Hanna SADOVA,

orcid.org/0000-0001-8412-3865

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the English Language and Literature Department
V. O. Sukhomlynskyi Mykolaiv National University
(Mykolaiv, Ukraine) anna123sadova@gmail.com

COMPARATIVE MODEL CONJUNCTION VERBALIZERS IN FOLKLORE DISCOURSE

The article describes the comparative model in folklore discourse in terms of the role of its verbalizers for the reality perception and interpretation. Folklore discourse is described as a special type of collective communicative activity, characterized by social purposefulness and conditioned by extra-linguistic factors. The purpose of the article is to describe the specifics of folklore discourse comparative models as one of the reality reflection forms verbalized with the help of conjunctions. It has been revealed that comparative proverbs not only reflect typical schemes of comparison formation, but also have some features of both structural organization and semantic content associated with these folklore genre specifics.

The analysis of wide array of proverbs has shown their semantic diversity associated with conjunction verbalizers “будто, словно, ровно, точно / as if, like; as though”. This is due to the fact that comparison contains many shades: comparison itself, matching, assumptions, possibilities, desirability, and unreality. Semantically interpreting the comparison prototype, conjunctions act as elementary content potential carriers.

It has been established that in folklore discourse the comparative model is verbalized with characteristic conjunction constructions. Conjunction verbalizers determine object and prototype comparison laws based on their figurative rethinking. In accordance with the patterns presented in the relationships between various combinations of compared entities, mechanisms forming a lexical metaphor are implemented in folklore discourse. It has been discovered that the comparison is carried out on the basis of various visual and auditory images, which can be clearly presented, and can be objectified by means of a certain situation. In comparative models with conjunction verbalizers “будто, словно, ровно, точно / as if, like; as though” attention is mainly focused on comparing objects based on their external features. The image, on the basis of which the metaphorical transfer is carried out, can be supported by a clarifying predicate of quality or presented as an initial phraseological unit. The proposed research is promising for understanding the semantic category of comparability and its explication in folklore discourse as a comparative model of the world.

Key words: comparative proverb, metaphor, metaphorical transference, conjunction, conjunction verbalizer, folklore discourse.

Ганна САДОВА,

orcid.org/0000-0001-8412-3865

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри англійської мови і літератури
Миколаївського національного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського
(Миколаїв, Україна) anna123sadova@gmail.com

СПОЛУЧНИКОВІ ВЕРБАЛІЗАТОРИ КОМПАРАТИВНОЇ МОДЕЛІ У ФОЛЬКЛОРНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

У статті охарактеризовано компаративну модель у фольклорному дискурсі в аспекті ролі її вербалізаторів для сприйняття та інтерпретації дійсності. Фольклорний дискурс описано як колективну комунікативну діяльність особливого типу, що характеризується соціальною цілеспрямованістю і зумовлена позамовними чинниками. Мета статті – описати специфіку компаративних моделей фольклорного дискурсу як однієї з форм відображення дійсності, що вербалізується за допомогою сполучників. Виявлено, що компаративні паремії не лише відображають типові схеми побудови порівняння, але й мають деякі особливості структурної організації, а також змістового наповнення, що пов'язано зі специфікою цього фольклорного жанру.

Звернення до широкого масиву паремій показало їх семантичну різноманітність, що пов'язана зі сполучниковими вербалізаторами «будто, словно, ровно, точно / немов, ніби, рівно, точно». Це зумовлене тим, що порівняння містить безліч відтінків: власне порівняння, зіставлення, припущення, можливості, бажаності, ірреальності. Семантично інтерпретуючи прототип порівняння, сполучники виступають потенційними носіями елементарного змісту.

Встановлено, що компаративна модель вербалізується у фольклорному дискурсі характерними сполучниковими конструкціями. Сполучникові вербалізатори зумовлюють закони порівняння предмета і прототипу з опорою на їх образне переосмислення. Відповідно до закономірностей, що подаються у взаємозв'язках між різними комбінаціями зіставлених сутностей, у фольклорному дискурсі реалізуються механізми, що формують лексичну метафору. Виявлено, що зіставлення здійснюється на підставі різних зорових і слухових образів, які можуть бути чітко представленими або об'єктивуватися за допомогою певної ситуації. У компаративних моделях зі сполучниковими вербалізаторами «будто, словно, ровно, точно / немов, ніби, рівно, точно» переважно акцентується увага на порівнянні предметів на підставі їх зовнішніх ознак. Образ, на основі якого здійснюється метафоричний перенос, може підкріплюватися уточнюючим предикатом якості або подаватися вихідним фразеологізмом. Пропоноване дослідження є перспективним для розуміння семантичної категорії компаративності й експлікації її у фольклорний дискурс як компаративної моделі світу.

Ключові слова: компаративна паремія, метафора, метафоричний перенос, сполучник, сполучниковий вербалізатор, фольклорний дискурс.

Statement of the problem. Folklore discourse is a specific entity that is realized in different stable communicative situations occurring in different spheres of human activity, therefore, the problem of its description, although covered in modern science (Kolistratova, 2012, Semenenko, 2011, Emer, 2010, etc.), does not find a clear-cut solution. It appears as a collective communicative activity of a special type, characterized by social purposefulness and conditioned by extra-linguistic factors.

The representation of reality given in folklore discourse contains behavioral standards in typical life situations, ethical norms (Abdrashitova, 2015: 46). Each genre in its own way represents general folkloric cognitive attitudes and models a special world picture. One of the brightest realizations of reality models are comparative proverbs, which not only reflect typical schemes of comparison formation, but also have some features of both structural organization and semantic content associated with these folklore genre specifics.

Since all proverbs are based on the correlation of the external semantic form with the internal one, comparison always runs through the proverb. Thus, the analysis of proverbs based on comparison – a kind of correlation – is interesting not only for describing the comparative model, but also for interpreting the specifics of proverbs as components of folklore discourse.

Research analysis. Comparability is known to be a semantic category that represents the opposition of meanings that are expressed by linguistic means and perform a comparative function regardless of the external environment. Comparative constructions have received a fairly wide coverage in the scientific linguistic literature (Cheremisina, 1976). The analysis of comparative formations in the context of the picture of the world (V. N. Teliya, N. P. Tropina, A. D. Shmelev, etc.) is carried out; the comparative model in particular authors' works (O. P. Kozel, I. Yu. Kocheshkova, and etc.) is investigated. However, the theoretical understanding of the compara-

tive model in folklore discourse requires attention in terms of its verbalizers' role for the reality perception and interpretation.

The purpose of the article is to describe the specifics of folklore discourse comparative models as one of the reality reflection forms verbalized with the help of conjunctions. The research material was proverbs from V. Dahl's collection (Dahl, 1989). Analysis of the vast array of proverbs with conjunctions has shown a significant frequency of formations with conjunctions *словно, будто, ровно, точно / like; as if, as though* (301 units out of 483 comparative conjunction proverbs). Resting on V. I. Kononenko's (Kononenko, 1970) and M. I. Cheremisina's (Cheremisina, 1976) researches, we follow O. P. Kozel and use terms "prototype", "object" and "basis" (Kozel, 2001) to describe comparative models.

Presenting main material. The analysis of a wide array of proverbs has shown their semantic diversity associated with conjunction verbalizers. This is due to the fact that comparison contains many shades: comparison itself, matching, assumptions, possibilities, desirability, and unreality. Semantically interpreting the comparison prototype, conjunctions act as elementary content potential carriers.

A. Vezhbetskaya and her followers point to the semantic discrepancies of conjunction verbalizers. Observation on the semantics of constructions with conjunctions "*как and будто / like and as if, as though*" shows that the former is characterized by the assimilation of entities in their quality, and assimilation in their image are typical for the latter. For the former, the explication proposed by A. Vezhbetskaya is possible: «А на звон колокольчика, как при дуновении ветра, склоняются все головы, как колосья в поле. = А на звон колокольчика склоняются все головы – можно сказать, что это могли бы быть колосья в поле, склоняющиеся при дуновении ветра»/“And to the ringing of a bell, as when the wind blows, all heads bow, as ears in the field. = And all heads bow to the ringing of the bell – we can say that it could be ears of corn in a field, bowing in the wind” (Vezh-

bitskaya, 1990: 144). A different explication seems to be applicable for constructions with the conjunction *будто* (as if, as though): «Утекла так, как будто была золотой рыбкой, издали заметившей всплеск поплавка. = Она бежала, – можно сказать, что это могла бы быть не девушка, а золотая рыбка, которая издали заметила всплеск поплавка»/ “It flowed as if it were a goldfish, which noticed a splash of the float from afar. = She was running – we can say that it could not have been a girl, but a goldfish, which noticed the splash of the float from a distance” (Vezhbitskaya, 1990: 145).

This idea is developed by O. Kozel, who also notes that in modern Russian there is a semantic heterogeneity of constructions with conjunctions *как* and *будто/like and as if, as though*: “When we say: *Я думаю, что он слон, В моем представлении он слон* / *I think that he is an elephant, In my view he is an elephant*, we always mean inaccuracy of identifications: He is definitely not an elephant, but a person resembling a quality or imaginative elephant ... When we say: *Он как слон* / *He is like an elephant*, we understand that someone has the characteristics of an elephant (attributes out of context are indefinite – this may be a size, features of behavior, intelligence, etc.): He is (big, behavioral, intelligent) like (big, behavior, intelligence) an elephant. When in a statement we hear: He is like an elephant, then the first reaction to these words is the understanding that we are talking about the size, about the image of the subject of the statement” (Kozel, 2001: 54). These examples demonstrate two types of comparisons which are “qualitative” and “figurative”, closer to the metaphor, as a result of which the explication “I see (imagine) him as if he were an elephant” cannot be transformed “I see (imagine) him as he is an elephant” (Kozel, 2001: 54).

The aforementioned semantic features of constructions with the conjunction verbalizer *будто* (as if, as though), in which it is mainly about the possibility of perceiving one situation through the image of another, leave a mark on the form of proverbs. The proverbs, actualized with the help of the conjunction *будто* (as if, as though), as well as the synonymous conjunctions *словно, ровно, точно* / *like* are of interest in terms of consideration in a metaphorical aspect, since, as it has been discovered, they are the most figurative and, accordingly, the closest to the metaphor.

The unification of components in comparative models is based on a variety of metaphorical transferences (Sadovaya, 2006: 12). Since, as it is known, in cases of metaphorical reading there is an act of representation, for constructions with verbalizers *словно, будто, ровно, точно* / *like; as if, as though* in our

opinion, the following explication would be adequate: * *P1 seems like P2 on the basis of X feature*, in which P1 is the subject of comparison, P2 is the prototype of comparison.

The ultimate generalization of the folklore word semantics is determined by the generalization of folklore images. In the comparative model of folklore discourse, the comparison takes place on the basis of various visual images. This is, firstly, “the exterior look”, and secondly, “what is drawn, presented to the inner view, someone’s imagination” (SRYa I, 1981: 599).

Such comparative formations are the linguistic embodiment of the imagery and commonality of the underlying cognitive processes. The extending elements in these proverbs not only concretize and narrow the meanings of the compared entities, but also serve to create rhyme. In this case, there is a metaphorical transfer of «живому – живое»: *Тут в горе – ровно кит в море; «неживому – живое»: Рогожка рядная – словно матушка родная; «живому – неживое»: То-то носина, словно соборное гасило.* / “animate – animate”: Titus in grief is like a whale in the sea; “inanimate – animate”: The straw-mat is like a dear mother; “animate – inanimate”: That nose resembles the cathedral hasilo (a kind of weapon). Here the comparison is carried out on the basis of a certain visual image: * Titus looks like a whale, * The straw-mat seems to be a mother, * The nose seems to be hasilo (a kind of weapon). The visual image can be supported by a qualifying predicate of quality. So, in the proverb *Уха сладка, варяя гладка, будто ягодка* / *Fish soup is sweet, the broth is smooth, as if a berry* the meaning *гладкий (smooth)* is, “without protrusions, depressions and roughness; smooth” (SRYa I, 1981: 312) clarifies the image of a berry with which the comparison is made: * *The broth appears as if it were a berry on the basis of smoothness.*

The visual image can be represented by the original phraseological unit. So, the proverb *Письмо – словно куры набродили* / *The handwriting is as if chickens were wandering*, contains a transformed phraseological unit *как курица лапой* / *like a chicken has written with its foot* meaning “illegible, so that it is impossible to understand” (FSRYa, 1967: 218), as a result of which the basis for comparison is the common seme contained in the meanings of the lexemes of the letter – “skill, writing skills; the system of graphic signs used for writing; writing; paper with written text, sent to someone to communicate something, to communicate with someone at a distance, as well as the corresponding mailing” (SRYa III, 1983: 127) and *бродить* / *wander* that is “a movement that is repeated, occurring in different direc-

tions or at different times” (SRYa I, 1981: 116). As a result of the interaction of these three meanings in the proverb, a visual image of a certain illegible, incomprehensible, chaotic writing performed in different directions is formed. Compare also: *В доме-то у них словно Мамай воевал/ In their house, it was as if Mamai fought* on the basis of phraseological units *как будто Мамай прошел/as if Mamai had passed* means “a complete disorder, chaos, terrible devastation somewhere” (FSRYa, 1967: 237). The prototype of the comparison gives either a clearly visual image or a situation leading to it.

The tendency of the figurative representation can also be traced when comparing situations in proverbs: *Идет, словно павлишка плывет, Стал, словно вкопанный, словно к земле прирос, Сгинул да пропал, словно в воду упал, Бежит от дому, будто черт от грома, Путает, словно кашу в лапти обувает, Обошел, словно мертвой рукой обвел./ One walks like a peafowl goes; One stood as if rooted to the ground; One has disappeared as if one has fallen into the water; One runs from home like a devil from thunder; One confuses like a mess in straw shoes; One walked around, as if with a dead hand circled.* When comparing situations based on a visual image, the object of comparison is often represented by a fixed phraseological unit. So, proverbs *Пишет словно разводы разводит, Бежит, словно под ним земля горит/One writes like speaks at length; One runs, as if the earth is on fire underneath* are built on the basis of phraseological units *разводить разводы* that is “to speak at length, wordy” (FSRYa, 1967: 378), *земля горит под ногами* that is “someone is forced to quickly, swiftly run away” (FSRYa, 1967: 123).

Entity matching can also be performed based on the auditory image. The image can be understood as “the result of the subject’s reflective (cognitive) activity, the reflection of objects, phenomena of objective reality in the mind” (DRL II, 1981: 599). The identification of the comparison basis is facilitated by the situation represented by the comparison prototype.

So, for example, in the proverb *Голос словно из бочки/Voice as if from a barrel*, the basis of comparison is explicated from the situation *из бочки/ from the barrel*, that is, dull, low, drawlingly: * The sound of a voice seems to be a sound coming from the barrel, based on deafness, and a long drawn out manner. Compare: *Слово вымолвит, ровно жвачку пережует/ The word will utter, as if he will chew the chewing gum*, etc., and also *Говорит, словно в стену горохом сыплет/ One says, as if pours peas into the wall* on the basis of the phraseological unit *как в стену горохом/ like peas against the wall*, which means “does not affect, does not have any effect on anyone (anything said)” (FSRYa, 1967: 118). At the same time, there is no clear definition between thematic groups of vocabulary and figurative meaning. This is explained by the peculiarities of folklore: orality, anonymity, collective authorship, variability, the evolution of the figurative system, etc.

Conclusions. Thus, in folklore discourse the comparative model is verbalized by the characteristic conjunction constructions. Conjunction verbalizers *будто, словно, ровно/ like; as if, as though* condition the laws of comparing the object and the prototype based on their figurative rethinking. In accordance with the patterns presented in the relationships between various combinations of compared entities, mechanisms that form a lexical metaphor are implemented in folklore discourse. The comparison is carried out on the basis of various visual and auditory images, which can be clearly presented, or can be objectified by means of a certain situation. In comparative models with conjunction verbalizers “*будто, словно, ровно, точно/ like; as if, as though*” attention is mainly focused on comparing objects based on their external features. The image, on the basis of which the metaphorical transfer is carried out, can be supported by a clarifying predicate of quality or presented as an initial phraseological unit. The proposed research is promising for understanding the semantic category of comparability and its explication in folklore discourse as a comparative model of the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Абдрашитова М. О. Особенности репрезентации образа Томска как фрагмента субкультурной картины мира горожанина в современном фольклорном дискурсе. *Вестник науки Сибири*. 2015. № 1 (16). С. 46–54.
2. Даль В. И. Пословицы русского народа: в 2-х т. Москва : Художественная литература, 1989. 449 с.
3. Вежицкая А. Сравнение – градация – метафора. *Теория метафоры*. Москва : Прогресс, 1990. С. 133–152.
4. Козел О. П. Семантическая структура сравнений в современном русском языке. *Вісник Черкаського університету*. № 24: Філологічні науки. Черкаси, 2001. С. 53–55.
5. Колистратова А. В. О некоторых особенностях современного фольклорного дискурса. *Вестник Иркутского государственного лингвистического университета*. 2012. № 13. Т. 1. С. 134–139.
6. Кононенко В. И. Синонимика синтаксических конструкций в современном русском языке. Киев : Наукова думка, 1970. 143 с.
7. Садова Г. Ю. Семантико-синтаксична організація компаративних паремій : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.02. Київ : Інститут мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні НАН України, 2006. 19 с.

8. Семенов Н. Н. Когнитивно-прагматическая парадигма паремической семантики (на материале русского языка) : автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.01. Белгород, 2011. 46 с.
9. Словарь русского языка: в 4-х т. / под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. Москва : Русский язык, 1981–1984. 567 с.
10. Фразеологический словарь русского языка / сост. Л. А. Войнова, В. П. Жуков, А. И. Молотков и др. / под ред. А. И. Молоткова. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1967. 543 с.
11. Черемисина М. И. Сравнительные конструкции русского языка. Новосибирск : Издательство Новосибирского университета, 1976. 270 с.
12. Эмер Ю. А. Фольклорный концепт: жанрово-дискурсивный аспект. *Вестник Томского государственного университета. Филология*. 2010. № 1. С. 91–99.

REFERENCES

1. Abdrashitova M. O. Osobennosti reprezentatsii obraza Tomska kak fragmenta subkul'turnoy kartiny mira gorozhanina v sovremennom fol'klornom diskurse [Features of the representation of Tomsk image as a fragment of the subcultural picture of the world of a city dweller in modern folklore discourse]. *Bulletin of Science of Siberia*. 2015. No. 1 (16). Pp. 46–54 [in Russian].
2. Dahl V. I. Poslovitsy russkogo naroda v 2 tomakh: [Proverbs of the Russian people: in 2 volumes]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura, 1989. 449 p. [in Russian].
3. Vezhbitskaya A. Sravnenie – gradatsiya – metafora. Teoriya metafory [Comparison – gradation – metaphor. Metaphor theory] Moscow: Progress, 1990. Pp. 133–152 [in Russian].
4. Kozel O. P. Semanticheskaya struktura sravneniy v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Semantic structure of comparisons in modern Russian language]. *Bulletin of Cherkasy University*. No. 24: Philological sciences. Cherkasy, 2001. Pp. 53–55 [in Russian].
5. Koliyatova A. V. O nekotorykh osobennostyakh sovremennogo fol'klornogo diskursa [About some features of modern folklore discourse]. *Bulletin of Irkutsk State Linguistic University*. 2012. No. 13. V. 1. Pp. 134–139 [in Russian].
6. Kononenko V. I. Sinonimika sintaksicheskikh konstruktsiy v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Synonymous syntactic structures in modern Russian language]. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1970. 143 p [in Russian].
7. Sadova G. Yu. Semantyko-syntaktychna orhanizatsiia komparatyvnykh paremiy [Semantic-syntactic organization of comparative proverbs]: author. dis. ... Cand. Philol. Sciences: 10.02.02. Kiev: Potebnia Institute of Linguistics NAS of Ukraine, 2006. 19 p [in Ukrainian].
8. Semenenko N. N. Kognitivno-pragmaticheskaya paradigma paremicheskoy semantiki (na materiale russkogo yazyka) [Cognitive-pragmatic paradigm of proverb semantics (based on the Russian language)]: author. dis. ... Dr. Philol. Sciences: 10.02.01. Belgorod, 2011. 46 p [in Russian].
9. Slovar' russkogo yazyka: v 4-kh t. [Dictionary of the Russian language: in 4 volumes] / ed. A. P. Evgenieva. 2nd ed., rev. and add. Moscow: Russian language, 1981–1984. 567 p [in Russian].
10. Frazheologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka [Phraseological dictionary of the Russian language] / comp. L. A. Voinova, V. P. Zhukov, A. I. Molotkov and others / ed. A. I. Molotkov. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopaedia, 1967. 543 p. [in Russian].
11. Cheremisina M. I. Sravnitel'nye konstruktsii russkogo yazyka. [Comparative constructions of the Russian language]. Novosibirsk: Novosibirsk University Press, 1976. 270 p. [in Russian].
12. Emer Yu. A. Fol'klorny kontsept: zhanrovo-diskursivnyy aspekt [Folklore concept: genre-discursive aspect]. *Bulletin of Tomsk State University. Philology*. 2010. No. 1. Pp. 91–99 [in Russian].