

STEADY RUSSIAN COMPARISONS OF THE MICRO-FIELD "SLOW-WITTEDNESS"

^aALIYA R. RAKHIMOVA

^aKazan Federal University, Leo Tolstoy Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, 18 Kremlevskaya Street, Kazan, 420008, Russia

E-mail: ^aRusia@Prescopus.Com

Abstract: Steady comparisons are one of the actively developed problem spheres of phraseology. At the moment cultural and structural aspects of the analysis of comparative are exposed to detailed consideration. In the present article the author analyzes features of stylistic accessory of the micro-field "slow-wittedness" comparative, their functioning in art texts. It is revealed that similar comparisons are not frequency in art texts in view of stylistic limitation of comparisons (often they have to a dung colloquial, contemptuous). Specifics of standards of comparison are established: frequent it names of animals or tree, its parts and wooden products. The reason of the similar choice of standards of comparison contacts features of national outlook of the Russian people at early stages of development. Conclusions about time of the use of steady comparisons of this semantics - the XIX century are drawn, the XX century is rarer. Special attention is paid to a subject comparative connection. Generally they serve for the characteristic of males. The characteristic of representatives of a feminine gender meets quite seldom and demands change of a standard of comparison. As a key method of the linguistic analysis in work serves the descriptive method as allows analyzing specifics of functioning of steady comparison in a context, opens implicitly the presented linguo-culturological potential of steady comparisons.

Keywords: steady comparison, linguo-culturology, phraseology, gender, intelligence.

1 Introduction

The phraseological fund of language throughout a long time is a subject of a linguistic research. Not only the structural organization of phraseological units, but also their semantic and linguo-culturological component is exposed to the analysis. On development of a linguistic thought in phraseological aspect impact was exerted by Arsenyeva (2016), Fernando (1996), Gibbs (1994), Kunin (1996), Melerovich (2001). As a result of the detailed description of types of phraseological units in independent unit of phraseology steady comparisons were allocated. By the present moment steady comparisons are in a stage of active studying in structural, linguo-cultural and comparative plans. V. Ogol'cev for the first time paid attention to complexity of steady comparisons (Ogol'cev, 2015), having pointed to their similarity to logical comparison and having found their differentiating signs. So, it was established that the cogitative operation sent to search and fixing of identical signs at observed objects is the cornerstone of logical comparison; figurative perception of a subject and comparison of this perception to the subjective background knowledge allowing doing certain conclusions of rather observed objects is the cornerstone of steady comparison (Ogol'cev, 2015). Now researches of comparative take place in comparative aspect. It allows to find a community in perception of the world in different national cultures, and also to open their logic of thinking, to find out the reasons of development of similar figurative comparisons. Such researches not only disclose the width of steady comparisons as subject of the linguistic analysis, but also indicate their linguo-culturological potential capable to show features of naive attitude of the person of this nation at an early stage of development. In this connection the works performed in anthropocentric aspect as allow to open many features of national thinking (Safin, 2016 are urgent; Gilazetdinova, 2016). The real research is focused on the analysis of the macro-field "character of the person and his internal state" as this field is opposition in relation to the macro-field "appearance of the person", therefore, will allow to open features of figurative perception of appearance of the person and his inner world.

2 Methods

As research method were used a method of continuous selection (material for a research the dictionary of steady comparisons of V. M. Ogol'cev) (served Ogol'cev, 2015), a method of the linguistic description, a typological method and a quantitative

method. During the analysis we addressed art texts and explanatory dictionaries with the purpose to offer an exhaustive explanation for steady comparison.

3 Main Part

Steady comparison has three obligatory components in the structure: subject to comparison, standard of comparison and basis of comparison. Subject to comparison is the observed subject. He is often already familiar speaking (listening/reading) of a context, the previous dialogue, life experience. Feature of this object is only that fact that speaking finds in it certain sign which wants to call figuratively. Moreover, often this sign is shown in excess quantity and perceived as "out of norm", as causes the aspiration to give its figurative description. Figurativeness is that extent of manifestation of a sign of an object is compared to extent of existence of the characterized sign of other object acting as the reference carrier. For example, in steady comparison *a scent as a dog* we can consider information that the dog possesses the best nose. Therefore, at an observed object the scent also is quite good.

The basis of comparison is often expressed implicitly (it is silly as a gray gelding, mad as hell, etc.) and indicates traits of character known for all, features of appearance, behavior (clever, silly, beautiful, high, etc.).

Often steady comparisons form synonymic ranks: silly as gray gelding, as chock, as log, etc. Steady comparisons have "indicators" of existence of the synonymous relations: coincidence of a conceptual core, valence.

Coincidence of a conceptual core means coincidence of the basis of comparison as this element indicates the sign which is exposed to the quantitative characteristic (specifies, where and in what degree it is shown). Often synonymous relations develop in those steady comparisons where the basis of comparison is presented by an adjective (beautiful, clever, and cunning as a fox). If the basis of comparison is presented by a verb, then the deep analysis of the broadcast semantics as the described action can have various shade concluded in a comparison standard is required. In that case it is not always possible to speak about a synonymy. So *to wander* steady comparison *aimlessly* designates external perception of the person who does not find to himself tranquility because of internal torments; steady comparison *to go as the thread behind a needle* indicates an image of action - one subject goes behind other subject everywhere. The given steady comparisons are not synonyms as transfer various concepts, despite a comparison basis community.

Also the subject connection is important. So, steady comparisons, having identical semantics, can belong to women's or to a male that deprives of unit of the synonymic relations: expressions *as an elephant, as a bear* are aimed at the characteristic of the clumsy man whereas comparison *as a mortar* are applied in relation to a female. Therefore, different subject domains do not give the grounds for development of the synonymous relations.

Let's consider a synonymic row with silly value which consists of 11 steady comparisons: *silly as a ram, silly as a log (colloquial, contemptuous), stupid as the oak (colloquial, contemptuous about the man, extremely silly), is silly as a gray gelding (colloquial, contemptuous), silly as a donkey, silly as a goose (colloquial, contemptuous), silly as a stub (colloquial, contemptuous) as a stopper (contemptuous) as a log (colloquial, contemptuous) as a block (чурбак, a chock), stupid as the Siberian valenok (colloquial, contemptuous).*

As we can notice, from 11 comparative of 9 units have stylistic to dung colloquial, contemptuous that defines at once the sphere of the use of language unit (Bochina, 2016; Spiridonov, 2016; Ukhanova, 2016). 1 unit has strictly limited scope of application

- *stupid as an oak*, is applied only in relation to the man. Other comparative have no dung concerning gender application (Bochina, 2014).

Moreover, a number of units as the basis of comparison has an adjective *silly*, and remained the basis *stupid*. We understand them as synonyms as according to Ojegov's dictionary, *silly* and *stupid* synonyms. *Silly* it is understood as "1. with limited abilities, slow, confused. 2. Not finding mind, deprived of reasonable pithiness, expediency" (<http://slovarozhegova.ru/word.php?wordid=5275>); *stupid* is treated as "... 4. Deprived of sharp perception, slow, and also confirming intellectual limitation (<http://slovarozhegova.ru/word.php?wordid=32509>).

The general semi two lexemes "slow-wittedness" is, as gives to us the grounds to speak about development of the synonymous relations in system of comparative.

The given numerous number of comparative with synonymous semantics naturally puts us before a question of frequency and the nature of applying each of them. In this regard we analyzed the national case of Russian (further NKRY) regarding relevance of the comparative found in it. We obtained the following data.

Steady comparisons *silly as the ram, is silly as a donkey* are found on 2 times in NKRY: *Another, Alexey Petrovich Choubin, was pathetic, insignificant creation, lascivious as a cat, silly as a ram.* (F. F. Vigel. Notes (1850-1860), *both of you well also do that are compliant; but as for to Grabshaufel, he how many I know, the real German; that is it is silly as the ram, is angry as he a monkey, and is stubborn as the Ukrainian bull!* (V. T. Narezchny. Russian Zhilblaz, or Adventures of the prince Gavriila Simonovich Chistyakov (1814). Important feature of these comparative is their use in texts of the 19th century, and also an connection to a male that was not recorded in dictionaries of comparisons.

Steady comparisons *it is silly as a gray gelding, is silly as a donkey* meet on 3 times in NKRY: *Be silent, Rakhmanov, you are silly as a gray gelding.* (A. K. Tolstoy. From comic letters to N. V. Adlerberg (1837-1838); *And tell, — Gosha at Zhorik, — questioned that Egor is silly as a donkey.* (Ildar Abuzyarov. An offensive language (2002), *A here, look, Vera, someone wrote: "here Murchik — was fresh as a cucumber", and another added: "also he is silly as a donkey!"* (P. N. Krasnov. From Two-headed Eagle to a red banner (the book 1) (1922). As we can notice, the use of these comparative is dated the 20th, 21st centuries that indicates the modern nature of comparisons. The subject connection remains focused on males.

Comparison with a goose meets once and is rather modern: *She will make even that she exceeds its forces, and right there will die of diligence ... Speak still: it is silly as a goose ... And it is cleverer than this bird is not present on light.* (A. I. Kuprin. (1927).

We connect a frontage of the comparative given above to a male with a comparison standard - a men's individual of an animal (*as a donkey, as a goose, as a ram, as a gray gelding*). Perhaps, comparison with the male defines a subject connection. So, similar comparison in relation to a feminine gender unnaturally sounds: *It is stupid as a ram / donkey*, the grammatical form of the used noun a priori indicates noun gender. Moreover, the comparisons designated as standards have the suppletive forms of a feminine gender (a ram - a sheep). This fact found reflection and in NKRY: *With submissively the dropped eyes in which the shame burned now he silently listened to reproaches of the wife, quiet and stupid as he a sheep, went to himself to the room and there was locked.* (Maxim Gorky. Foma Gordeev (1899). However in the dictionary of steady comparisons comparison *silly as a sheep* is not recorded.

4 Summary

The inanimate object, in particular part of a tree or product from it also can act as a standard of comparison (a stopper, a block, a log, an oak, etc.).

Steady comparisons with an oak, log are not recorded in NKRY. 4 offers where steady comparison is used are revealed *it is silly as a log: Only also happiness, who is silly as the log, does not think of anything climbs to that, does nothing*". (Alexander Voronsky. Gogol (1934), *A, that it is silly as a log, so it is right.* (A. F. Pisemsky. Whether it is guilty? (1855), *It, maybe, and well treats the patients, nevertheless ... it is silly as a log*". (F. M. Dostoyevsky. The double (1846), *Is just the man, silly as a log and which has in a pocket the most fair capital.* (A. I. Ertel. Stepyak's notes (1883). The listed examples from works of art are also dated the 19th century and concern to the male.

The stub as a standard of comparison is used twice: *Yes, but Rayumsdal is silly as a stub, — the Moon was surprised.* (Andrey Belyanin. Furious landgrave (1999). And the use belongs to the end of the XX century.

The most popular is comparison with a stopper (7 examples are revealed): *Mischa, you are silly as a stopper", — and he shrank and made similar to the beaten doggie.* (Vladimir Shakhidjanyan. 1001 questions about IT (No. No. 501-1001) (1999). It is remarkable that in this example the instruction on slow-wittedness by means of comparison is used in relation to the interlocutor that did not meet earlier: generally similar comparisons are used at the characteristic of the third party who is not participating in dialogue.

The appeal to a female was revealed in the analysis of functioning of a comparative *stupid as a log: Nothing, except stupid, as a log, thoughts that this someone else's book is not necessary to me.* (Anatoly Pristavkin. Little cuckoos or a plaintive song for calm of heart (1992). However it is important to emphasize that the characteristic concerns not an animate object, but a subject inanimate, abstract.

5 Conclusion

Thus, steady comparisons of Russian of the micro-field "slow-wittedness" represent quite numerous row. Act as standards of comparison or the name of animals: goose, donkey, ram, gray gelding, or names of a tree, its parts and wooden products: (oak, log, stopper, stub, chock, block). Many of comparative of this group have to a dung colloquial, contemptuous that limits the sphere of their use. In the national case of Russian each of comparative is presented not more often than 2-3 times. The most numerous is the use of a comparative stupid as an owl. Feature of steady comparisons of this semantics is their implicit frontage to a male. The appeal to a female meets seldom and demands change of the addressee (this situation concerns the standards of comparison presented by names of animals). Disputable is also a question of the reason of distribution of this characteristic on males.

Acknowledgement

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

1. Arsenteva E.E., Arsenteyeva Y.S. *Discoursal Analysis of Phraseological Euphemisms: Experimental Data in Teaching English//The Social Sciences*, 2016, 11(6), pp 1042-1048.
2. Bochina T.G., Jing Jing, Yapparova V.N. *Stylistic devices of contrast in poetry of Alexander Pushkin and Evgeny Baratynsky*. Journal of Language and Literature. 2016. Vol. 7. No. 1, pp 194-198.

3. Bochina T.G., Miftakhova A.N. *Gender interpretation of an image of the man in the RuNet//XLinguae* European Scientific Language Journal. 2014, - V. 7, No. 1, - pp. 2-14.
4. Fernando C.. *Idioms and Idiomaticity*. Oxford. University Press, 1996. pp 256.
5. Gibbs R.W. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding*. Cambridge University Press. 1994. pp 527.
6. Gilazetdinova G. K., Edikhanov I. Z., Aminova A.A. *Problems of Ethno-cultural Identity and cross-language communication*. Journal of Language and Literature. 2014. Vol.5 (3) . Pp. 39-42.
7. Kunin A.V. *The Course of Phraseology of Modern English*. Moscow. Fenix. 1996. pp 123.
8. Melerovich A.M., Mokienko V.M. 2001. *Phraseologisms in Russian Speech. Russian Dictionaries*. Astrel. Moscow. 2001, pp 210.
9. Nacional'nyy korpus russkogo yazyka. (*Russian Language national corpus*). URL: <<http://ruscorpora.ru/>> (accessed 17.04.2017). (In Russian)
10. Ogol'cev V.M. *Slovar' ustoychivyh sravneniy russkogo yazyka*. AST. Astrel. Moscow. 2015. pp 917.
11. Ozhegov S.I. *Tolkovyy slovar russkogo yazyka*.//URL <<http://slovarozhegova.ru/word.php?wordid=32509>> (date of the address 10.11.2016)
12. Safin I.Kh., Byckova T.A., Kolosova E.I. *Linguocultural semiotic concept "Language" in Russian, Polish and English Languages*. Journal of Language and Literature. 2016. Vol.7. No. 2. pp. 237-240.
13. Spiridonov A.V., Khabibullina E.V. *Occasional Derivation as a Way of Era Language Stylization in V. Aksyonov's novel "Voltairens and Voltairiennes"*. Journal of Language and Literature. 2016. Vol.7. No.1. pp. 219-222.
14. Ukhanova T.V., Kosova V.A. *Russian Adjectives with Confixes from an anthropocentric viewpoint*. Journal of Language and Literature. 2016. Vol. 7. No. 2. pp. 386 - 331.