INTERJECTIVE PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS (COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BASED ON RUSSIAN AND KABARDINO-CIRCASSIAN LANGUAGES)

INTRODUCTION

In all languages, in addition to independent and service words, there are a large number of stable word combinations, so-called phraseological units. Each variety of languages has its own specific distinctive features of phraseological units (hereinafter referred to as FE) (lexical, semantic, syntactic, grammatical) (ZHETLUKHINA et al., 2021). Their individuality and originality are associated with ethnic and national characteristics. Each such unit is characterized by several criteria: 1. Semantics of phraseology; 2. Grammatical structure; 3. Features of use.

In all languages, in addition to independent and service words, there are a large number of stable word combinations, so-called phraseological units. Each variety of languages has its own specific distinctive features of phraseological units (hereinafter referred to as FE) (lexical, semantic, syntactic, grammatical) (STUKALOVA ET AL., 2018; SHMELEVA et al., 2020). Their individuality and identity are associated with ethnic and national characteristics. Each such unit is characterized by several criteria: 1. Semantics of phraseology; 2. Grammatical structure; 3. Features of use.

In any language, FE have a complex structure, patterns of creation and functioning (SNURNITSYNA et al., 2021). The order of construction of phraseological units is connected with the vocabulary of the language, with the historical and cultural events of a certain people. V.N. Telia (2004: 19), in confirmation of this, speaks of phraseological units as the most "cultural component of the language". Regarding the Kabardino-Circassian language, Adygologists express the same opinion: "It is in phraseological units that the originality of the language, life, culture and history of each people are most clearly manifested, and knowledge of the phraseological composition of the language allows a deeper understanding of the psychology and mentality of the nation" (DZUGANOVA & OSHROEVA, 2015: 224). The phraseological units also "concentrate the national identity of the Adyghe culture" to a greater extent, which makes a significant contribution to the development of the Kabardino-Circassian language and the lexico-semantic system (TOKMAKOVA, 2020: 115).

In modern linguistics, the most relevant is the comparative development of linguistic realities, especially the study of phraseological units.

The object of our research is interjective phraseological units (hereinafter referred to as MFE) of the Kabardino-Circassian and Russian languages. Our choice of the topic is motivated by the fact that, although they have the same properties and functions as other categories of FE (imagery, expressiveness, figurative meaning, etc.), they contain certain distinctive features and features that need significant analysis. A distinctive feature of the MFE is the ability to express the emotional state of the subject of speech and his attitude to what is happening. Like ordinary interjections, MFIs enhance the emotionality of the utterance.

As our research shows, there are many works devoted to the development of stable units in both Russian and Kabardino-Circassian languages. The problem is that, while we find works...
on the Russian language that analyze the MFE in more or less detail, there are no similar research works on the Kabardino-Circassian language. Thus, the main goal of our article is formed: analysis, systematization, classification of the MFE of the Kabardino-Circassian language in comparison with the Russian language, identification of common and different in semantic terms and methods of their formation.

To achieve this goal, the following tasks are set in the article: Russian language; 1. To determine the main features of the MFE of the Kabardino-Circassian language in comparison with the MFE of the Russian language; 2. To systematize and classify the MFE of the Kabardino-Circassian language and compare it with the classification of the MFE of the Russian language; 3. To determine the grammatical features of the construction of the MFE of both languages.

The scientific novelty of the presented work consists in a detailed analysis and typologization of the phraseological material of the Kabardino-Circassian language using interjective words (such studies on the Adyghe languages have not yet been conducted) and comparing them with the MFE of the Russian language.

The main sources in the study of the MFE were the following works: E.F. Arsentieva (1989) "Comparative analysis of phraseological units", V.N. Telia (1996) "Russian phraseology: semantic, pragmatic and linguoculturological aspects", B.Ch. Bizhoev (2005) "Grammatical and lexical-phraseological problems of the Kabardino-Circassian language", Kabardino-Circassian language (2006), etc.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The research material was selected from the dictionaries: V.P. Zhukov, M.I. Sidorenko and V.T. Shklyarov (1987) "Russian Dictionary of Phraseological Synonyms", A.I. Fedorov (2008) "Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian literary language", L.A. Subbotina (2015) "Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian language", "Kabardian-Russian phraseological dictionary" compiled by B.M. Kardanov (1968), "School Russian-Kabardino-Circassian phraseological dictionary" by H.T. Tabuhov (1997), "School phraseological dictionary of the Kabardino-Circassian language" by B.Ch. Berbekov, B.Ch. Bizhoev and B.K. Utizhev (2001).

In our study, we used the following methods: 1. A scientific method of research for systematization, correction of both new and already existing knowledge on the topic; 2. A descriptive method by which we determined from which parts of speech the MFE data were compiled; 3. A method of grammatical analysis to determine the syntactic and morphological properties of MFE; 4. A comparative method for determining points of contact or differences in the studied languages; 5. A classification method for systematization and classification of available data.

BRIEF HISTORICAL INFORMATION

Phraseological units both in Russian linguistics in general and in the Kabardino-Circassian language in particular have been recorded and studied for quite a long time, which proves the special interest of linguists in these expressions.

The founder of the theory of phraseology can be considered V.V. Vinogradov (1977), since with the appearance of his works, the development of FE has acquired a thorough character. This is also evidenced by the statement of V.N. Telia (1996: 12), where it is said that thanks to his works, "phraseology has acquired quite clear contours precisely as an independent linguistic discipline". The makings in the study of phraseological units of the Russian language were traced in the works of A.A. Potebnia (1998), F.F. Fortunatov (2010).

Phraseological units both in Russian linguistics in general and in Kabardino-Circassian in particular have been recorded and studied for a long time, which indicates a special interest of linguists in these expressions.

The founder of the theory of phraseology can be considered V.V. Vinogradov (1977), since with the appearance of his works, the development of FE has acquired a thorough character. This is also evidenced by the statement of V.N. Telia (1996: 12), where it is said that thanks to his works, "phraseology has acquired quite clear contours precisely as an independent linguistic discipline".
The makings in the study of phraseological units of the Russian language were traced in the works of A.A. Potebni (1998), F.F. Fortunatov (2010). In the Adyghe languages, the layer of phraseological units is also widely represented, in the process of formation of which almost all parts of speech appear, which causes great interest among linguists. There are several studies on the Kabardino-Circassian language that are aimed at developing the theoretical foundations of phraseology. The most significant are the works of B.M. Kardanov (1973) Russian phraseological dictionary "Phraseology of the Kabardian language", where the analysis of semantic features, grammatical, structural and typological classification of FE was carried out for the first time. These works formed the basis for the formation of Adyghe phraseology. Then other scientific works of linguists were published, which promoted and developed the theory of phraseology. In particular, A.G. Emuzov (1986) "Lexico-semantic and grammatical analysis of the phraseology of the Kabardino-Circassian language", M.L. Apazhev (2000) "Modern Kabardino-Circassian language. Lexicology. Lexicography", B.Ch. Bizhoev (2005) "Grammatical and lexical-phraseological problems of the Kabardino-Circassian language", etc. But, unfortunately, none of the publications conducted in-depth studies of FE formed from interjections or performing the function of interjections in a sentence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Definition of Interjective Phraseological Units

As the observations of well-known linguists show, simple phrases can acquire stability only with the help of repeated repetitions of native speakers. A person, having heard a certain phrase, remembers and begins to use it in his speech, thereby introducing people who have contacted him into speech use, and so on along the chain until the phrase becomes the property of the whole people. At some point in time, a stable expression acquires an unchangeable vocabulary and meaning. It is clear that the formation of phraseological units requires a long time and depends on the frequency of use of this phrase.

Being short, emotional, expressive turns of speech, FE reflect the ethnic value, the memory of historical events and personalities, which are proof of the wisdom, knowledge, traditions, moral qualities of the people, lifestyle and attitude to others. There are a huge number of MFIs in the studied languages, the knowledge and skillful use of which indicate a high level of language proficiency.

The term interjective phraseological units refers to stable phrases that have lost their original meaning and perform the functions of interjections in a sentence or FE, formed with the help of interjective words. They refer to derived (secondary) interjections.

MFE and interjections both semantically, functionally, and syntactically have an identical purpose: they express emotions and feelings; they are not members of a sentence; although they stand apart, they completely coincide in general meaning with the utterance. Nevertheless, they have the same features and functions as phraseological units.

MFE, undoubtedly, play a huge role in identifying national and cultural characteristics. Their semantics reflect the long-term historical, cultural, social development of the people, certain customs, attitudes, traditions, cult persons, characters, heroes, reflect the worldview, the worldview of people. They are conventional language means specific to a certain ethnic group, and for their full use, the author of the speech, at least, must know them. At the same time, it is necessary to take into account the ethnolinguistic, gender, age, transcriptional, grammatical features of the language (AFAUNOVA, 2020: 27).

Interjective phraseological units, like FE, cannot be created in speech every time, they are a non-free, unchangeable form that already exists in the language, an integral phrase with its grammatical composition and lexical meaning. The most important thing is that they are extracted and reproduced from the depths of a person’s memory as complete and ready-made expressions with a stable meaning and an unchangeable vocabulary.

Synonymous interjective phraseological units

Phraseological units connected by synonymous ties must have certain characteristics: they must be interchangeable, relate to the same part of speech, express the same concept, correspond to the emotional content. Despite this, each phrase can have its own connotational shades. Based on these requirements, interjective phraseological units can form synonymous
series with the same success as other FE groups. Russian Russian language materials are taken from the "Dictionary of Phraseological Synonyms of the Russian Language" by V.P. Zhukov, M.I. Sidorenko and V.T. Shklyarov (1987). For example, formed with an interjection word or used in the meaning of interjections, FE in the Russian language, can make up the following rows: God forbid - God forbid (save) God (lord), deliver God (Lord) (express fear, experience, anxiety); be healthy - all the best (good, best), all the best, I have the honor, my respect, our to you with a brush (greeting at a meeting or farewell); I am thrice cursed - to fail (me) in (this) place, to fall (to me) through the ground, not to leave (to me) from the place!, blast (me) thunder, etc. (sworn words), here (out) what is it! - there (it is) like, please tell me, please tell me, here you go, it’s necessary (so), well, well! (they express strong surprise); here’s (those) (and) times for you! - here is so times!, here is so cranberry!, here is so pound!, here is you (those) and on!, here is so cranberry!, here is so number! (they express surprise, bewilderment, disappointment, etc.); the Christmas trees are green! - holy shit, honest mother!, fy you (well you!), holy fathers! (used to express amazement, admiration, irritation); the hell with it! - the devil is bald!, nothing like that!, how (would not) so (express protest, disagreement).The MFES of the Kabardino-Circassian language can also form synonymous series in the same way.

For example: тхъэ согъэпц — тхъэ дыгьылэ (сыгылэ), тхъэ дыдэ, тхъэ (нахэуэ) зызэптош, тхъэ согъэпц — тхъэ дыдэ, чыыштэлэ согъэпц, тхъэ дыдэ — тхъэ дыгьылэ, согъэпц, дыхэ — дыхэ (сыгылэ) (sworn words); зи унагъуэр бэгъэун — зи зыгуэшкэ бэгъэун, зи унагъуэр бэгъэун, тиысуякэ бэгъэун, зи унагъуэр бэгъэун, къаъэун эл эшит некъэшкэ (they express indignation, indignation, reproach); дыдэд мыгъуэр — дыдэд гууэ, дыдэд (дыдэдышкэ) бэгъэун, дуунэшкэ бэгъэун, дуунэшкэ (эшэлэ) (they express horror, indignation, fear, fright); еуунэб гууэрэ — е-э мыгъуэр, ей-й мыгъуэр, ей гууэ, оу-уу мыгъуэр (they express horror, indignation, fear, fright); гууэуэ мыгъуэмв эмжэны — ель ар!, ель ар!, елпэр ар, ай анэсын, е гууэуэ маахэм эмжэн, гууэуэ мыгъуээр, гууэуэ мыгъуэмв эмжэны, пу алаусын, пу нэлат (they express condemnation, reproach, indignation); ана мыгъуэр — ана гууэ, ана-на оэз, анае шылы, анае мыгъуэр, уз модэ!, табэ йастьырлык, изу зынуагъээр et al. (they express indignation, reproach, indignation); акъэй мыгъуэр — акъэй жыпэн (express a statement); альыхым и шынкурц — алыъэ шынур, алыыхым и шынкурц, узык жыпэн (жыпэн) (they express comfort, satisfaction); айдэ маржэ — маржэ хъун, маржэ хъунн, маржэ хъунээн, хъээй маржэ, хэйдэ маржэ (a call to something-L.) and others.

**Classification of interjective phraseological units**

In the Russian language, there are various types of systematization and classification of FE according to semantic, morphological, syntactic and other features: verbal, nominal, modal, adjectival, adverbial (adverbial), etc. In the Kabardino-Circassian language, B.Ch. Bizhoev (2005: 254-273) distinguishes FE with a verbal meaning, nominal, adverbial-circumstantial, comparative FE with a different number of subgroups. One of the points of this classification is also interjective phraseological units used to express emotions, feelings and expressions of will.

In the works of Russian linguists, we observe several types of classification of phraseological units: V.V. Vinogradov (1977) has a semantic classification, N.M. Shansky (1987) has a structural classification, V.N. Teliа (1996) has a stylistic classification, etc.

In the modern phraseology of the Russian language, interjective phraseological units are given much more attention. In the Kabardino-Circassian language, on the contrary, they are mentioned casually among the examples of different categories of FE or are not mentioned at all. Therefore, we will give our vision for the systematization of the MFE in comparison with the Russian language.

**Active and passive phraseological collection**

All interjective phraseological units of both the Russian language and Kabardino-Circassian are known to be divided into two groups: active and passive. The MFE of the first group consists of well-known, actively and massively used expressions in everyday speech. Passive MFEs, on the contrary, include archaisms or neologisms that are no longer used or are rarely used. For example, among the passive ones from the Kabardino-Circassian language, such obsolete expressions as: а нэлат - expresses dissatisfaction; алыъэ турурты мълъшкэн, алыъэ су
тъэьмъэгъэллцй джэъэсым и цэкэй щысъуэниш — sworn words; бээзр босып — a wish for a successful sale at the bazaar; most of the welcome words with the element appendix (ваэ апэй, бэъэъ эъуэ апэй, мэъэъуэ мэшэ, мэш ваэ апэй, гүэъгъэъ апэй) etc. Examples from the Russian language: old — бороны господи, боже праведный, боже правый, вот тебе (те) бог, вот тебе порука, мать пречистая, ай да ну!, поди от глаз! Неологизмы: без бээзр, бээзр нет, полный абзац, полный капец etc.

The following are considered active: from the Kabardino-Circassian language: альыхъ мыйэуэ, апэ апэй. гуэъгъэлл (мыйэуэ), муъа мыйэуэ, гуэъгъэлл мыйэуэ(му) — express grief, fright, experience; гуэъу маху — «have a nice trip»; ель ар!, ель обьы, зи унаъжэр бэъэъуэн — they express dissatisfaction, condemnation; альыхъым и шыкраакъ — they express dissatisfaction, condemnation; пу мээлыхъ — «as so as not to jinx it»; уи/фи пиъыъээцкъ фы оукъ — «good evening», (уи/фи) пиъэддъыъжъъ фы оукъ, фи пиъэддъыъжъъ фы оукъ — «good morning» etc. From the Russian language: ах ты, к чёртову бабушки, батюшки свети!, бож мой, бог с тобой, с богом, ей-богу, ну е её (его) в борото, будь(те) здоров(ы), это ты брось, эта важность!, вот (ещё) новости etc.

According to the method of education. MFE can be formed in two ways: with the participation of interjections and without the participation of interjections themselves (i.e. expressions that have passed into the category of interjections). For example, the first group includes: rus.: увы и ах, ну ура, фу ты (ну ты)!, ай да ну!, ну и ну!; каб.-черк. а дунехъ мыйэуэ, амты беттээл, ай джыях, эуэй мыйэуэ, пу мээлыхъ, тобъ йоосфирэлэй и т.д. Without interjections: rus. не то слово!, с ума сойти!, бож с тобой, вот это да!, чудное дело!, ёлки-пажки, что за пропасть!, каб.-черк. альыхъ гуэъц, альыхъым и цэкэй солъэ, зи унаъжэр бэъэъуэн, тъээр гыэъэлээнъ, уаан махуэр тэъыъэлэнъ, уаан маху эъэнъ и т.д.

(1) Depending on parts of speech which are used to form MFIs, they can be divided into several groups:

(2) Units formed with the help of interjections:

a) interjection + interjection: rus. аху уой!, ей-еї, ну-ну; каб. - черк. тоубэ йоосфирэлэй

b) interjection + other part of speech: rus. на ура (preposition + interjection); фу ты (ну ты)!, ахти мне, (междометие + местоимение); увы и ах, ну и ну (interjection + conjunction + interjection), ай да ну!, ой да ну! (interjection + particle + interjection), ой лу? (interjection + particle), ни тпу ну ну (particle + interjection + particle + interjection), фу ты пропасть (interjection + pronoun + noun), etc.; каб. - черк. ай-эй эъэ гуэъц, аое гуэъц, эгэуэ мыйэуэ (interception + particle), уау альыхъ (interception + noun), ёлкэй-тэтэй жэбэлъ, хэтыжэбэлъ, уэй-эй жэбэлъуэя (interception + adverbial part), уэй-эй жэбэлъы (interception + participle), су тобээ (interception + participle), гыэъэлэй лэй (interception + adjectixe), уауэзр и махузр, уауэзр и махуэр (interception + pronoun + noun), уауэзр гэъэнъ (кышъэнъ), хэты жэбэлъ, уэй-эй жэбэлэн, тобэ ёрехъу, тобэ къыъжъыъ, уэуу жэъэнъ (жэъэнъ), мэъэъуэн (къыъжъыъ) (interception + verb), уэуу альыхъ жэбэлэнъ, уэуу альыхъ жыъжъыъ (interception + noun + verb), etc.

(3) Units formed without the participation of interjections:

a) expressions with a verb: rus. чёрт возьму!, укороти язык! (verb + noun), счастливо оставаться!, здорово живёшь, пропади пропадом! (verb + adverb), хоть в гроб ложись, хоть в петлю лезь (conjunction + preposition + noun + verb), дьявол тебя (его и т.п.) побери! (noun + pronoun + verb), до чего дожили! (preposition + pronoun + verb), что и говорить (pronoun + conjunction + verb); каб. - черк. тъээр гыэъэлээнъ (noun + verb), альыхъ махуэр гэъэнъ (noun + adverb + verb), зи унаъжэр бэъэъуэн, зи лэкуэ бэъэъуэн (pronoun + noun + verb), зи унаъжэр бэъэъуэн (pronoun + noun + adverb + verb), etc.

b) expressions with a noun involving other parts of speech other than the verb: rus. к чёртовой бабушке (preposition + adjective + noun), батюшки, сваташки! (noun + noun), беда, да и только! (noun + particle + conjunction + adverb), просто беда (adverb + noun), бож с тобой (noun + preposition + noun), бож (боже) ты мой! (noun + pronoun + noun), etc. Examples from the Kabardino-Circassian language: альыхъ мыйэуэ, альыхъ гуэъц (noun + particle),
в) oath expressions consisting of various parts of speech: rus. провалиться мне на месте! (verb + pronoun + preposition + noun), будь я трижды проклят (verb + pronoun + preposition + noun), провалиться сквозь землю (verb + pronoun + preposition + noun), да отсюда у меня рука (verb + pronoun + noun), лопни мои глаза (verb + pronoun + noun), etc. In the Kabardino-Circassian language: тхьэр иуан (солов), альвыйр (азэлыхътара) согъэпц, тхьэ буйджэй (согъэпц), тхьэр эзэлыхъшат (согъэпц) (noun + verb); тхьэр (альвыйр, азэлыхъшат) махзу согъэпц (noun + adv + verb); альвым (азэлыхъшат, тхьэ) и цьэкъ солов (noun + pronoun + noun + verb); тхъэ ур мэ зи уфэ (noun + pronoun + noun + verb).

(4) In the Kabardino-Circassian language, there are greeting words formed with the help of the word анцэ, the semantics of which are lost - флэхъус анцэ, гуп махзу анцэ, шхох анцэ, ёлъе анцэ, боя анцэ ог фу/ун махз фэй, фу/ун эны фэй, уи пынъх (пышэлзэхъ, пышэлдэнъехъ, махшу) фэй (pronoun + noun + adv), etc. The Russian language also has an extensive list of welcome words: welcome (noun + verb), good afternoon (morning, evening) (adjective + noun), etc.

As can be seen from the above examples, all MFS, depending on the number of elements involved in their formation, are divided into binomial and polynomial.

According to the term, the first group includes MFS consisting of two components: rus. батъохъ съыпъу, просто беда, бог мой, будь неладен, эна важности!, вот ещё, ну вот, енки зелёные, ничего себё!. From the Kabardino-Circassian language: иу зиунагъээрэ (surprise), лых аэ (disapproval), шъыкъ алыкъ (calming down), чытапъэ колуя (I swear), узы анцэ, узы гуцэ (surprise), филь алурынъ, деньъэ аэ (condemnation).

The second group includes MFS consisting of three or more components: rus. боже ты мой, вот поди ж ты!, вот так на, вот так так!, как бы не так!, матерь моя родная!, вот тебе (те) и на!, вот это да!. In the Kabardino-Circassian language: узы алыкъ жэвэйзэн (give a break, calm down), тхьэм и цьэкъ солов (I swear), а сымыьжэ эрабъэ!, уи унагъээр эрэвэзэу, э зиунагъэбъэкъ хэзыцэйцыкъын, а э зи унагъэзер бэгъэу тъьысыкъын (surprise, condemnation, indignation), etc.

Interjective phraseological units of negative and positive forms

As you know, emotions can be both positive, positive, and negative, negative. Similarly, according to the emotions expressed by him, the MFE can be distinguished into negative and positive. The analysis of FE from the point of view of a positive or negative form was carried out in the article by N.G. Sherieva (2000: 101-105), where semantic shades were described in detail by means of examples and manifestations of feelings invested in pronounced phraseological units (good and evil, ugly and beautiful, etc.).

The group of positive ones includes MFS that express feelings of delight, admiration, surprise (Rus. батъохи светы (съыпъу)!, бог (боже) ты мой!, ух ты!, вот тебе на!, с ума сойти!, господи боже мой!, ну и ну!); kabardino-circassian language: иу зиунагъээрэ, а э зи унагъэгер бэгъэу тъьысыкъын, алей гуцэ, иу зиунагъээрэ, пу мэлэълэ, а унынъын, лей гуцэ(рэ);) reassurance, relief (rus. слово богу, слово господи); kab. - cherk. алыкъ шыкъ, алыкъым и шыкъуриц); satisfaction, approval, pride (rus. донво бы так!); kab. - cherk. уей-уей жэвэйцыкъы, хьет жэвэйцыкъы! etc.

The negative ones are treated by MFS with a feeling of disgust, contempt (Rus. фу ты!, ну ты!); kab. - cherk. ель ар!, ель абьу, ель ар!); disapproval, indignation, discontent, reproach (rus. ничего себе, к свинцам собачным!, черта с двой!, ничего подобного!, как бы не так, елки-папки!, матерь честная, батъохи светы!); kab. - cherk. э вун узы, а э мэйым имычъын, лей мыъыр, оджээнъ эмымъыр, а нэлэт); fear, fright, anxiety (rus. боже милостивый!, боже упаси, упаси бог, боже праведный (правав!); боге (ты) мой!); kab. - cherk. гузэгъэу мыъыр, узуу мыъыр, узууры и махзу, гузэгъэу жыгъыгъыш(тэ), дывдэдъ гуцэ, дывдэдъ мыъыр, дывдэдъ лей мыъыр, гузэгъэшыш(тэ) мыъыр); annoyances, perplexities, disappointments, upssets (rus. вот тебе раз!, вот так раз!, вот тебе и на!, вот так штука!, так так!, избави бог, бог упаси, упаси бог, вот еще новости,
Many MFES of the Kabardino-Circassian language are “universal”, i.e. neutral (AFAUNOVA, 2012: 52). Such interjective phraseological units make up the third group. These are interjections denoting a call (Russ: на шагу назад, на шагу прочь, ближе к делу, шутки в сторону; kab.-cherk. адый марж, марж юн, марж хьун); denoting an oath, a solemn promise (Russ. вот (тебе, м) крест, пускай бог разразит, ей-богу, разрази меня гром; kab.-cherk. тхъэр нахуу гъэщ, къэрэн къин юн, къэрэн миъ юнди къин); denoting a strong desire, a strong attraction, the desire to possess something (rus. да еще как!, хоть в петлю лезь, хоть на стенку лезь, хоть ложись да помирай; kab.-cherk. аджыдэ огъуэ, аджыдэ гущэ) etc.

Due to the polysemanticism of the MFE, some of them can simultaneously belong to several semantic groups, and their meaning, like the meaning of ordinary interjections, is determined only in context.

The problem of translating interjective phraseological units.

The translation of interjective phraseological units is more problematic than the translation of a simple interjection. To select an adequate analogue, you need to know all the language nuances, navigate through all the palettes of emotional manifestations of the source material. Since not all interjections are presented in dictionaries, all meanings are not specified, the translation of the MFE is much worse. When translating them, as well as when translating interjections, it is necessary to take into account the ethnolinguistic, gender, age, transcriptional, grammatical features of the translated language (AFAUNOVA, 2020: 27).

MFE, formed from independent words, to some extent retain their original meaning, which makes it possible to find similar variants for them. For example, the etymological analysis of the interjective phraseology алыкъыр согъэпц, expressing an oath, does not require much effort: олыхь (God) + согъэпц (гъэщ) - to betray, thus - “to betray God”, i.e. “I will betray God if...”.

When choosing an analog, it is important to accurately determine the intonation of speech, tone and manner of pronunciation. Erroneous interpretation of interjective phraseological units leads to translation inaccuracies. Without sufficient knowledge of the language, a stable phrase can be deciphered as separate independent words, which will lead to a distortion of the text.

There are many phraseological units for which you can find equivalents in both languages: о боже! о господи! - тобь хваац; буьдь молодцом! - убь-убь жэпэбъинь; черт возьми! - гъэщ махуээ, ээ унъ эбъуэ; вот тебе (тебе) крест! - тхъэр (алыхьыр) согъэпц!; боже мой! - я дади тхъэр!; ах, боже мой! - альяхьыр-ма!; будь ты проклят! - гъэщ мыхьуэ юн; божьи мой! - ах гущ; слова богу, божьей милостью! - алыкъым и шыкъыръа; черт возьми! тьфу ты пропасть! - емьнзэрг! емьнзэрнэбъац!; пропади пропадом - эмьнзэр эыхъыкъунъац!, etc.

In languages, there are MFIs that are translated by one interjective word: ах ты! акти мне! - егъеъ; батюшки, святвишки! батюшки светы! - лау, Ьэгъу; бог мой! бог (боже) ты мой! - алыкъ, etc.

But more often it is impossible to find a match for such units. In such cases, they are translated using independent words or phrases: буьдь что будет - эрхъыкъылама (эрхъыкъу) хъунъ; была не была! - дау мыхьуэац, сьы къымкъылама = эрхъыкъылама хъунъ; велика беда! - лъэхъукъымъ, алыкъымъымъ, ар пахъ ужъути!; вот так ключац! - хъунъ ар!; or a descriptive method: уны и ах - гуькуэц, тхъылъылы къыъылъыц (or a descriptive method); фу ты пропасть - гъэщ къыъылъыц (expresses surprise with a hint of swearing); фу ты, ну ты! - гъэщ къыъылъынъац къыъылъыц, гуьъылъ мыхьуэ къыъу (expresses surprise with a hint of swearing); уны и ах - гузац къыъылъыц (expresses concern); вон (оно) как, вот оно как - гъэщ къыъылъынъац тельцялъ къыъынъац къыъылъыц (expresses strong surprise), etc. Also from the Kabardino-Circassian language: уъъу алыкъ жэпэбъинь - to give a break; алыкъ-блюхьыкъ лъэузъу - beg, beg hard; узъури и махуэц - to yell, to shout; лъэу-луу цъынъ - to go to bed and sleep; пу ныллъ акъинъ - to curse; уъъули-съути ешъэъинъ - to make a fuss, raise confusion; уъъули гъэъинъ - to cry hard, to yell; уъъу жылънъ - to calm down, etc.
Our observations are confirmed by S.I. Vlakhov and S.P. Florin (1980), who claim that MFE can be translated by the method of phraseological translation (a phraseological analog or a phraseological equivalent is selected), or by the method of non-phraseological translation, i.e. by other language means.

Interjective phraseological units, like interjections, show their uniqueness when translating from one language to another, because they have great speech capabilities. When translating works of art, translators often omit such units. Of course, the lack of MFE will not interfere with the transfer of the essence of the text and in the construction of a dialogue. Rather, it leads to the loss of national color and colorfulness of the language, makes it difficult to convey the emotional manifestations of the subject of speech. Not knowing all the language means adversely affects the transmission of the emotional message of the text, the description of the situation or the characteristic qualities of the character. Thus, the need to feel the material subtly comes to the fore, to sufficiently understand the grammatical, lexical and ethno-cultural structure of the language.

Thus, we come to the conclusion that without knowledge of the MFIs themselves, without understanding the diversity of all semantic shades and without understanding all grammatical and lexical features, a competent and adequate translation of the material is impossible. The translated text must be the equivalent of the source text both in semantic-structural and communicative terms; it is necessary to take into account the linguistic-cultural and expressive components of the language.

CONCLUSIONS
In our study, it was proved that MFS are stable expressions that have special distinctive features both in grammatical, semantic, structural, and functional construction of the language. The authors of speech in the process of communication, most often, do not think about the phraseology used, about its origin, about the reasons for using this particular expression. This process is brought to automatism and the choice of a certain FE occurs on a subconscious level.

In general, MFE, like all categories of FE, are characterized by increased expressiveness and are an indicator of the national specifics, culture and history of a certain people, through them the specific, characteristic features of the language, the level of emotionality of representatives of the ethnic group, the attitude of people to each other are characterized. MFIs express the speaker’s attitude to what is happening, the emotions and feelings experienced, the manifestation of will.

As it was seen from the study, interjective phraseological units quite effectively form synonymous series in both Russian and Kabardino-Circassian languages. They fully meet the requirements imposed on such units: to express one concept, to be interchangeable, to correspond to the emotional content, etc.

Based on the classification of the MFE of the Russian language, we proposed in our work grouping the MFE of the Kabardino-Circassian language according to the following criteria: according to the emotions expressed, they are divided into negative, positive and universal; according to the method of education into three groups with several subgroups; according to the number of components into binomial and polynomial; according to the frequency of use into active and passive. The uniqueness of the MFE is also manifested in the translation process, since it requires the author to have special knowledge of both the source language and the language into which the text is translated.

Despite the fact that interjective phraseological units are non-separable units, they represent a living process in the language. As we saw in the work, some MFIs exist in different variations, and new expressions are also periodically observed in speech. This proves that MFE is a developing and dynamic phenomenon in linguistics.

REFERENCES
AFAUNOVA, A.A. Semantic and grammatical analysis of interjections and onomatopoeia of the Kabardino-Circassian language. Nalchik: KBIGI Publishing House. Nalchik: Izdatel’stvo KBIGI, 2012.
AFAUNOVA, A.A. Variability and difficulties in the translation of interjections (based on the material of the Russian and Kabardino-Circassian languages). Scientific Dialogue, 2020, 3, 24-37.

APAZHEV, M.L. Modern Kabardino-Circassian language. Nalchik: Elbrus, 2000.

ARSENTIEVA, E.F. Comparative analysis of phraseological units (based on the material of phraseological units semantically oriented to a person in English and Russian). Kazan: Kazan University Press, 1989.

BERBEKOV, B.CH., BIZHOEV B.CH. & UTIZHEV B.K. School phraseological dictionary of the Kabardino-Circassian language. Nalshyk: El’brus, 2001

BIZHOEV, B.CH. Grammatical and lexico-phraseological problems of the Kabardino-Circassian language. Nalchik: El’-Fa, 2005.

DZUGANOVA, R.H. & OSHROEVA, K.V. Comparative phraseological units in the works of Z.M. Naloev. In the collection: Narthology in the XXI century: modern paradigms and interpretations (p. 224-229). Vladikavkaz, 2015.

EMUZOV, A.G. Lexico-semantic and grammatical analysis of the phraseology of the Kabardino-Circassian language. Nalchik: Elbrus, 1986.

FEDOROV, A.I. Phraseological dictionary of the Russian literary language. About 13,000 phraseological units. Moscow: AST Publishing House, 2008.

FORTUNATOV, F.F. Comparative linguistics: a general course. Moscow: URSS, 2010.

Kabardino-Circassian language. Vocabulary, Phraseology, Oral and poetic language, Onomastics: vol. II. Nalchik: Republican Polygraph Combine named after Revolutions of 1905, 2006.

KARDANOV, B.M. Kabardino-Russian phraseological dictionary. Nalchik: Elbrus, 1968.

KARDANOV, B.M. Phraseology of the Kabardian language. Nalchik: Elbrus, 1973.

POTEBNYA, A.A. Language and speech. To the modern phraseology of the language. Moscow: Higher School, 1998.

SHANSKY, N.M. Modern Russian language. Moscow: Prosveschenie, 1987.

SHERIEVA, N.G. Evaluation as the most important component of phraseological meaning (based on the material of Kabardino-Circassian phraseological units). Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice, 2020, 13(12), 101-105.

SHMELEVA, O.D. et al. Media Influence: Cognitive and Psychological Markers (On Chinese Medical and Cosmetic Advertising Texts). Propósitos y Representaciones, 2020, 8, SPE(2), e798 http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2020.v8nSPE2.798

SNURNITSYNA, J.M. et al. Training of skills in students for self-organization and self-education in modern educational conditions. Eduweb Magazine, 2021, 15(1), 19-28.

STUKALOVA, O.V. et al. Modern Trends in Educational Institutions Education Quality Assessment. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 2018, 8(9), 197-208.

STUKALOVA, O.V. et al. Modern Trends in Educational Institutions Education Quality Assessment. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 2018, 8(9), 197-208.

SUBBOTINA, L.A. Phraseological dictionary of the Russian language. Moscow: AST Publishing House, 2015.

TABUHOV, H.T. School Russian-Kabardino-Circassian phraseological dictionary. Nalchik: El’brus, 1997.
TELIA, V.N. *Cultural and linguistic competence: its high probability and deep proximity in units of phraseological composition of the language*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004.

TELIA, V.N. *Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 1996.

TOKMAKOVA, M.H. Phraseoemotifs of the Kabardino-Circassian language with the verbs Etny, Shch lyn, Khun, lien. *Vestnik Kabardino-Balkarskogo instituta gumanitarnyh issledovanij*, 2020, 1(44), 115-120.

VINOGRA DOV, V. *On the main types of phraseological units in Russian*. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.

VLAKHOV, S. & FLORIN, S. *Untranslatable in translation*. Moscow: International Relations, 1980.

ZHELTUKH NIA, M.R. et al. Development of students’ media competence in the context of digital education. *Eduweb Magazine*, 2021, 15 (1), 29-38.

ZHUKOV, V.P., SIDORENKO, M.I. & SHKLYAROV, V.T. *Russian Dictionary of Phraseological Synonyms*. Moscow: Rus. Yaz, 1987.
Interjective phraseological units (comparative analysis based on russian and kabardino-circassian languages)

Unidades fraseológicas interjetivas (análise comparativa baseada em línguas russas e kabardino-circasianas)

Resumo
O principal objetivo do trabalho é estudar, tipificar unidades fraseológicas interjetivas da língua kabardino-circassiana e compará-las com a língua russa, estabelecer comum e diferente tanto no sentido semântico quanto nos caminhos de sua formação. Para atingir esse objetivo, foi realizada uma revisão dos principais trabalhos de pesquisa sobre o tema em desenvolvimento. Em nossa pesquisa, realizamos as seguintes operações metodológicas: descrição, análise científica, gramatical, comparação, classificação. O estudo comprova que os IMF têm as mesmas funções e características que as interjeições e unidades fraseológicas: expressam emoções e sentimentos; eles não são membros de uma sentença; eles coincidem com a expressão em significado; eles aumentaram a emoção; são determinantes das especificidades nacionais, cultura e história de cada grupo étnico. Eles podem entrar em séries sinônicas, bem como palavras independentes, e atender aos requisitos impostos a essas unidades: expressam um conceito, são intercambiáveis, correspondem ao conteúdo emocional.

Palavras-chave: Interjeição, unidade fraseológica (FE). Unidades fraseológicas de interjeição. Língua russa. Língua kabardino-circassiana. Classificação.

Abstract
The main purpose of the work is to study, typologize interjective phraseological units of the Kabardino-Circassian language and compare them with the Russian language, to establish common and different both in semantic meaning and in the ways of their formation. To achieve this goal, a review of the leading research papers on the topic under development was carried out. In our research, we carried out the following methodological operations: description, scientific, grammatical analysis, comparison, comparison, classification. The study proves that MFIs have the same functions and characteristics as interjections and phraseological units: they express emotions and feelings; they are not members of a sentence; they coincide with the utterance in meaning; they have increased emotionality; they are a determinant of the national specifics, culture and history of each ethnic group. They can enter into synonymous series, as well as independent words, and meet the requirements imposed on such units: they express one concept, are interchangeable, correspond to the emotional content.

Keywords: Interjection, phraseological unit (FE). Interjection phraseological units. Russian language. Kabardino-Circassian language. Classification.

Resumen
El objetivo principal del trabajo es estudiar, tipologizar unidades fraseológicas interyectivas de la lengua kabardino-circasiana y compararlas con la lengua rusa, para establecer comunes y diferentes tanto en el significado semántico como en las formas de su formación. Para lograr este objetivo, se llevó a cabo una revisión de los principales trabajos de investigación sobre el tema en desarrollo. En nuestra investigación, realizamos las siguientes operaciones metodológicas: descripción, análisis científico, gramatical, comparación, comparación, clasificación. El estudio demuestra que las IMF tienen las mismas funciones y características que las interjecciones y las unidades fraseológicas: expresan emociones y sentimientos; no son miembros de una sentencia; coinciden con la expresión en el significado; han aumentado la emocionalidad; son un determinante de los detalles nacionales, la cultura y la historia de cada grupo étnico. Pueden entrar en series sinónimas, así como palabras independientes, y cumplir con los requisitos impuestos a tales unidades: expresan un concepto, son intercambiables, corresponden al contenido emocional.

Palabras-clave: Interjección, unidad fraseológica (FE). Unidades fraseológicas de interjección. Idioma ruso. Idioma kabardino-circasiano. Clasificación.