

**PRINCIPLES OF ARRANGING PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN THE ENTRIES OF
RUSSIAN–TURKIC DICTIONARIES**

Mavlonova Nargiza Alisherovna
Acting Associate Professor (PhD)
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
e-mail: mavlonovanargiza@mail.ru

Abstract

This article presents the principles of arranging phraseological units in the entries of Russian–Turkic dictionaries, illustrated by relevant examples.

Keywords: Phraseological unit, head (key) component, alphabetical arrangement, phraseological dictionary, Russian–Turkic lexicography, phraseography.

Introduction

The issue of arranging phraseological units (PUs) in dictionaries is of considerable importance. This complex problem has long been and remains controversial. Its solution is of great practical significance, as the rational placement of phraseological units contributes to the most economical presentation of phraseological material and facilitates dictionary use.

Modern phraseography has developed various methods of arranging phraseological units. Let us consider the most common ones.

1. Arrangement of Phraseological Units under the Head (Key) Word (Nest-Based Method).

The arrangement of phraseological units under a head or key word (the nest-based method) is the most widespread in phraseography; however, it is rarely used in Russian–Turkic lexicography. According to this principle, each phraseological unit is assumed to have a semantic or conceptual center, that is, one component of the unit carries the main semantic load.

The Russian–Uzbek Phraseological Dictionary is compiled according to the nest-based method. Its essence lies in the fact that so-called head words are arranged in alphabetical order, and all phraseological units containing a given component are listed under each head word. For example, under the entry *volos* ('hair'), the following phraseological units are presented: to hang by a hair, not to touch a hair, one's hair stood on end, not by a hair, to blush to the roots of one's hair, to tear one's hair out, a head of hair.

At the same time, this approach necessitates repeating a phraseological unit as many times as there are components in its structure; however, this principle is not consistently applied in the dictionary mentioned above. The choice of the head component is made by the compiler arbitrarily.

As lexicographic practice shows, the identification of the semantic center of a phraseological unit is carried out differently by different compilers and is therefore highly subjective. Many scholars (A. M.

Babkin, A. I. Molotkov, S. K. Kenesbayev, among others) have opposed this method of arranging phraseological units.

A completely different view on the possibility of arranging phraseological units by the disputable head component was held by S. I. Ozhegov, who stated that “first of all, one should abandon the nihilistic idea that the head word of a phraseological unit cannot be determined, that a principled solution to this issue is unattainable, and that the ideal would be to place each phraseological unit in the dictionary as many times as there are individual words in its structure” [4]. Ozhegov defined the head word as the meaning-forming component of a phraseological unit, that is, the component that ‘phraseologizes’ a free word combination. Nevertheless, he also concluded that no single universal criterion can be proposed for identifying the head component.

The identification of the head component has not been a subject of discussion in Turkic phraseology, and no special studies on this problem exist. Therefore, we consider this method of arranging phraseological units to be unacceptable for Russian–Turkic phraseological dictionaries.

2. Arrangement of Phraseological Units by the Structurally Organizing Component

Along with the nest-based method, phraseographic practice widely employs the arrangement of phraseological units by the structurally organizing component. In Russian–Turkic phraseography, this principle was used by the compilers of the Russian–Kyrgyz Phraseological Dictionary.

The essence of this principle lies in the fact that each phraseological unit is entered in the dictionary as many times as there are components in its structure, including all lexical and aspectual variants. For example, the phraseological unit rukoy podat’ (‘a stone’s throw away’) is entered under both components rukoy (‘by hand’) and podat’ (‘to give’). The main dictionary entry is provided under the component rukoy, as it is considered the structurally organizing component. Under the component podat’, a cross-reference is given: Podat’. Rukoy podat’ see rukoy.

However, determining such a component is quite difficult for non-specialists. Although the system of cross-references helps the reader, searching for a phraseological unit in this case becomes multi-stage and, consequently, not very convenient. This is especially true given that the authors of the Russian–Kyrgyz Phraseological Dictionary primarily intended it for students of grades 4–8 in national schools who are not well versed in theoretical linguistic issues.

3. Arrangement of Phraseological Units by the Grammatical Center

The method of arranging phraseological units by the grammatical center is applied in phraseographic practice and is recognized as the most objective and expedient [3]. However, this principle is not used in Russian–Turkic phraseological dictionaries.

4. Alphabetical Arrangement of Phraseological Units by the First Component

The alphabetical arrangement of phraseological units by the first component is considered by many researchers to be the most expedient, as it eliminates a subjective approach to choosing the word under which a phraseological unit is placed. A. M. Babkin believes that “the grouping of phraseological units based on a common ‘semantic center’ or conditionally selected ‘key words’ is justified in those dictionaries that do not aim to provide a thorough and comprehensive characterization of each phraseological unit individually” [1]. S. K. Kenesbayev [2] also prefers alphabetical arrangement to all

other methods, since “thematic,” “conceptual,” and other groupings do not facilitate but rather hinder the search for the required phraseological unit in the dictionary. B. G. Tairbekov [6] points out that arranging phraseological units alphabetically makes dictionary use more convenient but at the same time complicates the consideration of lexical and grammatical variants.

Despite the fact that many scholars recommend this principle of arranging phraseological units, it has not gained wide application in the practice of compiling bilingual phraseological dictionaries. Alphabetical arrangement of phraseological units by the first component (whether a content word or a function word) is used in the Russian–Azerbaijani, Russian–Tuvan, Russian–Turkmen, Russian–Chuvash, and Russian–Kazakh phraseological dictionaries. With alphabetical arrangement, the main advantage of the dictionary is the clear and easy overview of the material. Indeed, such a principle of arranging phraseological units is the most natural, economical, and uncomplicated, which is very important for any dictionary as a reference source.

However, despite the simplicity, objectivity, and economy of this principle, a number of difficulties arise in its implementation. Among phraseological units, there are those that do not change throughout the entire grammatical paradigm and preserve a fixed order of components (for example, out of the blue, for the birds, with sleeves rolled down, not a soul in sight). The problem is complicated by the fact that many verbal and substantive phraseological units often change the order of their components, for example: to speak to someone’s face / to speak straight to someone’s face; mortal enemy / enemy mortal; to live in clover / in clover to live; to cherish like the apple of one’s eye / like the apple of one’s eye to cherish.

A fairly successful solution to this problem can be observed in Russian–Kazakh, Russian–Tuvan, and Russian–Turkmen phraseological dictionaries. Since in context verbal phraseological units usually begin with a verb, and substantive ones with an adjective, their alphabetical position in the dictionary is determined by these components. Various variants of a phraseological unit, grouped within one dictionary entry, are also placed in their own alphabetical positions with cross-references to the entry under which the main phraseological unit is described. When applying this principle, it should be taken into account that variants often differ in their stylistic marking. This feature is reflected in the Russian–Tuvan Phraseological Dictionary, but is not considered in other dictionaries.

The analysis conducted shows that modern phraseography lacks a sufficiently effective and universally acceptable principle for arranging phraseological units. As V. P. Berkov rightly notes, “a system of alternating the use of one, then another, then a third criterion turns out, on the one hand, to be too fluid, and on the other hand, too complex,” which leads dictionary compilers to frequent inconsistencies.

Despite certain difficulties, we believe that for bilingual phraseological dictionaries the most expedient method is the alphabetical arrangement of phraseological units by the first component, regardless of whether it is a content word or a function word. This method best meets the practical needs of users of Russian–national phraseological dictionaries.

REFERENCES

1. Babkin, A. I. Phraseology and Lexicography. In: Problems of Phraseology. Moscow–Leningrad, 1964, p. 32.
2. Kenesbayev, S. K. On Some Issues of Compiling a Phraseological Dictionary of the Kazakh Language. In: Issues of Phraseology and Compilation of Phraseological Dictionaries. Baku, 1968, p. 118.

3. Orlovskaya, L. Ya. On the Arrangement of Latvian Phraseological Units in a Phraseological Dictionary. Riga, 1968; Orlovskaya, L. Ya., Lau, A. G. Principles of Compiling a Dictionary Entry in the Latvian–English Phraseological Dictionary. Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the Latvian SSR, 1969, No. 9.
4. Ozhegov, S. I. On the Structure of Phraseology (in Connection with the Project of a Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language). In: Lexicology. Lexicography. Speech Culture. Moscow, 1974, p. 199.
5. See: Russian–Bulgarian Phraseological Dictionary, ed. by S. Vlahov. Moscow–Sofia, 1980; Russian–Latvian Phraseological Dictionary, comp. by A. I. Iotson, L. Tyurina. Riga, 1974.
6. Mavlonova, N. A. On the Comparative Study of Phraseology at the Present Stage. Scientific Progress, 2021, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 849–856.
7. Mavlonova, N. On the Issue of the Typology of Phraseological Combinations. Foreign Philology: Language, Literature, Education, 2018, Vol. 3, No. 3 (68), pp. 1–73.
8. Alisherovna, M. N. On the Comparative Study of Phraseology at the Present Stage. Central Asian Journal of Mathematical Theory and Computer Sciences, 2021, Vol. 2, No. 9, pp. 4–8.
9. Mavlonova, N. Independent Emergence of Interlingual Phraseological Correspondences. Foreign Philology: Language, Literature, Education, 2019, No. 4 (73), pp. 59–63.