

CLASSIFICATION OF INTERLINGUISTIC PHRASEOLOGICAL RELATIONS IN THE CHINESE AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

O.V. Pavlova

Amur State University (Birobidzhan, Russia).
E-mail: wodeyoujian@mail.ru

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

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

In contemporary linguistics, there is a growing trend in the study of phraseology within contrastive linguistics. In fact, because of its nature, contrastive linguistics reveals correspondence at all levels of linguistic structure, and moreover, it is appeared to be a section of studying the types of lexical and phraseological correspondences in the two languages and revealing in these nationally appropriate semantics of phraseological units (onwards PU). In our view, cultural identity of PU may be disclosed in an integrated, especially, the systematic / structural and anthropocentric approach to the study of phraseological system of two languages. As nowadays for modern linguistics it seems urgent to create a model of the language, based on the presence of a specific system of education in it, and organized interaction of internal and external determinants. Both approaches are generated by actually existing stratification of the language, which is defined as a self-adjusting system of education represented by anthropocentric components [1: 7].

According to the comparison of PU, Y.P. Solodoub marks that the phraseological systems of different languages have the property of “commensurability”, which is confirmed by the presence of interlinguistic phraseological equivalents (or typologically identical phraseologisms), that is PU, “the identity of the actual semantics of which is explained by the uniformity of the image-associative relations that underlie this transformation” [2: 9]. He views a group of the Russian PU, expressing a qualitative assessment of a person in relation to the phraseologisms of closely related (Slavic) non-

closely related (Germanic and Roman), as well as structurally and typologically unrelated languages (Hungarian, Mongolian, Indonesian, Vietnamese). It allows him to identify interlinguistic phraseological equivalents (onwards IPE) of several types of combination:

- 1) IPE with a full correspondence of the whole units on lexical and grammatical levels;
- 2) IPE with the absence of a full correspondence units on a lexical level;
- 3) IPE absence of one correspondence of units on a grammatical level;
- 4) IPE of a contiguous type, in which there are differences both on lexical and grammatical levels.

In order to present all the types of relations between the phraseological components of different languages, Y.P. Solodoub gives a number of linguistic units which are referred to non-equivalent phraseology [2: 11-13]. From his point of view, they can be divided into two groups. The first group includes units, the main feature of which is that they are built as a unified phrase-formed model, which means the scheme of the semantic construction of a number of PU of the languages, the identity meanings of which are determined by the uniformity of the logical structure of their phraseological images. In addition, the compared linguistic units can be linked with distant figurative associations that do not destroy the unity of the common phrase formed model, for example: Russian "Old file / (old hand)" and Serbo-Croatian. "Proshao e and kroz sieve and sieve kroz" (literal "Passed through a sieve and a strainer"). The question follows whether there is a limit of generality of phrase formed model. In our opinion, the Chinese idiom 落井下石 literal "To send a stone after the fallen one into the well" and Russian "Beat the lying person", as given in the example by Y.P. Solodoub, can be attributed to a unified phrase building model.

UP, which do not correspond to the plan of expression, are referred to the second group by Y.P. Solodoub. It is caused by lexemes, indicating the specific realities of Russian way of living, for example, "we're not just out of the trees" ("we're capable of understanding things by ourselves"), "chatter box" ("a person who talks a lot but says nothing of substance"). Let's illustrate the PU containing the realities inherent in the Chinese language: 半斤八两 literal "half liang and eight jing" means "that in his forehead, that on his forehead" ("it's six of one and half a dozen of the other"), 白璧微瑕 literal "Dots on white Jasper" - "A fly in the ointment".

And finally, the author identifies the category of Russian and foreign phraseologisms associated with full (or partial) parallelism of the external structure with completely dissimilar semantics. These units are Russian "That one who has not experienced grief, he cannot imagine the difficulties"

and the Chinese 不吃黄连, 不知味苦 which means “Not having trying gold-thread one won’t know how bitter its taste”.

It should be noted that, despite the impressive scope of the material (16 languages), the author has failed to present the classification of PU, which would fully reflect the differences between them. Furthermore, the results need further checking, in those cases where Y.P. Solodoub speaks about the identity or distant similarity of the imagery, there is a sense of subjectivity of the given reasoning.

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

1) Equivalent phrase matching:

- Identical equivalents - PU, characterized by a high degree of formal, semantic and stylistic similarities (upper limit of equivalence, such as the Chinese phraseologism 禁果格外香 “forbidden fruit is sweet” and Russian “Forbidden fruit is sweet”; 口蜜腹剑 “honey on the lips, but a sword behind the back” and the Russian idiom “honey on the lips but ice in the heart”);

- Direct equivalents - formation, characterized by full and partial semantic and stylistic coincidence correlativity (mostly by parallelism) of purely lexical components and grammatical structure (average limit of equivalence, for example, 不三不四 literal “Not three or four” which means of “no this, not that”);

- Synonymous equivalents - PU with motivated logical-semantic base that which is correlative with logic, idiomatic ideas and stylistic characteristics (lower limit of equivalence, for example, 形影不离 literal “An object and its shadow are inseparable” - “to follow like a shadow one after another”, “one cannot be separated with water”);

2) Non-equivalent correspondence (interlinguistic phraseological homonyms are the units that have the same sound and complete or partial semantic similarity / similarities) [3: 22].

Although this research is intended to have gradational approach to correlating phraseologisms in foreign languages, the settings of equivalence do not reflect those of real differences, which can be seen between comparable units.

To summarize, we should emphasize that the cross-language relations of PU in this work are defined by the degree of relatable common meanings and the structure of the specific PU in the Russian and Chinese languages. Regarding the structural and semantic aspects, these relations are of three types: full equivalent, partial equivalents and non-equivalent units (PU-gaps). In the given languages complete phraseological equivalence, specifically, the coincidence of PU structurally and semantically which appears very rarely. Partial phraseological equivalence represents the most signifi-

cant part of the total constitution of phraseologisms, and implies the coincidence of semantics correlating phraseologisms of different structural organization. Structural difference usually causes a semantic difference of PU. Therefore, correlated idioms are often represented by phraseological counterparts having similar or close significatum. Non - equivalent PU in both languages constitute a less significant part, in another language they are transmitted by words, free phrases or descriptively. Most partial equivalents (phraseological analogues) and non-equivalent PU indicates the national identity of each of the phraseological systems in these two languages.

The proposed classification considers the Chinese and Russian idioms in an onomasiological aspect, specifically the difference between the two units are determined by differences in the choice of linguistic means of expression to refer to the same concept. To nominate pairs of phraseologisms having a similar meaning, we will use the term congruent to mean the content. We have to note that this term is actively used in phraseology today. For example, it is used in relation to both the expression and the content. Congruence is a coincidence of the capacity of values rendered by PU reinterpreted and literal prototype [4: 64]. The classification was based on the following features: community / difference of imagery, identity / non-identity structure, similarity / difference of lexical structure.

There can be distinguished the basic principles of matching the Russian and Chinese PU in terms of semantics. There are set "matching line" of PU to identify similarities and differences between them concerning the form, content, frequency of use, emotionally expressive component. In this work "matching line" is based on prototypes and the whole meaning of PU. It is the basis on which ultimately, identity / non-identity of structure are determined in the Russian and Chinese PU.

When comparing the most difficult parameter was the imagery, which means the ability to cause in our minds visual representations, vivid pictures. Judgments about the similarities / differences of imagery are subjective, largely due to the special status of this feature. Trope definitely adorns speech, but at the same time, it can complicate the understanding of the listener / reader that is for those representatives of another culture, as the same images may carry completely different information and have different emotional coloring. Sometimes, the same meaning can be expressed in two languages through different images. Obviously, for a representative of another culture the importance of that image in a different language may not be understandable, and, accordingly, he can not properly respond to it. For example, the Russian idiom "Porridge can not be spoilt with butter" is relevant to the Chinese phraseologism: 多多益善 literal "The more, the better" and 船多不碍港, 车多不碍路 literal "Many boats do not interfere in the port, a lot of cars do not interfere on the road".

These PU point to the fact that in China, no one can imagine that porridge needs to add butter: from the of the Chinese point of view, the word “porridge” in Chinese can be translated as 粥 zhōu or 米饭 mǐfàn, which actually are quite different things, 粥 zhōu - it's more gruel, but 米饭 mǐfàn is boiled rice. Neither zhōu, nor mǐfàn is not prepared with butter in China. So, it is clear that the Chinese will not be able to interpret this proverb properly. However, in the Chinese language there is no equivalent with the same meaning, but only with the other which is more understandable for the Chinese way of life.

In this paper, we aim to classify PU according to the method of correlating the internal form in the Chinese and Russian languages, based on a detailed examination of the given congruent forms, taking into account the structural and semantic aspects of phraseological units.

The research material are the idioms in the Chinese and Russian languages, observed as a result of partial selection from “Big phrasebook of chehnjuj of the Chinese Language” edited by Tang Shu; “Selected Chinese proverbs” edited by Zhong Ting; Phrasebook in 2 volumes “The Sea of sayings” by Wen Duanchzhen and their translation equivalents in the Russian language from the dictionaries of some Russian scientists: “Big phrasebook of the Russian language. Meaning, use. Culturological comment” edited by V.N. Telia; “Dictionary of the phraseology in Russian speech”, edited by A.M. Melerovich and V.M. Mokienko [5-9]. In the course of the study there were used by the Russian and Chinese translations lexicographical sources.

The amount of material analyzed is 566 PU in Chinese, and 507 UP in Russian. We have to explain that the number of Chinese idioms increased at the expense of phraseological synonyms.

Taking into account the considered classification by Y.P. Solodoub and E.M. Solodoukho, the following types of correspondences were identified:

- 1) full equivalence;
- 2) partial equivalence:
 - Coincidence the structure with the difference of lexical-semantic representation of units;
 - Coincidences in structure with the partial identity of the lexical-semantic units;
 - Coincidence of the structure in the presence of generic characteristics of generality of one of the elements;
 - Differences in the structural and lexical-semantic representation;
 - Differences in the structural representation with the identity of one of the components of phraseological unit;
 - Differences in the structure in the presence of common generic concept;
 - Partial coincidence in the structure and lexical-semantic representation of units;
- 3) non-equivalent (lacunarity).

Full equivalence characterized by lexical and structural identity, is presented in 3.35% (19 units) of all selected phraseologisms and represents the smallest group.

Partial equivalence is presented in 78.1% (442 units) of all the selected vocabulary.

Non-equivalent units constitute 18.55% (105 units) chosen from the whole body of the tested units.

The given classification allows at this stage of the work to make some preliminary conclusions. Percentage of partial equivalence of PU coincidences in inner form and imagery in the phraseologisms by comparable content in the Chinese and Russian languages is quite high. That indicates the similarity in the linguistic world image in a system-structural aspect.

The analysis of the actual material has showed that phraseological equivalents express the same concept, and has identical semantics. Depending on the differences in terms of expression, interlingual phraseological equivalence can be divided into the following types:

1) complete equivalence, that is PU, similar to the structure and lexical-semantic representation of the presence of full lexical-semantic relations and the nature of the images. This is a small group, but, nevertheless, it surely takes its place in languages, because transmits universal concepts, events, rules and facts. For example, Russian idiom “a tooth for a tooth” and the Chinese 以牙还牙 literal “a tooth for a tooth” expresses the same meaning “without any concessions to each other, quarrel, argument, wrangle, fight”. Furthermore, idioms, identical in meaning, do not differ either in structure or in semantics. Let’s illustrate the complete equivalence of some more examples:

趁热打铁 - “strike while the iron is hot”;

如鱼得水 - “like a fish in water”;

祸不单行 - “misfortune never comes alone”;

寡不敌众 - “one is not a warrior”;

火上加油 - “pour oil on the fire”.

In these examples, the figurative and non-direct meaning are the same in both languages, so translation of such phraseological units is not difficult. However, sometimes figurative meanings with the same figurative basis in the two languages may be different. For example, 炉火纯青 literal “Fire in the furnace acquired pure blue color”. Figurative meaning of this expression is “to achieve perfection, the highest point, the apogee”. In the Russian language the expression “Let it burn with blue flame” has a completely different meaning which is “damn it to hell”. So, the same image “blue flame” gives different figurative meanings.

It seems quite natural that the “same / similar basic metaphors forming body of stable combinations, idioms, sayings, found in most European lan-

guages" [10: 134]. Another thing is with the Chinese language, which has a much greater originality, not usually associated with European languages, either with a common origin or common cultural sources or essential layer of borrowings. It is well known that Chinese, because of the nature of its structure rejects all foreign borrowings, but if adopting, trying to make a foreign word as accessible as possible to understand. Therefore, the Chinese language has enough semantic borrowings, but little phonetic and lexical ones. Nevertheless, it is possible to detect both collocations with identical lexemes presented in the next couple of Chinese and Russian phraseological units having the same meaning and matching inner form, that is, they are equivalents "to pour over with cold water", "grab the straw", "raise the flag" and many others.

Next, let's consider the second type of interlinguistic phraseological equivalence - the partial equivalence, characterized by a partial identity of the expression of PU with identical semantics. Thus, expressing the concept of "number" the Russian idiom "can be counted on the fingers" which means "a little, little" correlates with a partial phraseological equivalence with Chinese PU 屈指可数 literal "Bend the fingers, it can be counted". These PU have a common structure, completely the same component and expresses the general meaning of "the ways of counting".

1) Coincidence of the structure with the difference of lexical-semantic representation of PU:

鹤立鸡群 literal "Crane among chickens" means "a giant among pygmies", "to be head and shoulders above all" (to be the tallest);

吹糖人 literal "Blow out sugar men" - "to twiddle" means "to do something that does not require a lot of effort";

水泄不通 literal "There is no way for water to leak" or "no room to fall";

朝秦暮楚 literal "Qin Principality in the morning, Chu Principality in the evening" or "One thing is in the morning, the other one is in the evening"; seven Fridays of the week;

泡蘑菇 literal "Soak the mushrooms" - "pull the gimp" to mean "to exercise a long process";

龙生龙子, 虎生虎子 literal "A dragon gives birth to a dragon and tiger to a tiger" or "the apple does not fall far from the apple-tree", "An eagle gives birth to an eagle, and an owl gives birth to an owl".

2) Coincidence in the structure with the partial identity of the lexical-semantic units:

好曲不能当饭吃 literal "Good song cannot feed" means "nightingale cannot be full of fables";

新瓶装旧酒 literal "Old wine in new bottles" - "an old song in a new way", "old as the world";

大海捞针 literal “Catch the needle that had fallen into the sea” - “looking for a needle in a haystack” (it is hard to find a tiny item in a large space);

雨后春笋 literal “Like a spring bamboo after rain” - “like mushrooms after the rain”;

吃过连苦, 方知蜜糖甜 literal “If one never tasted bitter pistachios, he will never know the sweetness of honey” - “if one does not taste bitter, he will never know sweet”.

Partial analogues here are showed in the fact that, firstly, there is a similarity of grammatical structure and semantic proximity of words in the lexical-semantic representation of PU; secondly, collocations identical in meaning have partial correlation of their inner form, but differ in the expression of a term. The same concept in different cultures causes various associations, which is quite normal. It is explained by different backgrounds of each unique nation.

3) An idiom, structurally identical, if there is a generality of a generic feature of one of the elements:

对牛弹琴 literal “Play the lute in front of buffalos” - “cast pearls in front of pigs” (to do something useless);

害群之马 literal “Horse, spoiling the whole herd” - “black sheep in the herd” (somebody who differs of the rest in a bad way);

安如泰山 literal “Immutable as the Tianshan Mountain” - “stand like a rock”;

破釜沉舟 literal “Break pots, sink the boats” - “burn the ships”;

留得青山在, 不怕没柴烧 literal “If there is the Qingshan Mountain, there is brushwood there” - “if there is a forest, there are woods there”.

For idiomatic analogues, which are based on the same concept, the complete identity of the other parameters is not necessary, there may be unsteadiness in the meaning between identity and difference. For example, the Russian idiom “from the heart” means “quite frankly; with complete frankness, directness”. Having the general concept of “sincerity” the relevant Chinese PU 全心全意 literal “With all my heart, with all my soul” is more expressive that generates stylistic differences: The Russian PU refers to a conversational style, and Chinese to the written one. The other semantic features are the same: An approving assessment, emotiveness and internal form.

4) The differences in the structural and lexical-semantic representation:

以毒攻毒 literal “Use the poison as an antidote” - “like cures like” (“fight fire with fire”);

小题大做 literal “Inflate the whole story of the little things” - “storm in a teacup” (“make a mountain out of molehills”);

摩肩接踵 literal “Rub shoulders and feet touching” - “no room to fall”;

莲开并蒂 literal “Lotus blossoms, two flowers on a stem” - “to live in perfect harmony”;

树倒湖散 literal “Tree fell - monkey fled” - “run like rats from a sinking ship”;

碰一鼻子灰 literal “Stick your nose in ash / calx” - “left holding the bag” / “Fiasco” (go flop);

呆若木鸡 literal “Numb like a wooden chicken” - “to stand by the graven image”, “stand there”;

班门弄斧 literal “Brag Lou Ban the skill to use an ax” or “eggs do not teach chicken”.

5) The differences in the structural representation with the identity of one of the components of a phraseological unit:

水中捞月 literal “Catch the moon in the water” - “carry water with a sieve”;

胆战心惊 literal “Gallbladder fights, heart flutters” - “heart stops from fear”, “tremble”, “Hough shaking”;

五内如焚 literal “The five internal organs (liver, heart, spleen, lungs, kidneys) as if on fire” - “soul burns”, “confusion in the soul”;

如坐针毡 literal “Feel like sitting on a bed, which sticks out of the needle” - “sit / be on pins and needles”, “be on the corner”;

三寸不烂之舌 literal “Good tongue of three inches long” - “sleight of mouth”, “the gift of eloquence”.

6) Differences in the structure with the common generic concept:

瓜熟蒂落 literal “When the pumpkin is ripe, stalk disappears” - “everything is good in its season”;

剑拔弩张 literal “Unsheathe the sword, push the string” - “saber-rattle”;

坂上走丸 literal “Like a ball rolling downhill” - “snowballing”;

脚底抹油 literal “Smear foot” - “to rush”; “Only heel glitter”;

棺材瓢子 literal “Filling for a coffin” - “one foot in the grave”.

7) Partial coincidence in the structure and lexical-semantic representation of units:

星星之火可以燎原 literal “The spark will kindle a flame” - “spark can ignite the steppe”;

老马识途 literal “Old horse knows the way” - “old horse does not ruin furrow”;

明哲保身 literal “A wise person protects himself” - “better safe than sorry”.

We have also to emphasize that the Chinese and Russian PU can have a different internal form and discrepancy in a component compound, but at the same time, are related to the type of semantic analogues and occur rather regularly. For example, 鸟头白 literal “When the crows turns white” - “when the cancer whistles” “means, the action is impossible for the subject

to do”; 三七二十一 literal “Three by seven is twenty one” or “two by two is four” means “common knowledge, simple arithmetic”; The Russian idiom “to sink into the water”, “to be missing” and the Chinese 杳如黄鹤 literal “Disappear without a trace like the Yellow Crane”; 玉石俱焚 literal “And jasper, and rock - all put into the bonfire”, comparable to the Russian idiom “punish guilty and innocent”. In the examples above, it is obvious that the internal form when compared PU in different languages take a very important place.

Among those factors leading to partial equivalence in lexical semantics of two different languages, the formal-structural characteristics of the language is a static sign, and the sources of new nomination and comparative efficiency of different means of vocabulary is the dynamic attribute.

While linking interlinguistic multivalued PU in Russian and Chinese it is necessary to find out if contrasted idioms are equivalent in all phrase-semantic variants or one of them. The analysis showed that, in determining the nature of equivalent connection of polysemantic PU should not proceed from the PU as a whole but each of its phrase-semantic variant. Their correspondence is usually a partial equivalence, or at all goes into the category of phraseological equivalents. For example, with different structures the Russian PU “the tongue does not turn” and the Chinese PU 难以启齿 literal “It is hard to open teeth” express the same concept of “ask, tell”, and also the exact same meanings: 1) one does not dare to ask, say anything for fear of offending or hurt someone; 2) someone does not dare to ask, say anything cause of embarrassment, confusion, and the like. They have different structural and grammatical organization when the semantic is identical, so they refer to the partial equivalents. The Russian PU “not to keep an eye on someone / something” means “to stare at anyone closely, carefully; watch closely, observe someone / something” corresponds the Chinese idiom 目不转睛 literal “eyeballs don’t move in the eyes”, which means “to stare at someone closely, carefully”. In the Chinese language the idiom which is similar to “to watch something closely, to observe someone / something” is hard to find a free expression phrase 密切注视 literal “to watch closely”. Obviously, due to incomplete coincidence of the semantics they are considered to be phraseological analogues by one of the meanings.

Together with phraseological equivalents and analogues, when comparing PU in the Russian and Chinese languages scientists also distinguish lacunar (gap) / non-equivalent units. It should be made clear that in this work these terms will be used as synonyms. Gaps and non-equivalent units are allocated only in the comparison of specific languages. The concepts of interlinguistic gap and a non-equivalent unit are correlative: the first stand out against the latest and mutually imply each other. It should be noted that in the process of contrastive analysis the native language and a foreign lan-

guage are compared. In this case, the gaps can be identified only in a foreign language as a mother tongue analyses only units recorded in dictionaries which, in case of the lack of compliance in a foreign language are classified as non-equivalent. Thus, non-equivalent PU, unique to this proper language system, not in another, caused by specificity of national characteristics. Universality and originality of national characteristics provide adequate comparison of investigated PU in Russian and Chinese on their formal and semantic structure. The analysis of representations of the same notions in Russian and Chinese reveal their national identity of the idioms. National identity of phraseology can be viewed in the structural-grammatical, lexical, stylistic, phonetic and semantic properties. But most clearly and fully cultural identity is observed in the semantic organization of Russian and Chinese phraseology, in their figurative structure. All of this is explained by the fact that Russian and Chinese cultures have totally different philosophical origins and cognitive bases of formation, and that is the result of their significant difference. So, the phrase image, as one of the components of the content of PU, is a main “keeper” of the national specificity of a phraseological unit [11: 15].

Talking about Chinese non-equivalents, it should be explained that most of them are based on myths. In China, there are still beliefs in traditional calendars, horoscopes; this phenomenon is reflected in phraseology. Speaking of Russian non-equivalent PU, we note that they were mostly taken from the Bible, Greek mythology, Russian history and folklore. For example, PU “An egg is valuable to the day of Christ” (“Fast enough, well enough”) means “valuable is what you get or is done for you in the right time you need it”. In the Chinese linguistic picture of the world, this concept is absent and, as a rule, the translation is represented by phrases and detailed descriptions specifying the national and cultural connotations.

It must be emphasized that the theory contributes to identify gaps mechanisms of culture. Very often it turns out that the concepts expressed by lacunae in Chinese in Russian, are implicit to the native speakers of the Russian language and culture and, therefore, in most cases, intercultural communication remains unclear [12: 28-33].

Here are some examples of the unique PU, reflecting the same situation, but each language having its own national-specific properties. For instance, the concept of “a time that never comes” is encoded in the Chinese language as follows: 猴年马月 “in the year of the monkey and the month of the horse”, Russian analogue of phraseologism “when the cancer on the mountain whistles”, which is used to express the impossibility of any action. (It is understood that cancer is on the mountain can not whistle, but why cancer, and why on the Mountain? This, without etymology knowledge, it is difficult to find a clear answer). The Russian idiom “to Morkovkina Shrove-tide” means “till the end of time” or “until hell freezes over” compared with a fictional Chinese 马月 “month of a horse”, which is not present in one of

the calendars in any of the world's horoscopes. In this case, not the total meaning gapped of phraseologism, but its individual components. Let's illustrate lacunarity by some more examples: 凤毛麟角 literal "Phoenix feathers, Tsilina horn" is a rare talent, unique; 龙飞凤舞 literal "Flying dragon, phoenix dance" means "majestic power; sprawling, flying handwriting in calligraphy"; 珠宝 松茂 literal "Bamboo is lush, pine is bushy" means "The wish of prosperity and peace to a family".

Thus, on the one hand, and the lacunarity and non-equivalents are treated as synonyms, when it comes to the same linguistic sphere, for example, in relation to not represented in one of the compared languages phraseologisms in this meaning, we can say that it is non-equivalent formed here in phraseological lacuna. However, on the other hand, in relation to different aspects of language one should distinguish between these terms, because the lack of semantically identical phraseologism in one of the languages can be compensated through the expression of this concept by means of congruent to the content of words, phrases and sentences.

All this suggests that the prevalence in the study of phrasemica of phraseological analogues and non-equivalent units of equivalent phraseology indicates the national identity of each of the phraseological systems of compared languages. There is the fact that in the representation of a particular notion of similarity is greater than in the media representation of the same concept by linguistic means. In the Russian and Chinese languages we can observe different ways of representing the same concept. Thus, the majority of PU of compared languages express the same concepts, but complete phraseological equivalence is rarely found in their comparison.

The given classification of types of interlinguistic phraseological relations is mostly based on both the system and PU anthropocentric characteristics. Partially equivalent type of phraseologism deserves special attention because it has a dominant position in comparison with other types, but in terms of the correlation of the language and culture, together with the non-equivalent units demonstrate not only the characteristic features of language systems taken into consideration, but also reflect the cultural identity, fixed in the language.

References

1. TROFIMOVA, E.B., 2008. *Alternative linguistics*. Bijsk: Publishing house BPGU University named after V.M. Shukshin, 76 p.
2. SOLODOUB, Y.P., 1985. *The Russian phraseology as the object of comparative structural-typological studies (based on the phraseological units with the meaning of a personality's qualitative assessment)*. Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical Institute named after V.I. Lenin, 112 p.
3. SOLODUKHO, E.M., 1989. *Theory of idiomatic approach (on the material of the Slavic languages, German and Roman language families)*. Kazan: Kazan University Press, 294 p.

4. GRYANKINA, E.S., 2004. *Semantics of phraseological units in the minds of the native speakers of the Russian language (based on Russian and English phraseology in literal translation)*: Dissertation of the Candidate of philology. Barnaul, 216 p.
5. 2001. *Large phrasebook chehnjui Chinese language*. Tang Shu, ed. Beijing, 1514 p.
6. ZHOUNG Ting, 2001. *Selected Chinese proverbs and sayings*. Urumchi, 373 p.
7. 2004. *Complete collection of Chinese proverbs and sayings "Sea of utterances"* in 2 volumes. Wen Duanchzhen, ed. Shanghai, 2386 p.
8. 2006. *Big phrasebook of the Russian language. Meaning. Usage. Culturological comment*. V.N. Telia, ed. Moscow: AST-PRESS BOOK, 784 p.
9. MELEROVICH, A.M. and MOKIENKO, V.M., 1997. *Idioms in the Russian language*. Moscow: Russian dictionaries, 864 p.
10. BRAGINA, N.G., 1999. Fragment of lingua-cultural vocabulary (basic concepts). *Phraseology in the context of culture*. Moscow: Languages of the Russian Culture, pp. 131-137.
11. SOLODOUB, Y.P., 1996. The role of verbal complex of prototype in implementation of connotative possibilities of phraseologism. *Philological studies*, 1, pp. 11-17.
12. GLAZACHEVA, N.L., 2003. Once again of the typology of interlinguistic gaps (in the Chinese and Russian languages). *Lacunae in language and speech. Proceedings*. Blagoveshchensk, pp. 28-33.