

УДК 413.19
ББК 81.2 Р-4

**В.Ю. Меликян,
А.В. Меликян
V.Y. Melikyan,
A.V. Melikyan**

**FIXED PHRASE SCHEMES
WITH THE COMPULSORY
COMPONENT WH-WORD
IN THE ENGLISH, RUSSIAN
AND SPANISH LANGUAGES**

Статья посвящена описанию фразеосинтаксических схем с опорным компонентом, выраженным вопросительным словом, в трех разносистемных языках: английском, русском и испанском. Фразеосхемы описаны в структурном, семантическом, этимологическом, парадигматическом, синтагматическом, фразеологическом, экспрессивном, стилистическом и сопоставительном аспектах.

Ключевые слова: синтаксическая фразеология, фразеосинтаксическая схема, воспроизводимость, структурно-семантическая устойчивость и целостность, идиоматичность, экспрессивность.

DOI: 10.18522/1995-0640-2015-4-132-139

Меликян Вадим Юрьевич – докт. филол. наук, профессор, зав. кафедрой теории языка и русского языка Института филологии, журналистики и межкультурной коммуникации Южного федерального университета
Тел.: (8-863) 2-444-067; 8-928-125-22-60.
E-mail: MelikyanV@mail.ru

Меликян Анна Васильевна – канд. филол. наук, доцент кафедры межкультурной коммуникации и методики преподавания иностранных языков Института филологии, журналистики и межкультурной коммуникации Южного федерального университета
Тел.: (8-863) 2-444-067; 8-928-901-45-70.
E-mail: Melikyan.anna@mail.ru

© Меликян В.Ю.,
Меликян А.В., 2015.

Phraseological units are important resources of any language. In the judgement of V.N. Teliya, phraseology is an actual object in the investigation of the correlation of «a human being – a language», because here: «the knowledge about both human, naïve picture of the world, all the types of subject attitude toward its fragments and about a programmed circulation of these language essences as well as their use in intergenerational standards and stereotypes transmission of the national culture is conceptualized» [Teliya, p. 9].

In this aspect, phraseological sentences are characterized by particular significance, and due to the high degree of standardization and stereotyping they become vivid examples of the lingvocreative thinking of the personality that tends to provide the high communication level. Besides, «phraseologisms are frequently used in the colloquial form of communication where the importance of the human factor increases greatly» [Zemskaya, p. 223]. The domination of the stereotyped units in speech, especially phraseological ones, depends on the social preferences, based on the social stereotype that they are a «certain invariant of behavior, invariant of activity, colloquial in particular» [Krasnih, p. 266].

The stereotype is characterized by frequency and stability, the categorical qualities of phraseological units. Thus, as the demonstration of standard and stereotype in the social and linguistic aspects, phraseologisms play an important role both in communication and functioning of society: «To function

as a whole, as a complex social system, the community must state such bounds of the individual conduct in which this conduct becomes equal, stable, repeated» [Levkovich, p. 212].

The phraseological unit research is not equal in different scientific traditions. The phraseology research was mostly developed in Russian linguistics where its results were arranged as a separate part of language theory. It was Russian linguistics that kept stating the idea about separate investigation of syntactic phraseological units during the first part of the twentieth century. The phraseology development at the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first proved the accuracy and actuality of this tendency. During recent decades, the syntactic phraseology theory has become a separate scientific discipline and a separate, additional subsystem; thereby, the arguments about its place in the language system were concluded [Melikyan V., 2010, 2014, 2015].

Fixed phrase schemes are one of the most specific classes of syntactic phraseologisms. They unify the features of different subsystems and levels of the language, contain the qualities of syntax and phraseology units and are characterized as the units of colloquial form of dialogue speech that possess economy, expressiveness, anthropocentricity and pragmatics. This syncretism contributes to their expressiveness, effectiveness and actuality in speech communication practice. Their thorough and versatile investigation gives a following research impulse for the separate aspects of phraseology, syntax, morphology, lexicology, stylistics, dialogue speech, comparative language theory and other linguistic branches.

Fixed phrase schemes with the compulsory component are expressed by a WH-word function in the contemporary languages of different systems, particularly English, Russian and Spanish. They are a separate syntactic phraseologism group of this kind. The English fixed phrase schemes with the compulsory component expressed by WH-words include ten units. In general, they are characterized by the common phraseological categorical features that can be found in such kinds of units in different languages, but they also have some peculiarities.

As a result of the analysis, it was fixed that fixed phrase schemes of this group have eight simple and two compound compulsory components: *how* (two fixed phrase schemes), *how many [much]*, *what* (two fixed phrase schemes), *what for*, *when*, *who*, *where*, *why*. For example: – **How** quick the snow gets thick on the ground. (G.K. Chesterton, *The Innocence of Father Brown*); – **How many** hours, months, years, have I spent worrying about weight while Perpetua has been happily looking for lamps with porcelain cats as bases around the Fulham Road? (H. Fielding, *Bridget Jones's Diary*).

This amount of compound compulsory components corresponds to 20 %, and this fact makes the English fixed phrase schemes with WH-words quite different from those of Russian and Spanish. In these languages they account for approximately 40 %.

Ten Russian fixed phrase schemes contain simple compulsory components: *какой* (two fixed phrase schemes, with interrogative and universal pronouns),

что (interrogative pronoun) and seven interrogative adverbs – где, зачем, как, куда, откуда, почему, почем; six fixed phrase schemes have compound compulsory components expressed by the combination of the interrogative pronoun and other lexemes: что за, что бы, чем не, до чего, один ... чего стоит [Melikyan V., 2011, 2013]. For example: – Что ж, тебе скучно здесь? – спросил Пьер. – **Как** не скучно, соколик. (Л. Толстой, Война и мир); – **Что за** сапожки, просто чудо! Так бы взял да примерил. (В. Шукшин, Сапожки).

Six Spanish fixed phrase schemes contain simple compulsory components (*qué, cómo, quién, dónde, cuándo, cuánto [cuán]*), and four of them contain compound ones (*por [de, para, a, en, con] qué; que de; no [y] qué [sino] no; que ... ni que*) [Melikyan A., 2007]. For example: *Los vecinos, que ocupaban sus balcones, miraban también. Y cotilleaban ... Se hacían lenguas de la sordidez de los Bigaro supervivientes: – ¡Qué miserables! – decía una señora en bata. ¡Un entierro de tercera y sólo veinte pobres! ... (R. Azcona, Los muertos no se tocan, nene...); Ayer almorzamos con él, mi prima y yo. ¡Qué de carantoñas nos hizo prodigando por igual sus afectos a ella y a mí! (B. Pérez Galdós, La incognita).*

Such diversified tendencies of fixed phrase scheme development are evidence of the fact that in this case the specific character of the language system itself is not always the dominating factor. For an analytical language like Spanish, a rather large amount of the compound compulsory components is quite explicable, while for such an inflexional language like Russian this fact cannot take place because of its specificity. On the other hand, the question about the reasons for unproductiveness of the compound compulsory components in the analytical English language appears.

In this case the index connected with the amount of fixed phrase schemes of this group in different languages turns out to be more logical – there are ten of them in English and Spanish, and sixteen of them in Russian. A conclusion can therefore be made – the specific character of a compulsory component is very important for forming fixed phrase scheme content in general, although this factor is not exceptional and all-embracing.

The compulsory changeable component in all analyzed languages has rather flexible characteristics of lexico-grammatical content and morphological use, and can be expressed by all content parts of speech. Its lexico-grammatical paradigm can be diverse: both zero (defective) and unlimited (full). The morphological paradigm is characterized by the same peculiarity. As a rule, lexical variation is unlimited.

The etymologies of these fixed phrase schemes are similar, and they are mostly derivative and formed on the basis of an interrogative sentence (special question). For example: 1) – *Play Quidditch at all? – No, – Harry said again, wondering what on earth Quidditch could be. (J. K. Rowling, Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone); – The Mole waggled his toes from sheer happiness, spread his chest with a sigh of full contentment, and leaned back blissfully into the soft cushions. – What a day I'm having! – he said. (K. Grahame, The Wind in the Willows; 2) – Какой у него талант? – Он хорошо рисует. /Из разг. речи/; → – Может быть, у него в самом деле есть*

талант. – Какой тут талант! Что это такое! – воскликнул уже с досадою Калинович. (А. Писемский, Тысяча душ); 3) – ¿Cómo no te voy a acordar sobre este accidente horrible? – Es necesario hacer algo, distraerse. → – ¿Te acordás del renco Ramírez? – ¿Cómo no te voy a acordar si me dejé por dentro! – le contestó Leví del mal humor! (C. L. Fallas, Mamita Yunai). There are only two exceptions: one non-deviative Spanish fixed phrase scheme and one Russian fixed phrase scheme deviated by a simple declarative sentence.

The specific character of the compulsory component underlying form contributes to its highly limited paradigmatic possibilities – only 10 % of compulsory components in English fixed phrase schemes have any paradigmatic characteristics (*how many – how much*), and in Spanish there are none. The synthetic character of the Russian language determines a higher percentage in this aspect at 25 % (*один ... чего стоит* (lexically permeable); *зачем [для чего, к чему, куда, на кой [какой] чёрт [бес, дьявол, шут, леший, пес, ляд, хрен, прах], на какого чёрта [беса, ...], за каким чертом [бесом, ...], на фиг(-а) [хрен(-а), чёрта, черта], ...]; почему [отчего, с чего, с какой стати, что, чего, зачем, для чего, когда]; почём [почему]*). Например: – *По крайней мере, я не обманываю; ведь не могу же я, при таком количестве дел, заниматься любовью серьёзно: зачем же я буду притворяться влюблённым, вводить в заблуждение! То ли дело договор!* (А. Островский, *Таланты и поклонники*); Ср.: – **На кой прах** людям ум перед гибелью-то? Пропадать и без всякого ума можно. (А. Чехов, *Сви-рель*); Ср.: – *Ух, говорит, и крепка же будет, мертвому глаза продерет. А на кой ляд мне эта крепость, с похмелья я что ли.* (И. Бунин, *В саду*); Ср.: [Достигаев:] – **На кой пес** роаль, если на ней никто не играет? (М. Горький, *Достигаев и другие*).

The compulsory changeable component is characterized by the broad paradigmatic possibilities in English and Russian, and as for the Spanish seven out of ten fixed phrase schemes do not have a lexico-grammatical and morphological paradigm, for example: 1) «**¿Qué de + N1!**»: – *Ayer almorzamos con él, mi plima y yo. ¿Qué de carantoñas nos hizo prodigando por igual sus afectos a ella y a mí!* (B. Pérez Galdós, *La incognita*); 2) «**¿Ni [y, pero, oh, eh, ay, uf, vamos, vaya] Qué + N1 [Adj, V finit, subj, Adv]!**»: *Trabajó toda la mañana, absorto, sin pensar en nada, sin darse cuenta de que a las diez arreció la lluvia y alguien pasó frente al taller gritando que cerraran las puertas para que no se inundara la casa, y sin darse cuenta ni siquiera de sí mismo hasta que Úrsula entró con el almuerzo y apagó la luz. – ¿Qué lluvia! – dijo Úrsula. – Octubre – dijo el.* (G. G. Márquez, *Cien años de soledad*); Ср.: *Una vez Aureliano Segundo se impacientó tanto con el sofocante aleteo, que ella sintió el impulso de confiarle su secreto, como se lo había prometido, pero el instinto le indicó que esta vez él no iba a reír como de costumbre! – Qué diría tu madre si lo supiera.* (G. G. Márquel, *Cien años de soledad*).

The order of compulsory unchangeable and changeable components in the fixed phrase scheme structure in English and Spanish is inconvertible, while in Russian it can be changed in five out of sixteen fixed phrase schemes. For example: 1) «**Что + <это(-от, -а, -и) [Pron1,**

N1] > + за + N1(?)!»: – *И что это за герои пошли! Ни устава не хотят признавать, ни дисциплины, об военной службе и понятия не имеют, действуют как детишки на ярмарке...* (М. Шолохов, *Они сражались за Родину*); 2) «<**Ох [ух, ай, ой, эх, и-и]**> **Какой(-ая, -ое, -ие)1 [экий(-ая, -ое, -ие, -а, -о, -ой)1** (разг.), **эк(-а, -о, -и)1** (прост.), **каков(-ова, -ово, -овы)1]** + **N1 [Adj1, Pron1]!»:** – *Ах, ах! – огорчился викарий. – Какое несчастье, поистине несчастье! Помрачение рассудка, вы говорите, и нет надежды, что поправится? Боже мой, боже мой...* (А. Конан Дойль, *Затерянный мир*); Ср.: «<**Ох [ух, ай, ой, эх, и-и]**> **N1 [Adj1, Pron1] + какой(-ая, -ое, -ие)1]!»:** – *Перевезите меня, Николай Семёнович! – послышалось с того берега. – Николай молча спустился к лодке. – До чего хорошо! Красота какая.* (М. Шолохов, *Они сражались за Родину*). It proves a certain rule that for analytical languages the word-order in syntactic constructions is more significant and has more functional value. Therefore, they have fewer means of secondary phraseological explication status of such utterances that lead to the strict structural elements order.

On the one hand, these three languages fixed phrase schemes are semantically specific; on the other hand, they are similar. Thus, an English fixed phrase scheme represents, on average, 2.9 meanings, Spanish 2.4, and Russian 2.1. In English and Spanish negative meanings (negation, negative evaluation, non-intensivity) account for approximately half of all meanings, and in Russian less than half of them (14 out of 34). Thereby, the Russian mentality represented by fixed phrase schemes at the language system level turns out to be more positively loaded. However, in all three languages negative meanings prevail and that corresponds to the common tendency of language units' realization not only in the phraseology sphere. Besides, polysemantic fixed phrase schemes dominate in all languages: in English 100 %, in Russian 75 %, and in Spanish 70 %. This testifies to the highly dynamic process of phraseology that leads to the diversity of the meanings system of the initial motivating sentence. The specific character of the compulsory component's underlying form also contributes to it, because it is a non-content lexeme characterized by a rather high degree of meaning generalization, and through peculiarities of the interrogative meaning uncertainty predisposes such semantic and functional transformations.

The fixed phrase schemes of these three languages mostly have equal syntagmatic opportunities of dissemination and combination with other utterances in the text, especially emotionally-coloured syntactic phraseologisms of different classes. For example: – *How stupid you are! Why didn't you tell him! – Well, why didn't you say?* (К. Грэхем, *The Wind in the Willows*); – *Так ты не поедешь? – сердито спрашивал Чечевичкин. – Говори: не поедешь? – Господи! – тихо плакал Володя. – Как же я поеду? Мне маму жалко.* (А. Чехов, *Мальчики*); – *No se caliente la cabeza, señor.. – ¡Dios mío! ¡qué bien te sienta el estado de viuda! ¡Y riquísima que me han*

dicho que eres!... Ocho años de destierro te ha costado, pero en fin, si estuviste como el ratón en el queso, ¡anda con Dios! (F. Caballero, Clemencia).

Many fixed phrase schemes become intermediate in formatting new phraseological units with a higher level of phraseologization – the comunicemas. Thus, on the basis of the fixed phrase scheme «**What + N₁!**» the following comunicemas were created: **What a lark!**, **What a dreadful thing!**, **What the fun!**, **What the mischief!**, **What the something-something!**, **What's the big idea!** etc. For example: – *Ah! They'll come in the afternoon. You'll find, – we said to each other. – Oh, won't those people get wet. What a lark!* (J. K. Jerome, *Three Men in a Boat*).

The fixed phrase schemes with the compulsory component expressed by WH-word have such features as reproductibility, stability, structural and semantic integrity, idiomaticity, expressiveness, and colloquial stylistic marking. These qualities are equal for all fixed phrase schemes of all languages, but they are developed differently. The peculiarities of their underlying form conditioned the common number of idiomatic features that appear in the following: non-deductive phraseosyntactic meaning, modus proposition content, functional and expressive senses and stylemes.

Thus, the fixed phrase scheme «**How + Adj [Adv] + Pron₁ [N₁] + to be [V finit]!**» has all the characteristics which units of phraseological subsystems possess. Its reproductibility lies in that it is used by the speakers «off the shelf». The plan of expression and the plan of content are unchanged and they presuppose each other. The stability of the analysed fixed phrase scheme is explained by a certain number of compulsory components (unchangeable and changeable), the impossibility of inverted word-order and limitation of paradigmatic qualities. The semantic integrity is conditioned by the common phraseosyntactic meaning of the syntactic model that has a syntactic character. This aspect of meaning presupposes the presence of such content elements as emotiveness, positive or negative evaluation, intenseme, colloquial styleme and expressiveness. The phraseosyntactic meaning is explicated by the whole syntactic model and strengthens the integrity of both the plan of expression and the plan of content. As well as this, the structural integrity is determined by the impossibility of the compulsory unchangeable component omission and variational structural limits of optional elements.

One of the most important aspects for the phraseological status determination is idiomaticity, which touches different peculiarities of these unit's creation and is the reason why it has a different development. In general, it is connected with the skewness of the plan of expression and the plan of content of a fixed phrase scheme. The described fixed phrase scheme has the following non-deductive features: the phraseosyntactic meaning of positive or negative evaluation and a high degree of developing the subject that is not explicated by its lexeme stuff. For example: – *If your father had not died when he did. Don't be frightened! How you start! – She did, indeed, start.* (Ch. Dickens, *The Tale of Two Cities*). This fixed phrase scheme has the following meaning: «You started very much...». The component «very much» is not reflected in the formal fixed phrase scheme structure. The idiomaticity

is in the modus proposition content connected with the speaker's attitude toward the speech subject of «surprise, perplexity, anxiety, etc.» that has no formal representation in the syntactic construction. The functional skewness of the form and the content also conditions the miscoordination of the interrogative model of the sentence and its exclamatory communicative sense. The sense of the colloquial stylistic marking that is not developed in the plan of expression is idiomatic in itself, because its productive interrogative sentence has neutral stylistic colouring.

In general, English, Russian and Spanish fixed phrase schemes are characterized by a number of integral and differential features of language structure and speech functioning which help to view them as linguistic universals. Their comparative analysis on the basis of different languages contributes to forming the integral and more precise knowledge of this syntactic phraseologism class. In this connection, the fixed phrase scheme research on the basis of other groups languages becomes rather important and actual because it will let us formulate the main rules of syntactic phraseology applicable to any language.

Works Cited

Krasnih V.V. Stereotypes: necessary reality or imaginary necessity // Materials of IX congress MAPRYL. Reports and thesis of Russian researchers. Bratislava; Moscow, 1999.

Levkovich V.P. Custom and ritual as a way of social regulation of behavior // Psychological problems of social regulation of behavior. Moskva, 1976.

Melikyan A.V. The system and functional aspects of interpretation of fixed phrase schemes with the compulsory element expressed by the interrogative word (on basis of The Spanish language): author's abstract of scientific paper. Rostov-on-Don, 2007.

Melikyan V.Y. Syntactic phraseological units in the Russian language // The Russian language at school. 2010. № 11.

Melikyan V.Y. Lingvocreative language function as the manifestation of universe fundamental laws (on basis of Russian fixed phrase schemes) // Philology issues. 2011. № 2.

Melikyan V.Y. Fixed phrase schemes with the compulsory element expressed by the interrogative adverb // The Russian language at school. 2013. № 5.

Melikyan V.Y. The contemporary Russian language. Syntactic phraseology. Tutorial for students. M.: Flinta: Science, 2014.

Melikyan V.Y. Fixed phrase schemes with the compulsory element expressed by conjunction: language and speech // The Russian language at school. 2015. № 3.

Teliya V.N. Connotative aspect of nominative units semantics. Moscow, 1986.

Zemskaya E.A. (ed.) Russian colloquial speech / Editor-in-chief Zemskaya E.A. Moscow, 1973.

Melikyan V.J., Melikyan A.V. (Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation)

Fixed phrase schemes with the compulsory component wh-word in the English, Russian and Spanish languages

The paper is dedicated to the description of fixed phrase schemes (phraseosyntactic schemes, phrase schemes) with the compulsory component

expressed by the interrogative word in three languages of different systems: English, Russian, Spanish. Fixed phrase schemes are described in structural, semantic, etymological, paradigmatic, syntagmatic, phraseological, expressive, stylistic and comparative aspects.

Key words: *Syntactic phraseology, fixed phrase schemes (phraseosyntactic schemes, phraseoschemes), reproductibility, structural and semantic stability and integrity, idiomaticity, expressiveness.*

Melikyan Vadim Jurievich – Ph.D. of philology, professor, head of theory of language and the Russian language dpt. Institute of philology, journalism and cross-cultural communication. Southern Federal University. Ph.: (8-863) 2-444-067; 8-928-125-22-60; e-mail: MelikyanV@mail.ru

Melikyan Anna Vasilievna – candidate of philology, professor assistant. Institute of philology, journalism and cross-cultural communication. Southern Federal University. Ph.: (8-863) 2-444-067; 8-928-901-45-70; e-mail: Melikyan.anna@mail.ru