extent simplifying the real situation. The research has shown that it is sometimes difficult to draw a line between *semantic analogues* and conditionally allocated type of *partial*.

Conclusion

Using the component analysis method we have analysed over 1,750 English and Russian phraseological units from monolingual and bilingual phraseological and English and Russian explanatory dictionaries. Three types of interlingual phraseological compliances / non-compliances have been elicited: *semantic equivalents, semantic analogues* and *partial semantic analogues*.

Semantic equivalents fully coincide in seme structure

of significative and denotative macrocomponent and the four components of connotation: the estimating seme, the emotive seme, the expressive seme and the functional and stylistic component. *Semantic analogues* are characterized by some distinctions in the connotative macrocomponent (namely emotive, expressive and functional and stylistic components) which can differ in terms of identical seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent. Very often, however, partial differences in seme structure of significative and denotative whole are observed; i.e., the existence of differential additional seme (or semes) in one of the compared phraseological unit or in both. In this case both coincidence and difference of the three components of connotation can be observed: of emotive, of expressive or of functional and stylistic components. This group includes the largest number of compliances: *semantic equivalents* are presented mostly by monoequivalents (there is only one possible translation of the phraseological unit), whereas *semantic analogues* can be interpreted ambiguously, i.e. a Russian phraseological unit may correspond to two or more English compliances. *Partial semantic analogues* differ in the seme structure of significative and denotative macrocomponent, fully coincide in estimating components but have some differences in the emotive, expressive and functional and stylistic components.

According to the component analysis method, based on the criteria of identity and difference of seme organization of phraseological units, we have elicited certain divergences concerning, first of all, the *significative* and *denotative macrocomponent* of phraseological units. The *connotation components* (except for the estimating one) can either coincide, or differ.

In determining the levels of semantic compliances of multilingual phraseological units we have developed a semantic scaling (*upper, middle and lower levels*) which is characteristic of each type of interlingual compliances. Thus, according to this scale, we conclude that *semantic equivalents* are characterized by the upper level of compliances, *semantic analogues* by the middle level and *partial semantic analogues* by the lower level of semantic compliances.

It should be noted that, as a rule, *semantic equivalents* are presented by monoequivalents (there is only one possible translation of the phraseological unit), whereas *semantic analogues* can be characterised by ambiguous compliances, i.e. one Russian phraseological unit may correspond to two or more English units.

Considering the three types of interlingual phraseological compliances / non-compliances, we elicit strongly expressed quantitative prevalence of *semantic analogues* over *semantic equivalents*. Thus, the quantity of *semantic analogues* exceeds the quantity of *semantic equivalents by* 0.5% which can be explained by the belonging of the two languages to different groups as well as by peculiarities in their historic development.

The results of the research further the development of a new scientific approach to solving one of the most important problems of comparative study of the phraseological material of different languages by taking into account the latest achievements in the field of semasiology and phraseology.

The findings of this study have applied value for future practice and theory. They could be used in drawing up textbooks, workbooks, tutorials and reference books, as well as solving translation problems. They could also be helpful for students of philological departments of universities and teacher training colleges, institutes of foreign languages, and those developing training courses. The corresponding fragments of work can serve as theoretical and practical material for special courses on English and Russian phraseology. Additionally, the methodology of identifying the types of interlingual semantic compliances can be used in comparative studies in relation to any language.

A further study could address the comparative investigation of ways of translating phraseological units with no direct equivalents (culture-specific vocabulary) into other languages which would enable translators to provide an interpretation which is more or less adequate and close to the original meaning.

References

Arsenteva, E. F. (2006). *Frazeologija i frazeografija v sopostavitel'nom aspekte (na materiale russkogo i anglijskogo jazykov)* [Phraseology and frazeografiya in comparative aspect (on the material of the Russian and English languages)]. Kazan, Russia: Kazan. gos. universitet.

Ayto, J. (Ed.). (2010). *Oxford dictionary of English idioms* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ayupova, R. A. (2004). *Problemy sopostavitel'noj frazeologii anglijskogo i russkogo jazykov* [Problems of comparative phraseology of the English and Russian languages]. Kazan, Russia: Kazan. gos. universitet.

Ayupova, R. A. (2013). *Frazeologija i frazeografija anglijskogo i russkogo jazykov* [Phraseology and frazeografiya of the English and Russian languages]. Kazan, Russia: Izd-vo KPFU.

Chang, C. (2004). *English idioms and interpersonal meanings*. Guangzhou, China: Sun Yat-sen University Press.

Chitra, F. (1996). *Idioms and idiomaticity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cowie, A. P., Mackin, R., & McCaig, I. R. (Eds.). (2004). *Oxford dictionary of current idiomatic English* (Vol. 2: Phrase, clause and sentence idioms). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cowie, A. P. (1998). *Phraseology. Theory. Analysis, and applications*. Oxford, UK: Clevendon Press.

Fraser, B. (1970). Idioms within a transformational grammar. *Foundations of Language, 6*(1), 22-42.

Freeman, W., & Phythian, B. A. (Eds.). (1986). *A concise dictionary of English idioms*. London, UK: Hodder Arnold H&S.

Gak, V. G. (1977). *Sopostavitel'naya leksikologiya* [Comparative lexicology]. Moscow, USSR: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

Gläser, R. (1998). The stylistic potential of phraselological units in the light of genre analysis. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology* (pp. 125-143). Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Gvozdarev, Yu. A. (1981). Sopostavitel'noye opisaniye frazeologii raznykh yazykov [Comparative description of phraseology of different languages]. In Yu. A. Gvozdarev (Ed.), *Obrazovaniye i funktsionirovaniye frazeologicheskikh yedinits* (pp. 116-121). Rostov-on-Don, USSR: Izd-vo Rostovskogo universiteta.

Heacock, P. (Ed.). (2003). *Cambridge dictionary of American idioms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ilyushchenko, N. S. (2011). *Semanticheskiye korrelyatsii v sisteme angliyskikh i russkikh antropomorfnykh frazeologizmov* [Semantic correlations in the system of English and Russian anthropomorphic idioms] (Unpublished candidate of philology dissertation). Voennyj Universitet, Moscow, Russia.

Kovshova, M. L. (2008). Analiz frazeologizmov i kody ikh kultury [Analysis of phraseological units and culture codings]. *Izvestiya RAN. Seria Literatura i Yazyk, 67*(2), 60-65.

Kunin, A. V. (1967). *Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar'* [English-Russian dictionary of phraseological units]. Moscow, USSR: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya.

Kunin, A. V. (1972). *Fraseologiya sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka. Opyt sistematizirovannogo opisaniya* [Phraseology of modern English language. Experience of a systematic description]. Moscow, USSR: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya.

Kunin, A. V. (1984). *Anglo-russkiy frazeologicheskiy slovar'* [English-Russian dictionary of phraseological units]. Moscow, USSR: Russkiy yazyk.

Lipka, L. (1992). *An outline of English lexicology*. Tübingen, Germany: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Liu, D. (2008). *Idioms: Description, comprehension, acquisition, and pedagogy*. London, UK: Routledge.

Makkai, A. (1972). *Idiom structure in English*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Pyatnitskaya, N. Yu. (1987). *Universalnoye i natsionalnoye vo frazeologii: Semantiko-stilisticheskiy analiz frazeologicheskikh edinits russkogo i angliyskogo yazykov* [Universal and national in phraseology: Semantic-stylistic analysis of phraseological units of the Russian and English languages] (Unpublished candidate of philology dissertation), Saratov Polytechnic Institute, Saratov, USSR.

Raykhstein, A. D. (1979). O mezhjazikovom sopostavlenii frazeologicheskikh edinits [About interlingual comparison of phraseological units]. *Inostranniye Yazyki v Shkole, 4*, 3-8.

Raykhstein, A. D. (1980). *Sopostavitelnyy analiz nemetskoy i russkoy frazeologii* [The comparative analysis of the German and Russian phraseology]. Moscow, USSR: Vysshaya shkola.

Sakaeva, L. R. (2013). Komponentnyj sostav frazeologizmov, nominirujushhih cheloveka po chertam haraktera [Component structure of the phraseological units nominating the person on traits of character]. In *Russkij jazyk i duhovnaja kul'tura russkogo naroda: Sohranenie i razvitie nacional'nogo samosoznanija* (pp. 40-46). Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia: NChF NOU VPO Universitet upravlenija TISBI.

Solodub, Yu. P. (1997). Sopostavitelnyy analiz struktury leksicheskogo i frazeologicheskogo znacheniy [Comparative analysis of structure of lexical and phraseological meaning]. *Philological Sciences, 5*, 43-54.

Solodukho, E. M. (1977). *Voprosy sopostavitelnogo izucheniya zaimstvovannoy frazeologii* [Questions of comparative study of borrowed phraseology]. Kazan, USSR: Izdatelstvo Kazanskogo universiteta.

Strässler, J. (1982). *Idioms in English: A pragmatic analysis*. Tubingen, Germany: Verlag.

Telia, V. N. (1990). *Frazeologiya. Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar* [Phraseology. Linguistic phraseological dictionary]. Moscow, USSR: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya.

Telia, V. N. (1995). Osnovnye osobennosti znacheniya idiom kak yedinic frazeologicheskogo sostava yazyka [Primary meanings of idioms as nits of phraseological structure of language]. In T. S. Aristova, M. L. Kovshova, E. A. Ryseva, V. N. Gelia, I. N. Cherkasova & V. N. Telia (Eds.), *Slovar' obraznykh vyrazheniy russkogo yazyka* (pp. 10-16). Moscow, Russia: Otechestvo.

Telia, V. N. (Ed.). (1995). *Slovar' obraznykh vyrazheniy russkogo yazyka* [The dictionary of tropes of Russian]. Moscow, Russia: Otechestvo.

Telia, V. N. (1996). *Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskiy, pragmaticheskiy i lingvokulturologicheskiy aspekty* [Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatical and linguoculturological aspects]. Moscow, Russia: Shkola «Yazyki russkoy kultury».

Walter, E. (Ed.). (2006). *Cambridge idioms dictionary.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Weinreich, U. (1974). Problems in the analysis of idioms. In J. Puhvel (Ed.), *Substance and structure of language* (pp. 23-81). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Welte, W. (1990) *Englische phraseologie und idiomatik. Ein arbeitsbuch mit umfassender bibliographie* [English phraseology and idioms. A workbook with a comprehensive bibliography]. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Wheeler, M., Unbegaun, B., Falla, P., & Thompson, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Oxford Russian dictionary: Russian-English / English-Russian* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

White, J. G. (Ed.). (1998). *Cambridge international dictionary of idioms.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, F. T., & Hill, R. J. (Eds.). (1995). *The Macmillan dictionary of English colloquial idioms.* London, UK: Macmillan.