

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2023.1.4>

MIĘDZYJĘZYKOWE PARALELE FRAZEologiczne Z ELEMENTAMI OZNACZONYMI KULTUROWO W ASPEKCIE KOMUNIKACJI MIĘDZYKULTUROWEJ

Viktoria Misenyova

*kandydat nauk filologicznych, docent,
docent Katedry Języków Obcych i Komunikacji Zawodowej,
Narodowego Uniwersytetu Prawniczego imienia Jarosława Mądrego (Charków, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0625-6034
vika7430@ukr.net*

Iryna Lypko

*kandydat nauk filologicznych, docent,
kierownik Katedry Języków Obcych i Komunikacji Zawodowej,
Narodowego Uniwersytetu Prawniczego imienia Jarosława Mądrego (Charków, Ukraina)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5021-8126
l.p.lypko@nlu.edu.ua*

Adnotacja. W artykule podkreślono celowe wykorzystanie dopasowania języka nauczania i języka ojczystego studentów zagranicznych w celu ustalenia podobieństwa lub rozróżnienia porównywanych jednostek oraz zakresu zidentyfikowanych różnic lub podobieństw. Jest to podstawa do strukturyzacji treści nauczania, w którym odbywa się narodowo zorientowane podejście do nauczania języka obcego w określonej grupie odbiorców krajowych. Porównanie jednostek frazeologicznych języka ukraińskiego i języka ojczystego studenta pozwoliło autorom wyróżnić kilka grup frazeologizmów, różniących się różnym stopniem podobieństwa: od całkowitego zbieżności semantyki, stylistycznego zabarwienia i oryginalnego obrazu (formy wewnętrznej) po absolutny brak równoważności podobieństw frazeologicznych.

Słowa kluczowe: komunikacja międzykulturowa, stopień porównania, studenci zagraniczni, interferencja, komponent narodowo-kulturowy, paralele frazeologiczne.

INTERLANGUAGE PHRASEOLOGICAL PARALLELS WITH CULTURALLY-MARKED COMPONENTS IN THE ASPECT OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Viktoria Misenyova

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages and Professional Communications
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University (Kharkiv, Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0625-6034
vika7430@ukr.net*

Iryna Lypko

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Head of the Department of Foreign Languages and Professional Communications
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University (Kharkiv, Ukraine)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5021-8126
l.p.lypko@nlu.edu.ua*

Abstract. In the article the main attention is focused on the expedient use of the comparison of the foreign student's native language and the target language to establish the similarity and distinction of the compared units as well as the degree of their similarity or distinction. It serves as a basis for structuring the content of training in which the nationally-oriented approach of teaching a foreign language in the definite national audience is carried out. Comparison of Ukrainian and the student's native language phraseological parallels has allowed the authors to allocate several groups of phraseological units with different degree of similarity: from full coincidence of semantics, stylistic colouring and initial image (an internal form) to phraseological units with no direct equivalents in other languages.

Key words: cross-cultural communication, degree of comparison, foreign students, interference, national-cultural component, phraseological parallels.

МІЖМОВНІ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНІ ПАРАЛЕЛІ З КУЛЬТУРНО-МАРКОВАНИМИ КОМПОНЕНТАМИ В АСПЕКТІ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Вікторія Місеньова

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри іноземних мов та професійних комунікацій,
Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого (Харків, Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0625-6034
vika7430@ukr.net*

Ірина Липко

*кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
завідувачка кафедри іноземних мов та професійних комунікацій,
Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого (Харків, Україна)
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5021-8126
l.p.lypko@nlu.edu.ua*

Анотація. У статті наголошується на доцільному використанні співставлення мови навчання та рідної мови іноземних студентів з метою встановлення подібності або відмінності одиниць, що порівнюються, а також ступінь виявлених відмінностей або подібностей. Він є основою для структурування змісту навчання, в якому здійснюється національно-орієнтований підхід до навчання іноземної мови в певній національній аудиторії. Зіставлення фразеологічних одиниць української та рідної мови студента дозволило авторам виділити кілька груп фразеологізмів, що розрізняються різним ступенем подібності: від повного збігу семантики, стилістичного забарвлення і вихідного образу (внутрішньої форми) до абсолютної безеквівалентності фразеологічних паралелей.

Ключові слова: міжкультурна комунікація, ступінь порівняння, іноземні студенти, інтерференція, національно-культурний компонент, фразеологічні паралелі.

Introduction. Phraseology, created as a linguistic discipline rather recently, now draws the increasing attention not only of linguists, but also experts in the field of teaching Ukrainian as a foreign language.

Phraseological units (PhU) are studied not only as proper linguistic phenomena, but also as a means of fixing experience and mentality of ethnos, and as a means of providing extralinguistic information connected with the person and as one of the ways of the people's culture reflection. To master the foreign language, it is necessary to realize that the informant of the target language is the informant of foreign culture, and to communicate with him, it is necessary to learn his culture, as assimilation of the foreign language is, first of all, assimilation of a new culture. According to such approach language acts as its important component and a form of expression of a national view at the world (Бацевич, 2004; Манакин, 2012; Nový & Schroll-Machl, 2005; Nový & Schroll-Machl, 2015; Průcha, 2010; Тер-Минасова, 2000; Trenholm & Jensen, 2008; Tylor, 2010; Weaver, 2000).

The degree of Scientific Research of the Issue

National identity of the language in phraseological units receives the brightest and direct manifestation as they are correlated directly with extra language reality. Revealing of national and cultural specifics of the phraseological units' semantics of one language can be carried out only in comparison with the phraseological unit of the student's native language, and allocation of common features of two languages promotes fast understanding of the national and cultural component in semantics.

In modern practice of teaching the Ukrainian language to foreigners the problem of mastering phraseology was always and still remains rather difficult in the methodical relation, in spite of the fact that the considerable attention is paid to learning phraseology in multinational audience both in scientific-theoretical and practical-methodical aspects. Taking into consideration contemporary language teaching methods and pedagogical practice V. Vagner considers that the most important means of optimization of the educational process is nationally-oriented teaching/learning (Вагнер, 2006). It is the main methodical installation on the basis of which the principles of consciousness, systematicity, functionality, communicative orientation are implemented, adequate forms and methods of training are defined. According to S. Ter-Minasova's point of view influence of the student's native language system on the formation of a new language system takes place in mastering each linguistic phenomenon of any level and throughout learning the target language therefore nationally-oriented language teaching methods can be attached to all language levels and at all stages of teaching/learning (Тер-Минасова, 2000).

Purpose and Tasks of the Study

The purpose of the study is the description and systematization of phraseological parallels with culturally-marked components while learning Ukrainian phraseological units in multinational groups of foreign students.

In connection with the goal, it is necessary to solve the following tasks:

1) to reveal typical mistakes of using phraseological units when comparing Ukrainian and Eastern phraseological pictures of the world;

2) to expand the vocabulary fund of phraseological units (not only active, but also passive) in the foreign students' speech;

3) to determine the main differences of national-specific phraseological units in multinational groups of students;

4) to reveal the main difficulties while comparing Ukrainian and Eastern phraseological pictures of the world.

Statement of the Problem

Before proceeding to the solution of the tasks, let's consider the basic concepts related to the problem of intercultural communication.

Having entered a foreign culture, it is necessary not only to act in accordance with the norms, customs and traditions of this culture, but also to have an idea of the national character, which occupies an important place in each ethnic image. The national character is a totality for representatives of a particular nation of specific physical and spiritual qualities, norms of behavior, activity, etc., and most importantly, the totality of the most important ways of regulating activities and communication based on the values of the society created by the nation (Манакін, 2006).

In the process of research, the question arises: what the manifestation of a national character is and what can be considered a source that provides real information about the national character. The personality traits are reflected in his/her language and in the use of phraseological units in particular. Phrasemes, reflecting in their semantics the long process of people's culture development, fix and transmit from generation to generation cultural concepts, stereotypes, symbols, standards, mythologem, etc. V. Telia writes that the phraseological units of the language is «a mirror in which the linguocultural community identifies its national identity» (Телия, 1996: 64). Joining this point of view, V. Maslova draws attention to the fact that phraseological units are always directed at the subject, that is, «they arise not so much to describe the world as to in order to interpret, evaluate and express a subjective attitude to it» (Маслова, 2001: 79).

Ability to understand and to use phraseological units in speech in a correct way increases the general language culture, helps a free and figurative statement of a thought, improves the ways of translation and expands country-specific representations of foreign students. For the analysis of phraseological material in training foreign students the target language, various methods can be implemented: semantic interpretation, the linguistic-cultural comment and the comparative analysis of PhU used in the target language and the student's native language. Many linguists consider the comparative analysis as one of the leading directions of training phraseology. Comparative learning of phraseological units, being a linguistic basis of the language teaching methods of foreign phraseology, allows not only to predict the interference of a great number of PhU, but also to interpret language material in a methodical way, proceeding from specific goals and problems of the target language training.

Presentation of the Main Research

Let us consider what connection between phraseological units and the mentality of people is, what characteristic features of Ukrainian culture are reflected in the Ukrainian national character.

Ethnic stereotypes serve as a measurable manifestation of a national character. They serve an important function in determining human behavior in different situations. Ethnic stereotypes are a generalized idea of the typical traits that characterize any people. For example, our idea of the Chinese culture, which is distinguished by many subtleties and excesses in observing customs and traditions, is reflected in the *китайські церемонії* (excessive conventions in relations between people). It should be noted that in Russian this set phrase is often used as ironic. The reason is the clash of two cultures that are completely different from each other. We see a lot of unusual and strange in the Chinese culture, which makes us laugh or irony.

Phraseological units reflecting a positive or negative assessment of certain human qualities can be considered an indicator of ethical standards, the rules of social life and behavior in society, as well as the relationship of a nation through its culture and language to the world. Researchers note that the most important positive qualities of Ukrainian people are kindness, sensitivity, selflessness, generosity, sociability. This feature is confirmed by the presence such phraseological units as *людина великої душі, розважити душу, душу розгортати*, etc. It is interesting that the discovered virtues advantages of the Ukrainian character were not understood as qualities that compensate for its shortcomings, but as a continuation of these shortcomings. When it comes to the Ukrainian national character, then immediately there is an idea of the mysterious Ukrainian soul, about which foreigners often speak with admiration or with mockery. According to S. Ter-Minasova everything lies in the fact that the Ukrainians in the national system of values have the fundamental concept that prevails over reason, mind, common sense – the «soul», whereas, for example, the core concept for Englishmen is reason, common sense – mind, and lexical unit for «soul» as a part of phraseological units corresponds to the English word «heart». Among the phrasemes given by the author, phraseological units which have no matches in the word system (Тер-Минасова, 2000). For example: *від усієї душі* – with all one's heart; *душа непокоїться* – smb's heart is heavy with sorrow, guilt; *до глибини душі* – to the bottom of one's heart; *у темних закутках душі* – in one's heart of hearts.

Comparison of phraseological parallels of the target language and the student's native language has allowed the author to allocate several groups of PhU according to different degree of similarity: from full coincidence of semantics, stylistic colouring and initial image (an internal form) to phraseological units with no direct equivalents.

1. The first group of the compared phraseological units is formed by full equivalents. This group includes PhU, which despite some differences in component structure, has identical meaning, high degree of figurativeness, stylistic colouring and can be used in identical situations. Let's consider the way of representing in phraseology of different languages the situation in which a speaker points out the impossibility of making a certain action: *UKR. як на*

камені шиенця вродить; *ENG. when pigs begin to fly* (коли свині почнуть літати); *CHN. на рік мавпи та на місяць коня*; *ARB. коли осел підніметься на гору*.

Phraseological units of this group offer no special difficulties in semantization them when training Ukrainian as a foreign language. Such PhU have an identical invariant of sense and an identical internal form, but sometimes tiny nuances of sense can be behind the absolute identity. Bilingual dictionaries provide phraseological units which can, at first sight, be carried to absolute equivalents, and only careful analysis allows noticing insignificant differences which interpretation can have unexpected and important consequences, from the point of view of understanding national mentality.

2. Partial equivalents are referred to the second group of the compared phraseological units. It is possible to find phraseological units which make identical meaning in the target language and the student's native language, but differ in various degree of figurativeness or stylistic colouring that point to the distinction of two cultures. Usually such phraseological units have identical meaning, but differ in the structure of lexical components and, therefore, an internal form. For example, in Ukrainian there is PhU *біла ворона* (about the person who differs from other people in the behavior, appearance). In the Ukrainian pictures of the world it can be used both in positive and negative meanings. In the Chinese picture of the world there is PhU *журавель серед курей* (*CHN. he li ji qun*) with a similar meaning, but different stylistic colouring as this unit is used only in a positive meaning. The Turkmen have the same PhU with a positive value only – *біле курча*.

Different degree of figurativeness can become the reason of difference in several phraseological pictures of the world: *CHN. цзян тайгун дяо юй, юаньчжэ шангоу* (*старець Цзян ловить рибу – сидить і чекає, коли вона сяде на гачок*) – *UKR. виглядати над морем погоди*. The image which is the foundation of the Chinese PhU is much brighter as this set phrase is tied to a legend according to which Jiang – a legendary wise man and a righteous person was a big fan of fishing and devoted to this hobby much time. At the same time fish, as if paying a tribute of his wisdom, went to him even on an empty hook. Different degree of figurativeness is caused by the fact that Eastern idioms gravitate to a sublime style, to poetry that quite corresponds to the status of moral and valuable estimates of life situations and certain behavior models of the person in them. The stylistics of the Ukrainian idioms of valuable sense is obviously lowered, many of them are noted by irony or a frank sneer, abound colloquial (sometimes abusive) vocabulary. Such phraseological units can be translated with difficulties as different figurativeness disturbs understanding of the meaning and when translating they are filled with other images.

3. Phraseological units which have no equivalents in other languages can be referred to the third group. In the Ukrainian language as well as in any others, there are many phraseological units which have no compliances at the level of sense in other languages. Such phraseological units often remain beyond the scope of bilingual phraseological dictionaries. For this reason they have nothing to give as compliances, we can only translate them and explain their meaning. For example, in the Chinese language there are no equivalents for the Ukrainian phraseological units containing national-specific vocabulary (archaisms, toponyms, anthroponyms, etc.) in the structure: *чугуївська верста, пупа надривати, гав ловити, підносити гарбуза, як у віночку, аж гай гуде, нате й мій глек на капуста*, etc. Such phraseological units need to be translated word-for-word, trying to keep their language features, stylistic colouring. Phraseological units which metaphors are based on the usual words having compliances in the student's native language can be also untranslatable: *виносити сміття з хати, хоч шаром покати, зуб на зуб не попаде, як курка лапою*.

So, difficulties of learning phraseological units with no direct equivalents are in the fact that people living in different social, territorial, environment conditions, having different history, religion, customs, the principles of morals, psychology, etc. even the most everyday occurrences and objects often cause unequal associations from which phraseological metaphors appear. Despite the difficulties of translation and understanding of Ukrainian phraseological units, they need to be included in the process of language training. This is one of the best ways of making foreign students more active, imparting them love to the target language, bringing up on the examples of Ukrainian proverbs and sayings.

When training Ukrainian phraseological units the role of etymology is extremely important, though isn't identical in relation to the target language and the student's native language. In Eastern languages a phraseological expression often represents the compressed in several hieroglyphs reference to a parable, legend or a historical event. In the Ukrainian language the majority of etymological references opens an internal form of phraseological fusions. For this reason for the student, who is not implemented in the historical and cultural context of Ukrainian civilization, information about the origin of this or that expression is the condition of the correct understanding of a set phrase general sense.

Thus, learning of phraseological systems allows doing generalizations which are beyond linguistics and concern the features of national figurativeness of thinking, moral and valuable priorities existing in the culture of the target language. The popular wisdom, imprinted in phraseological units and beauty of images by means of which it is expressed, is a direct reflection of beauty and wisdom of people's collective language consciousness.

The experience of work in multinational groups demonstrates that foreign students quite often inadequately perceive and use Ukrainian phraseological units in their speech, because they poorly possess the extralinguistic information concentrated in PhU. Difficulties of extralinguistic nature are caused by the difficulties arising in case of understanding the information concluded in native speakers' speech, therefore work at national-specific phraseology is extremely important process that depends on the ways of presenting phraseological units to foreign students.

From the point of view of national consciousness typical difficulties are shown, first of all, at perception of verbal images of the Ukrainian texts. In language teaching methods there is a fair opinion that the foreigner who has a language competence of the literary text completely understands only literal «grammatical» sense of the phrase while the language of art is a language of images, and images develop in reader's perception only when reading of the text goes beyond literalism (Манакін, 2012). For example, for foreign students there are absolutely alien images (*лис Микита*, хатка на курячій ніжці, Баба-Яга кістяна нога, дід з кикоть, а борода з лікоть, тридесяте царство, інше государство, аж дух сперло) if they don't know that these images are connected with the Ukrainian folklore.

One of the developing directions of linguoculturology is cross-cultural communication. Definition of this direction is reflected in the term itself: this is the communication of people representing various cultures (Бацевич, 2004; Маслова, 2001; Манакін, 2012; Nový & Schroll-Machl, 2005; Nový & Schroll-Machl, 2015; Průcha, 2010; Тер-Минасова, 2000; Trenholm & Jensen, 2008; Tylor, 2010; Weaver, 2000). Researches on the cross-cultural communication are widely applied not only in linguistics, but in language teaching methods as well (Бацевич, 2007; Пентиліук, 2015; Телия, 1996; Trager & Hall, 1954; Tylor, 2010). When training a foreign language, it is necessary to consider its connection with culture. After all it is required not only to acquire linguistic data but also to learn the national character, traditions, customs of other people, system of its norms and values.

Acquaintance with the mentioned works shows that researches on cross-cultural communication has held a firm place in linguistics by now, having received the status of the independent linguistic direction. Nevertheless, there are many issues which in the aspect under analysis have not been investigated yet. If the general questions of cross-cultural communication in a certain measure have been studied, the separate levels and systems in the specified aspect haven't been taken into consideration yet. In modern language teaching methods and student teaching it is conventional that the most important means of the educational process optimization is nationally-oriented teaching. It is the main methodical installation on the basis of which the principles of consciousness, systematicity, functionality and communicative orientation are realized, adequate forms and methods of training are defined.

Influence of the students' language system on the formation of a new language system happens in acquiring each linguistic phenomenon of any level and in the process of learning UAFL, therefore certain techniques of nationally-oriented language teaching methods can be attached to all language levels and at all levels of teaching. Comparative learning of languages has the philological nature: acquaintance with the culture of a native speakers' country is carried out in the process of learning language units with national and cultural elements in semantics. By comparison of languages national and cultural distinctions are observed practically at all levels, but they are especially bright at lexical and phraseological levels. For this reason lexicology and phraseology act as a direct object of comparative linguoculturology.

The necessity of expansion of typological studies in the field of phraseology was indicated by many scientists as «lexicological and phraseological systems of language act as the main and defining sphere of processes of languages interaction» (Вагнер, 2006: 118). The main object in the analysis of phraseological systems of two languages is a phraseological image, as the peculiarities of figurative thinking are more reflected in the structure of set phrases.

In phraseological units national identity of the language receives the brightest and direct manifestation as they are correlated directly with extra language reality. Revealing of national and cultural specifics of the phraseological units' semantics of one language can be carried out only in comparison with the phraseological unit of the student's native language, and allocation of common features of two languages promotes fast understanding of the national and cultural component's semantics.

The purposes of comparative representations of national phraseological units are quite obvious: «knowledge of proverbs and sayings of these or those people promotes not only the best knowledge of language, but also the best understanding of people's views and characters» (Тер-Минасова, 2000: 98). However realization of similar plans is connected with overcoming the essential difficulty which means the discrepancy or partial coincidence of phraseological units' and proverbs' semantic invariants. Comparative study of different phraseological pictures of the world, being a linguistic basis of the language teaching methods of foreign language phraseology, allows not only to predict the interference of a great number of phraseological units but also to interpret the language material methodically.

Methodical interpretation of the comparative phraseology data proceeds from the purposes and problems of training. In the field of phraseology they are as follows: 1) to expand a stock of phraseological units (not only active but also passive) in the students' speech;

2) to train in adequate understanding and the use of phraseological units in different types of speech activity;

3) to develop the students' intelligence in comprehension and mastering of the phraseological pictures of the world fragments of the target language.

There are three types of skills for mastering phraseology: potential – understanding of unfamiliar phraseological units in the context on the basis of their word-for-word translation, receptive – recognition of phraseological units which had been learnt before, productive – use of phraseological units' in own speech (Тер-Минасова, 2000). Besides, for implementing phraseological units into the process of teaching it is necessary to define what real difficulties (lexical, grammatical, semantic, linguocultural) foreign students are able to face with. Lexical difficulties of mastering phraseological units can be caused by phraseologically-connected vocabulary, archaisms, neologisms, stylistically-marked words, proper names, terms and other words with low rate of use. Grammatical difficulties of learning phraseological units can be caused by phraseologically-connected word forms, preference of little-used forms, homonymous and repeating forms, an atypical word order, and predicative structures unknown for students. Due to the inclusion of phraseological units in speech, there are some difficulties as follows: general and special

means of interphrase communication, restriction and lack of compatibility according to general rules, individual rules of compatibility, statement of punctuation marks according to special rules, impossibility of the sentence parts to be included between phraseological unit components (Вагнер, 2006; Маслова, 2001; Телия, 1996). Many of the specified difficulties amplify under the influence of intralingual and interlingual interferences.

Mastering of any foreign language for executing its main communicative function assumes also the formation (acquisition) of cultural competence. For example, when training Ukrainian to the Chinese students, we face with many difficulties, because cultures of Ukraine and China are far from each other. This information should be considered to build up the process of teaching the Chinese students Ukrainian so that there was a stage-by-stage formation of the students' identity, the development of their creative opportunities, awakening of interest to the Ukrainian culture, traditions and world-view perception. Comparison of phraseological units gets a special practical sense in the linguocultural aspect which promotes not only the expansion of the students' background and the formation of their linguocultural competence but also allows to warn the specific mistakes caused by the interference and to eliminate the influence of the students' native language and culture.

The originality of the Ukrainian national culture and its considerable differences from the Eastern ones create certain difficulties for students, therefore it is necessary to find optimum ways for improving the process of training, which can be carried out at the expense of taking into account the peculiarities of cross-cultural communication, deep and versatile entry of foreign students into national and cultural specifics of native speakers' speech behavior and culture.

It should be noted that Ukrainian and Eastern cultures have absolutely different sources and bases. For example, in the formation of the Ukrainian national culture the important role was played by the Christianity and paganism, whereas the Chinese culture relies on the Daoism, Buddhism and the main thing – Confucianism. The Chinese phraseological units (especially with no direct equivalents, which are difficult for Ukrainian native speakers' comprehension) came in the Chinese language from the texts of ancient historians, philosophers, writers, poets, and reflect in the language thousand-year traditions of the Chinese: *ши хоу Чжугэ Лян* (букв. бути Чжугэ Ляном після події), *цзян тайгун дяо юй, юаньчжэ шангоу* (букв. старець Цзян ловить рибу – сидить і чекає, коли вона сяде на гачок), *хуа ши тиан зу* (букв. намалювавши змію, додати їй ноги) (Манакин, 2012). The considerable part of Ukrainian phraseological units is taken from the Bible, Greek mythology, history and folklore: *розсипати перла перед свинями, яблуко незгоди (розбрату), ведмежа послуга* (Бацевич, 2004).

According to the analysis of Ukrainian and Chinese national-specific phraseological units, spheres of the human experience generally coincide, but their content remains specific: phraseological unit reflects the realities of the national culture or is building up on the basis of national associative and figurative connotations. This specific character has to be considered when training phraseological units in multinational groups of students. The results of the comparative analysis of Ukrainian and Chinese phraseological units give us the chance to present the meaning of phraseological units more voluminous and deep according to the language reality reflected in a communication process. The research of Ukrainian and Chinese phraseological units' correlation and the development of ways for presenting these units by the students promote the improvement of a teaching model taking into account cross-cultural communication.

As for the figurative means used in languages for the expression of moral and valuable phraseological units' meanings, difference in the «construction material» of metaphors is especially noticeable. For example, the Chinese language consciousness appeals to the nature, wild animals, while the Ukrainian one is more often turned to the household plots, domestic animals. The other difference consists of various stylistic nuances of phraseological units and proverbs. East idioms aspire to a sublime style, poetry that corresponds to the status of moral and valuable estimates of life situations and certain behavior models of the person in them (Вагнер, 2006). The stylistics of Ukrainian idioms is obviously lowered, many of them are marked out by irony or frank sneers. Besides, these units are rich in colloquial (sometimes abusive) vocabulary.

Let's carry out the comparative analysis of Ukrainian and Chinese semantic equivalents in which two main differences have been shown especially visually: *біла ворона* (кит. журавель серед курей); *надати ведмежу послугу* (кит. витягувати паростки руками, щоб вони краще росли); *випробувати долю* (кит. смикати тигра за хвіст); *сім п'ятниць на тиждні* (кит. вранці підтримувати царство Цинь, а ввечері – Чу); *не бачити далі від свого носа* (кит. уподібнюватися жабі, що сидить на дні колодязя і дивиться в небо) (Манакин, 2006).

It can be noticed that Ukrainian phraseological units are characterized by the lowered stylistics of metaphors with the «construction material» – people, everyday occurrence; Chinese phraseological units are differed by poetic metaphor coloring with the «construction material» – nature, fauna.

In Ukrainian and Chinese languages it is possible to see the phraseological parallels, which have an identical or similar meaning, and can be used in identical situations. When learning such phraseological units, it is also expedient to use the comparison of the student's native language and the target one to establish the similarity and distinction of the compared units as well as the degree of this similarity or distinction. It gives the material for organizing the content of training in which the nationally-oriented approach of teaching a foreign language in the definite national audience is carried out.

The problem of learning Ukrainian language national specifics in the didactic purposes is based on the fundamental position that the process of learning the phraseological system has to begin with mastering interlingual phraseological compliances – equivalents which appear on the basis of life experience, universality of thinking laws and coincidence of some forms of different people's figurative vision. Observations showed that at the selection

of any equivalent the disclosure of sense and presentation of a situation have to be in the centre of attention. The detailed interpretation, phraseological units' commenting, selection of the Chinese compliances provide penetrating into the value of Ukrainian phraseological units, acquiring of semantic and situational restrictions of their use.

Conclusion and Further Studies

Phraseological parallels with culturally-marked components really occupy a significant role in the cultural representation of a Ukrainian person, since they do not only characterize a person, his activity, mental abilities, spiritual qualities, etc., but also have specific features, which reflect the symbolism of the people. They play a special role in reflecting the national stereotype, worldview and mentality, which must be taken into account in the process of intercultural communication.

In phraseological parallels cultural information is realized through the interaction of factors that determine semantics and limit the use of the phrase of the analyzed group.

The national-cultural specificity of phrasemes is determined by the symbolism of their figurative foundation. As part of phrases that do not have correspondences in the system of words, the main role in the formation of meaning is played by zoological symbols, color symbols, substantive symbols, perception symbols, and numerical symbols. Due to the presence of components with symbolic meaning, the semantics of the analyzed phraseological units becomes much more accessible and understandable to the native speaker and creates difficulties in intercultural communication.

Teaching/learning of the Ukrainian phraseological system allows to do generalizations which are beyond linguistics and concern the features of national figurativeness of thinking and moral and valuable priorities existing in the culture. The experience of work in the Chinese audience confirms that students quite often inadequately perceive and use the Ukrainian phraseological units in the speech, because they poorly possess the extralinguistic information concentrated in phraseological units. Difficulties of the extralinguistic character are caused by the difficulties arising at understanding the information concluded in the native speakers' communication. Therefore work with national-specific phraseology is extremely important process and the efficiency of learning Ukrainian phraseology by foreign students substantially depends on its performance.

Relying on observations of linguists and methodologists as well as on the experience of teaching foreign students, it should be noted that the difficulties in learning phraseology in foreign audience are caused by the fact that the European and Eastern language systems have distinctions at all levels: phonetic, lexical, grammatical, and also in the field of graphics. Lexical difficulties in respect of the content, first of all, are found in perception of semantic meanings of the words with no equivalents in other languages. As a part of phraseological units, national-specific and background words denoting names of objects and phenomena of national life we meet very often. Recognition and understanding of the mentioned lexical units at the perception of Ukrainian phraseological parallels by foreign students are provided with not only language knowledge, but also «background» knowledge of culture of the country of the target language.

Further work on this issue provides an in-depth study of finding out typical mistakes in the use of Ukrainian phraseological units by foreign students in order to make the process of teaching/learning more effective. The main attention will also be focused on the issue of the linguodidactic analysis of the text of a manual as a means of teaching foreign students.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Бацевич Ф.С. Основы коммуникативной лингвистики: учебник. К.: Академия, 2004. 344 с.
2. Бацевич Ф.С. Словник термінів міжкультурної комунікації. К.: Довіра, 2007. 205 с.
3. Вагнер В.Н. Лексика русского языка как иностранного и ее преподавание: учебное пособие. М.: Флинта, 2006. 100 с.
4. Манакин В.М. Мова і міжкультурна комунікація. К.: Академія. 2012. 288 с.
5. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. М.: Академия, 2001. 208 с.
6. Пентилок М. Словник-довідник з української лінгводидактики. Київ: Ленвіт, 2015. 320 с.
7. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. М.: Академия, 1996. 288 с.
8. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. М.: Слово, 2000. 261 с.
9. Nový I., Schroll-Machl S. Spolupráce přes hranice kultur. Praha, Management Press. 2005. 313 s.
10. Nový I., Schroll-Machl S. Interkulturní komunikace: Češi a Němci / Ivan Nový, Sylvia Schroll-Machl. Praha, Management Press. 2015. 167 s.
11. Průcha J. Interkulturní komunikace. Jan Průcha. Praha, Grada. 2010. 200 s.
12. Trager G., Hall E. Culture and communication: model and analysis. 1954. Research and Communications, 3, P. 25–31.
13. Trenholm S., Jensen A. Interpersonal Communication. Oxford University Press. 2008.
14. Tylor E.B. Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom. Vols. 1–2. Cambridge University Press. 2010.
15. Weaver G.R. Culture, Communication, and Conflict: Readings in Intercultural Relations. Pearson Pub. 2000.

References:

1. Batsevych, F.S. (2004). *Osnovy komunikatyvnoyi linhvistyky: pidruchnyk [Basics of communicative linguistics: textbook]*. K., Akademiya [in Ukrainian].
2. Batsevych, F.S. (2007). *Slovyk terminiv mizhkul'turnoyi komunikatsiyi [Dictionary of terms of intercultural communication]*. K., Dovira [in Ukrainian].
3. Vagner, V.N. (2006). *Leksika rysskogo yazika kak inostrannogo i ee prepodavanie: ychebnoe posobie [Vocabulary of the Russian language as a foreign one and its teaching: manual]*. M., Flinta [in Russian].
4. Manakin, V.M. *Mova i mizhkul'turna komunikatsiya [Language and intercultural communication]*. 2012. K., Akademiya [in Ukrainian].
5. Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Lingvokul'turologiya [Linguoculturology]*. Izd. Akademiya [in Russian].
6. Pentylyuk, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Slovyk-dovidnyk z ukrayins'koyi linhvodydaktyky [Reference book in Ukrainian linguodidactics]*. K., Lenvit [in Ukrainian].
7. Ter-Minasova, S.G. (2000). *Yazyk i mezhdunarodnaya kommunikatsiya [Language and international communication]*. M., Slovo [in Russian].
8. Nový, I. & Schroll-Machl, S. (2005). *Spolupráce přes hranice kultur [Cooperation across cultural boundaries]*. Praha. Management Press.
9. Nový, I. & Schroll-Machl, S. (2015). *Interkulturní komunikace: Češi a Němci [Intercultural communication: Czechs and Germans]*. Praha. Management Press [in Polish].
10. Průcha, J. (2010). *Interkulturní komunikace [Intercultural communication]*. Praha. Grada [in Polish].
11. Teliya, V.N. (1996). *Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskij, pragmaticheskij i lingvokul'turologicheskij aspekty [Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguoculturological aspects]*. Izd. Akademiya [in Russian].
12. Trager, G. & Hall, E. (1954). Culture and communication: model and analysis. *Research and Communications*. Issue 3, pp. 25–31.
13. Trenholm, S. & Jensen, A. (2008). *Interpersonal Communication*. Oxford University Press.
14. Tylor, E.B. (2010). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*. Vols. 1–2. Cambridge University Press.
15. Weaver, G.R. (2000). *Culture, Communication, and Conflict: Readings in Intercultural Relations*. Pearson Pub.