



Phraseological Units with Components Denoting Weather in English Compared to Native Languages

Rimma Nailevna Salieva¹, Oksana Yurievna Amurskaya², Rimma Abelkhaerovna Safina³, Nuriya Rustemovna Davitova⁴

¹ Department of Romance and Germanic Philology, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; sargus5@yandex.ru

² Department of Romance and Germanic Philology, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; oksana2181@mail.ru

³ Department of Romance and Germanic Philology, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; rsafina@mail.ru

⁴ Department of Romance and Germanic Philology, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia; nuriadavitova@gmail.com

Abstract

This article looks at English phraseological units that have elements in their structure connected to the macrofield "weather." Comprehensive analyses of linguistic units are conducted at the semantic, structural-grammatical, and component levels. Finding phraseological correspondences and assessing the level of equivalency between phraseological units when translating them into English are the goals of this study. "Many studies have demonstrated that phrases are not only components of a language system, but also cultural carriers, and they underscore the need to shift the focus of contemporary phraseology research to cultural phenomena." Obama's organic and casual use of conventional metaphors enriches his rhetorical power instead of making it seem like tidbits. Proverbs, with their frequently evocative metaphors, give his speeches more emphasis and feeling while enabling listeners to understand his pragmatist or philosophical arguments in plain terms. The primary scientific goal of the study is to identify types of phraseological correspondence between languages, such as complete and partial equivalents, complete analogs, and partial and non-equivalent units. This will be accomplished by carrying out tasks like selecting phraseological units, detailed structural-grammatical, component, and semantic analysis, and applying appropriate methods. There is no denying the practical value of the data provided. It is easier for the recipient to comprehend phraseological units when they can recognize and comprehend the degree of phraseological equivalency. It facilitates more accurate translation. The linguistic parallels and divergences found can help make the study and instruction of English phraseology more effective. It is feasible to recognize and comprehend the features of the English language through the comparative and contrasting analysis of phraseological relations, which establishes the degree of equivalency in the translation of examined phraseological units.

Keywords: Linguistic Units; Phraseological Correspondence; English Language.

1. Introduction

Finding whole and partial phraseological equivalents, complete and partial analogs, and non-equivalent units among phraseological units with components signifying weather in English is the aim of this study. The analysis of English phraseological correspondences is the primary task to accomplish this goal. Regarding the different ways that phrase units are translated from one language to another, scientists have differing opinions. Three categories of correspondences are recognized in the translated language by Komissarov et al. (1960): Phraseological equivalents: in every way, the phraseological units in the translated language match the phraseological units in the source language. 2) Phraseological analogues: Although phraseological units share the same stylistic orientation and semantic level, their underlying images are distinct. 3) Compute. Translation techniques are traditionally divided into two groups: phraseological and non-phraseological. As previously mentioned, there are two types of phraseological methods: phraseological analogs and phraseological equivalents. The following translation types are distinguished in non-phraseological methods: qualified translation, combined translation, lexical translation, descriptive translation, and calculation (Arsentieva, 2008).

Piirainen (2008) defines phraseological calculation as non-phraseological translation techniques such as component-wise, word-for-word, or descriptive translation that translate phraseological units. Dictionary data is used to

classify translation techniques for phraseological units. Researchers such as Komissarov (1999) have noted that "using the appropriate phraseological unit" is the best way to communicate virtual phraseology. Though no dictionary can provide the use of phrasal units in context, this usage is not always effective. Among the resources for expanding and improving vocabulary is phraseology. It expresses the unique perspective of this global language community and is the most expressive component of the lexical system (Artemova, 2009).

Three languages, each with unique national features and characteristics, are compared and enriched at the same time during the detailed analysis. "Phraseological units transmit cultural attitudes and stereotypes, standards, and archetypes from one generation to the next, reflecting in their semantics the long process of people's culture's development." For this reason, it's essential to communicate the right meaning while taking into account the original text's characteristics.

According to Yarullina et al. (2019), phraseological units can be compared at linguistic levels like semantic, structural-grammatical, and component levels to determine the degree of correspondence between the phraseological units in the original language and the translated language. The phraseological units under study can be categorized into the following classes based on this assertion: 1) Partial and complete equivalents. Three) non-equivalent units; 2) analog (complete and partial). The studied materials' scientific novelty stems from the authors' attempt to verify the equivalency of phraseological units at the semantic, structural-grammatical, and component levels while looking for phraseological correspondences in English.

2. Literature Review

The examination of contemporary theoretical works that tackle the issue at hand suggests that there is insufficient development in the study of phraseological units in the modern English language. In addition, this vocabulary segment is extensively examined from multiple angles to ascertain the standards for their choice from a theoretical standpoint. The boundaries, characteristics, distinctions, stylistic applications, translation formats, typology of word formation, and contemporary trends in phraseology development are all exposed and explained. Specifically, several academics have conducted this research, including Vinogradov (1977) and others. They state that the study of phraseologisms' categorical features is the focus of phraseology as a branch of linguistics. This study helps to distinguish between the key characteristics of phraseology and determines the essence of phraseologisms as distinct linguistic units. It also explains the processes that lead to the formation of phraseologisms and the patterns by which they function in language. Even within a single research topic, there are differing opinions regarding the precise definition of a phraseological unit and the number of phraseological units that are deemed accurate, despite the fact that numerous in-depth analyses have been conducted on numerous phraseology-related issues.

Phonology is defined differently in world linguistics and Ukrainian linguistics. Opryshko & Bezkorovaina (2021) define a phraseological unit as the collective term for semantically related word and sentence combinations. Unlike similar forms of semantic structures, phraseological units are reproduced in speech in a fixed ratio of semantic structure and a specific lexical-semantic composition, rather than in accordance with general patterns of word choice and combination in the organization of utterances (Galperin, 2012). According to Opryshko & Bezkorovaina's definition from 2021, a phraseologism is the collective term for semantically related word combinations that are not formed in speech but serve that purpose by having a consistent content-to-vocabulary ratio assigned to them (Kunin, 1996). Another definition provided by Yartseva (1990) states that a phraseological unit is a complex interdisciplinary unit that interacts with units of various levels in both form and meaning (Komar, 2011; Opryshko & Bezkorovaina, 2021).

3. Methodology

Several techniques showed promise for our investigation, including phraseological identification, phraseological description, dictionary definitions, component analysis, comparative typological, and continuous sampling. They enabled the material to be examined, explained, contrasted, and presented using the primary ideas of phraseological theory.

4. Results

The primary source of scientific novelty is the endeavor to examine and contrast the phraseological microsystems of language, each of which consists of phraseological units with a component associated with the "Weather" macrofield. The fact that a phraseological unit represents a substantial portion of the language system and accurately depicts the world

of native speakers explains the relevance of the research findings. Many problems arise when translating a phraseological unit, which can be attributed to variations in style, meaning, and word choice. Phonological unit translations are not always exact replicas of the source text. On the other hand, phraseological units' specificity is revealed by their complexity. Finding full and partial analogs, full and partial equivalents, and non-equivalent units is the study's outcome. Now, let's examine and ascertain the level of similarity between the phraseological units we are currently studying in the English language. We will identify equivalents, analogues, and non-equivalent phraseological units based on the classification of (Mieder, 2009) when examining the interlingual relations of phraseological units with a component associated with the macrofield "Weather."

When PUs exhibit complete correspondence with the original in every aspect—including denotative and connotative macrocomponents, structural, grammatical, and component levels—as well as the underlying images, they are deemed full equivalents. The connotative macro-component's emotive, expressive, evaluative, and functional-stylistic components all need to line up with the initial phraseological unit. Phonological units that translate to neither an equivalent nor an analogue in another language are referred to as non-equivalent units. We are dealing with the phenomenon of relative non-equivalence in these situations. Non-equivalent phraseological units capture each people's traditions, customs, and religion while also reflecting their historical, social, cultural, and national features. During the analysis, we only looked up equivalents and analogs within phraseological units that contained elements linked to the "Weather" macrofield. If the units corresponding to those phraseological units do not contain components related to the "Weather" macrofield, then even those phraseological units that have corresponding phraseological units in the language under consideration have been deemed non-equivalent and are not taken into consideration.

During the research process, it was discovered that the majority of the non-equivalent phraseology units examined in the English language do not correspond simultaneously. These units typically denote a unique term for an uncommon occurrence or have a metaphorical transformation not found in other languages. Nonetheless, phraseological units exist in all languages that correspond to certain words but not others. Similar values can be expressed in various ways in different languages due to the fact that phraseological units with components connected to the "Weather" macrofield have an uneven number of non-equivalent units. This indicates that most of the units describe the same realia of the surrounding world.

5. Discussion

Comparative research on phraseology units' translation techniques was conducted by foreign researchers Kayumova et al. (2019); Gololobova et al. (2018); and Bayramova (1982) and other representatives of the Kazan language school. The materials under study demonstrated how heavily phraseological units containing elements that symbolize weather occur in the English language. After examining the techniques for translating phraseological units, we discovered that, even with the variances in the English language, translations that are nearly identical to the source can still be achieved by using analogs and equivalents in the target language. Remember that there are always universal and necessary understandings shared by all speakers of a national cultural mindset.

Determining and comprehending the level of phraseological equivalency makes it easier for the recipient to perceive phraseological units; this leads to a more accurate translation because it is more certain and error-free. In addition to helping to better understand and teach phraseology in both the native and target languages, the interlanguage similarities and differences that have been found can also help to highlight the unique characteristics of national lingua cultures, which are currently receiving a lot of attention. Additionally, a thorough analysis of the interlingual phraseological correspondences of the English units that contain the elements linked to the "Weather" macrofield in their structure could offer a direction for future study.

6. Conclusion

Three categories of phraseological units—equivalent, analog, and non-equivalent—were found in the equivalency analysis. There was only one complete equivalent and four partial equivalents found for English. In language pairs, more equivalent matches were discovered. The majority of the phraseological units under study make reference to analogs. The phraseological units that have corresponding phraseological units in other languages under investigation are included in this study as non-equivalent units, provided that the corresponding units do not contain elements pertaining to the "weather" macrofield. It was discovered that the majority of non-equivalent English units are not also equivalent

in other languages. These units typically refer to a relatively uncommon specific name or entail a metaphorical transformation that is unique to that language. The primary finding is that complete and partial analogs are most frequently used in the phraseological units under study. The majority of the non-equivalent units studied in other languages do not match at the same time, and there is a limited use of full and partial equivalents in each language. For a comprehensive understanding of the features of native and foreign languages, more comparative analysis of interlanguage phraseological correspondences will be crucial. A more suitable translation will benefit greatly from contrastive analysis.

Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Arsentieva, E. F. (2008). *Russian and comparative philology 2008/ Kazan State University*. Faculty of Philology - Kazan State University, 176 p.
- Artemova, A. F. (2009). *English phraseology: Special course*. Textbook/A.F. Artemova - 2nd ed., revised. and additional M.: Higher School, 208 p.
- Bayramova, L. K. (1982). *Phraseology and translation*. Phraseology and syntax.- Kazan: KGU. S. 3-42(b)
- Galperin, I. R. (2012). *Essays on the stylistics of the English*. Moscow: Librocom; 2nd edition, rev. 376 p.
- Gololobova, N., Arsenteva, E., & Nikulina, E. (2018). Author's Transformations and Their Translation in "The Prussian Officer" by D.H. Lawrence. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 8(10), 401-406.
- Kayumova, A. R., Konopleva, N. V., & Safina, R. A. (2019). Linguo-cultural peculiarities of phraseological units with the component 'fire' in English, Russian, Spanish, Tatar and German. *X Linguae*, 3(5), 55-65.
- Komar, L. (2011). Phraseology as a science and its research subject. *Youth and the market*. Lviv, 3(74), 128-132.
- Komissarov, V. N. (1999). *Modern translation studies*.-M.: ETS, 192 p.
- Komissarov, V. N., Retsker, Y., & Tarkhov, V. I. (1960). *A manual on translation from English into Russian*. - M.: Higher School, Part 1.
- Kunin, A. V. (1996). *Course of phraseology of modern English. Textbook. for institutes and faculties*. foreign language 2nd ed., revised. Moscow: Higher School, Dubna: Phoenix, 381 p.
- Mieder, W. (2009). *Yes, We Can: Barack Obama's Proverbial Rhetoric*. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York, 29 Broadway, 18th floor New York, 353 pgs.
- Opryshko, N. O., & Bezkorovaina, L. S. (2021). *Phraseological Units With Component Words Denoting Noble Titles In The English Language*. Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University. DOI <https://doi.org/10.32838/2710-4656/2021.6-1/29>.
- Piirainen, E. (2008). *Figurative Phraseology and Culture in: Granger Sulviane. Meunier Fanny*. Phraseology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. 423 pgs.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1977). *Selected works. Lexicology and lexicography*. Moscow: Nauka, 310 p.
- Yartseva, V. N. (1990). *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 712 p.
- Yarullina, O. A., Tarasova, F. H., Varlamova, E. V., & Polhovskaya, E. V. (2019). Evaluation component in the phraseological units of the English and Tatar languages. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics this*, 10, 1132-1138.

