

DOI : 10.33274/2079-4835-2022-25-2-71-79

UDC: 81'1/4

Udovichenko H. M.,
PhD in Pedagogical
sciences,
Associate Professor

Mykhailo Tuhan-Baranovskyi Donetsk National University
of Economics and Trade, Kryvyi Rih, Ukraine,
e-mail: udovichenko@donnuet.edu.ua,
ORCID: 0000-0003-3731-0857

Mysnik Ya. S.,
Student

e-mail: mysnik_ys@donnuet.edu.ua

BASIC APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF COMPARISON IN LINGUISTICS

УДК: 81'1/4

Удовіченко Г. М.,
канд. пед. наук,
доцент

Донецький національний університет економіки і торгівлі
імені Михайла Туган-Барановського,
м. Кривий Ріг, Україна,
e-mail: udovichenko@donnuet.edu.ua,
ORCID: 0000-0003-3731-0857

Миснік Я. С.,
студент

e-mail: mysnik_ys@donnuet.edu.ua

ОСНОВНІ ПІДХОДИ ДО ВИВЧЕННЯ ПОРІВНЯННЯ В МОВОЗНАВСТВІ

Objective. *The objective of the article is to determine the the basic approaches to the study of comparison in linguistics.*

Methods. *The main scientific results are obtained applying a set of general scientific and special methods of research, namely: analysis and generalization of scientific literature on the problems of comparison in linguistics; theoretical generalization, analysis and synthesis; holistic and integral approaches to the study of comparison in linguistics; comparative, descriptive and analytical methods.*

Results. *Comparison is defined to be the assimilation of the depicted objects, phenomena, facts. One more understanding of comparison is a figurative lexical expression, the base of which is the comparison of two objects, phenomena etc., after consideration of which the perception of the first phenomena is enhanced by emphasizing its characteristics and properties. Some may imply the presence of the following properties in comparison: the separate communication of the compared concepts, the dissected nomination, structurality, semantic multifunctionality, polyfunctionality.*

Comparisons can be typologized based on various bases — of which structures, semantics, stable connectedness of elements, their functional characteristics, etc. Each of the classifications is important both for understanding the linguistic essence of comparison, and for a full analysis of comparative constructions in the language of a particular writer. In comparison with other tropes, comparison is characterized by a wide variety of structural organization. The classic division of comparisons into simple and sustained similes is important for a stylistic analysis of the literary text, in which both simple and sustained similes comparative constructions can play a significant role, obeying the author's communicative plan.

Comparison is a trope that is formed on a figurative comparison of two objects or phenomena and is a three-membered structure consisting of an explicit subject, an object and a comparative modulator. Other scientists distinguish two types of comparisons from the point of view of semantics. To the first group, they refer neutral comparisons, specific ones, with the help of which the speaker recreates the objectively existing characteristics of phenomena. The second group of comparisons includes tropes that have an evaluative element or stylistic

cally expressive content components. According to classification developed by K. Fromilheig, objective and subjective comparisons are distinguished. Objective comparisons are created by the speaker on the basis of specific physical experience, while subjective ones follow from individual associations.

Under stable comparisons, or comparative phraseological units (CPU), phraseological units (PU) of comparative semantics are usually understood. They have a pronounced evaluative function — the evaluation can be both positive and negative. Stable comparisons are characterized by the following properties of phraseological units: stability, motivation (as phraseological units), expressiveness, reproducibility. The main feature of sustainable comparisons is the usual rather than occasional figurativeness of individual comparisons. An important clarification about CPU is made, noting that they perform an amplifying function compared to metaphorical tropes, in which this function is expressed more implicitly.

Key words: *comparison, trope, comparative phraseological units, phraseological units.*

Introduction. The comparison is defined as the assimilation of the depicted objects, phenomena, facts, phenomena, well recognized audience, and as a result of such a comparison, the described phenomenon becomes more specific, obvious and expressive by Slavic researchers. A comparison can also be understood as a figurative lexical expression, which is based on a comparison of two objects, phenomena, etc., as a result of which the perception of the first phenomenon is enhanced by emphasizing specific characteristics and properties. Some of them imply the presence of the following properties in comparison: the separate communication of the compared concepts, the dissected nomination, structurality, semantic multifunctionality, polyfunctionality.

The **objective** of the article is to determine the basic approaches to the study of comparison in linguistics.

Methods . The main scientific results are obtained applying a set of general scientific and special methods of research, namely: analysis and generalization of scientific literature on the problems of comparison in linguistics; theoretical generalization, analysis and synthesis; holistic and integral approaches to the study of comparison in linguistics; comparative, descriptive and analytical methods.

Results and Discussions. Foreign researchers are unanimous with domestic scientists in understanding the comparison as a tool with which the similarity of two concepts is established. In the work of the foreign researcher S. Shamisa, the comparison is defined as the assertion of the similarity of two objects in one or more qualities, that is, a comparison is a figure of speech that requires a clear connection between an object, subject and design that connects them [5, p. 2]. Comparison in English is most often understood as a figure of speech, with the help of which the speaker compares two different objects to identify their similarities using the words *like* or *as* [3, p. 56].

So, the comparison is a phenomenon that is well studied in domestic and foreign linguistics. There are a large number of definitions of this trope, however, their uniformity and the fact that in most cases the essence of comparison is reduced to the function of comparing objects, phenomena, persons, etc., should be noted. The most complete, in our opinion, is the definition developed in studies of scientists, and by comparison, we will understand, following them, “trope, in which two unrelated concepts, usually related to different classes of phenomena, are compared with each other according to any one of the characteristics” [1].

Next, we turn to the consideration of the existing classifications of comparisons, paying attention to how different types of comparison help researchers to understand the linguistic essence of this phenomenon, as well as the features of its functioning in the text belonging to a particular author.

Comparisons can be typologized based on various bases — of which structures, semantics, stable connectedness of elements, their functional characteristics, etc. Each of the classifications is important both for understanding the linguistic essence of comparison, and for a full analysis of comparative constructions in the language of a particular writer. The main division — structural and semantic — follows from the presence of two bond components in each linguistic phenomenon — an expression plan (structure, structure, outer shell) and a plan of content (semantics, meaning). In addition, taking into account the structural and semantic characteristics is of particular importance for highlighting the types of stable units, since a stable nature can be acquired over time in the language both formal and substantial components of the analyzed phenomenon.

In comparison with other tropes, comparison are characterized by a wide variety of structural organization. Despite the versatility of comparison as a category, in various languages it has a specific structure. In the Ukrainian language, comparisons can be expressed by complete and incomplete comparative subordinate, comparative degree with conjunction *as*, *as if*, *as if*, *precisely*, etc.; a noun in the ablative case (burns with fire); comparative degree of the name of the adjective or adverbs (faster than wind); comparative adjectives (ivory-like) and adverbs; predicates (house like a fortress), etc.

There are comparisons that use words in their structure: *similar*, *to*, comparative verbs (*reminiscent*) and other operators. Some classifications distributes the types of comparisons in the Ukrainian language into six groups: comparative expressions with conjunctions *as if*, *for sure*, etc.; comparative subordinate clauses characterized by the presence of the subject and predicate; comparisons in the ablative case, which are synonyms of comparative phrases; comparisons in the genitive case in combination with the comparative degree of the adjective; comparisons formed by the adjective *similar*, synonymous to the conjunction *as*; detailed comparisons, which are usually formed from two independent sentences.

In English, the words *like*, *as*, *as ... as*, *seem*, *remind of*, *give appearance of*, *as if* and others most often act as comparison operators. It notes that comparison in English can be expressed using comparative phrases or subordinate comparative sentences. Binding words, *like* and *as* comparison operators in the structure of comparison significantly affect the transmission of the degree of similarity of the compared phenomena. When using them, the degree of comparison is incomparably higher than in designs with other operators such as *remind of*, *give appearance of*, *as if*, which, characterizing the correspondence between the compared objects, simultaneously indicate an incomplete similarity. In comparisons using these words, there is a limited similarity, which is facilitated by the subject-logical meanings that they retain, considering the syntax and semantics of figurative comparison, distinguishes five structural types of comparison, differing both in the syntactic structure of the designated (theme) and denoting (image) and syntactic-semantic relations between them.

In the classification proposed by another scientist, the following varieties of comparisons are described: unextended comparisons; common comparisons; comparisons, the image of which is expanded by involved participle and adverbial participial structures or subordinate clauses; repetition of comparisons; comparison-parallelism (characteristic of folk poetry).

By the number of indicated signs of the subject, simple and detailed comparisons are distinguished. In her opinion, “comparisons indicating a sign in compared objects are called simple”, and “comparisons that indicate several common signs in compared objects are called “sustained similes”

The classic division of comparisons into simple and sustained similes is important for a stylistic analysis of the literary text, in which both simple and sustained similes comparative constructions can play a significant role, obeying the author's communicative plan. It considers the structural organization of this trope as a classic model that includes a comparison ref-

erent (what is compared), a comparison agent (what is compared with), the base (sign) and a bunch of similarity (like, as if, as though...).

Despite the existing variety of structural types of comparisons, in most studies devoted to the analysis of the structural parameters of comparison, a three-term structure of this trope is distinguished. So, according to researchers, comparison is a trope that is formed on a figurative comparison of two objects or phenomena and is a three-membered structure consisting of an explicit subject, an object and a comparative modulator.

The subject is understood as an object compared with something; under the object is understood as the object with which something is compared; under the comparative modulator is understood as a language element indicating a comparison of subject and object. The most common comparisons, as a rule, reflect the norm of the language and consist of three parts: topics (what is compared), comparisons (what is compared with), a separate indication of what they have in common (base of comparison).

Scientists are highlighting the same structural elements, define them in other terms: the subject of comparison, the object of comparison, and the attribute (module) of comparison; object, image and sign. A number of researchers single out only two main components in the comparison structure. In particular, in some works, a description of the structure of comparison is given, according to which the word denoting the object or person being compared is called the object of comparison; the second comparison component is defined as the comparison term. The comparison may include an auxiliary element as an operator or a comparison modulator. In Ukrainian, it can be service words, independent parts of speech, word-building elements, etc. It believes that personal comparisons often have an indication of the object being compared (topic) and a description of the object with which they are compared. They focus on the following structural and grammatical varieties of figurative comparisons: three-member nominative, two-member nominative, two-member adjective, one-member verb.

If all elements are present, the comparison structure is explicit, if some of the components are absent, implied, then the structure is implicit. Semantic classification involves the analysis of the semantics of the phenomenon under consideration, the transmitted information, including evaluative and expressive. In the content aspect, comparisons can be erased and original. Comparisons that are regularly reproduced in speech and therefore lose their vivid imagery become erased. Original comparisons are inherent only to a particular author, reflect his worldview, his understanding of the surrounding reality. It is the original comparisons that act as special characteristics of the writer's idiostyle.

Slavic philologists divide comparisons in the semantic aspect into two groups:

1) exact comparisons, not burdened with evaluative elements, their distinguishing characteristic is the use in a neutral style;

2) comparisons that are characterized by an evaluative element, or comparisons used in a certain style. Analyzing the original comparisons, they believe that their main task is to describe the features of the phenomenon from different points of view, but most often they are used to create an original image of the phenomenon.

Another scientist also distinguishes two types of comparisons from the point of view of semantics. To the first group, she refers neutral comparisons, specific ones, with the help of which the speaker recreates the objectively existing characteristics of phenomena. Such comparisons, regardless of context, have the function of an objective informant. However, if a certain evaluative element is added to the objective information, the trope loses its neutral characteristic and passes into the second group. The second group of comparisons includes tropes that have an evaluative element or stylistically expressive content components. This group, in turn, can be divided into two subgroups:

1) traditional comparisons considered within the framework of lexicography;

- 2) individual comparisons, including:
 - a) traditional comparisons, expanded by a writer or journalist;
 - b) individual stylistic neologisms.

Along with the above semantic comparison typologies, there are other semantic classifications of comparisons.

In foreign studies, similar semantic types of comparisons are distinguished. There is a distinction between literal and non-literal comparisons. In non-literal comparisons, the agent and the referent belong to different conceptual spheres, and similarity markers cannot be discarded [4, p. 7].

According to another classification developed by K. Fromilheig, objective and subjective comparisons are distinguished. Objective comparisons are created by the speaker on the basis of specific physical experience, while subjective ones follow from individual associations. The researcher also explains the phenomenon of explicit and implicit comparisons. In an explicit comparison, the similarity marker or meaning is easily read. One has to think about the meaning of the implicit comparison [2, p. 8]. So, in the works of different researchers, there is a certain similarity in the selection of semantic types of comparisons. First of all, comparisons are differentiated into stable and individual. Individual ones are a product of the creativity of the person creating the comparison, while stable ones reflect the features of the usage.

Let's consider the latter in more detail. Under stable comparisons, or comparative phraseological units (hereinafter — CPU), phraseological units (hereinafter — PU) of comparative semantics are usually understood. They, as a rule, have a pronounced evaluative function, the evaluation can be both positive and negative. Stable comparisons are characterized by the following properties of phraseological units: stability, motivation (as phraseological units), expressiveness, reproducibility. This type of comparison refers to figurative phrases supported by the meanings of their constituent words. The main feature of sustainable comparisons is the usual rather than occasional figurativeness of individual comparisons. Stable comparisons are actively used in the language by any of its speakers and, as a rule, have lexicographic fixation. Not reflected in the dictionaries may be new CPU, recently entered into the usus. An important clarification about CPU is made by one linguist, noting that they perform an amplifying function compared to metaphorical tropes, in which this function is expressed more implicitly. In other words, in comparative phraseological units, the amplifying function dominates over the emotional-evaluative one.

The expanded classification of CPU that perform an amplifying function can be found in the works of different scientists. According to the semantic significance, they divide stable comparisons into four groups:

- 1) comparative structures, which are based on the physical properties of inanimate objects;
- 2) comparative structures in which the basis for comparison is a comparison with natural phenomena;
- 3) comparative structures associated with the names of the fauna representatives, the basis for comparison in them is the most obvious characteristics of the latter;
- 4) comparative allusions, including biblical and mythological plots.

Depending on the use or absence of alliteration, sustainable comparisons are divided by the researchers:

- 1) into the phraseological unit, in the structure of which alliteration is present;
- 2) PU without alliteration.

In the other study is distinguished by six thematic rows of CPU:

- 1) a description of the appearance of a person, his physical state and movements;
- 2) the character of a person, features of relations;

- 3) the parameters of the thinking and speech of a person;
- 4) social characteristics, the material situation of man;
- 5) the parameters of the emotional state of a person;
- 6) the features of inanimate objects, situations, natural phenomena.

When considering the structure of CPU, researchers determine as the main types of CPU adjective and verb units. Adverbial comparative phraseological units are not too numerous. Adjective CPU is usually considered as a separate type of phraseological units. Such comparisons, like the rest of the types of comparative structures, are characterized by tippable values: one is compared with the other. The main task of adjective comparisons in the text is the transmission of additional information.

CPU with adjectives that model the character of a person represent a large group in both Ukrainian and English. Such CPU can be divided into three main types — CPU of positive, CPU of negative and CPU of neutral assessment.

In the works devoted to the phraseology of the modern English language, scientists consider semantic characteristics that transform the component composition of adjective CPU. Adjective comparison is described by them as a system in which the first component is expressed by an adjective in a comparative degree and is usually used in a literal sense which means that CPU belong to the class of phraseological units with a partially revised meaning of the words included in it. They also note that a double referential correlation of CPU is possible. In this case, tropes can designate both characteristics of the phenomenon and characteristics of a person. Accordingly, it might be assumed that CPU can be units of a complete rethinking. Researchers argue that one of the most well-known structures of adjective CPU in English is the “*as conjunction + adjective + as conjunction + indefinite (or definite) article + noun (or phrase)*” model. Such a structure is able to convey specific relationships, describing the attribute of the referent and reflecting the degree of its involvement. In its semantics, this model is close to phrases with a conjunction as in Ukrainian.

Another type of CPU with the structure of a phrase is represented by verb units. The verb is the main element of these phraseological units. The connection between the main and dependent components of subordinate PU is always objective. In Ukrainian, an option of object communication is control, and in English — adjacency. In the group of verbal CPU expressed by the model “*V + comp + Adj + N*”, the conjunctions “like, as” act as a comparison component. Such a structure characterizes attributive-adverbial relationships, pointing to actions and their qualitative characteristics, and including the degree of extreme intensity of the action, that is, verbal CPU are determined by the expression of a feature that has a hyperbolic character. In terms of the features of the meaning, adverbial PU are divided into qualitative and adverbial. Adverbial CPU belong to the class of qualitative adverbial phraseological units. They are subdivided:

- 1) on adverbial comparatives of *modus operandi*.
- 2) adverbial comparative measures, degrees.

Therefore, stable comparisons (CPU) are usually units that have an estimated value. Stable comparisons are characterized by such properties of phraseological units as stability, reproducibility, figurative motivation, and expressiveness. In linguistics, both semantic classifications of stable comparisons and structural exist. Semantic classifications are based on differences in the subject matter of comparisons, while structural classifications are based on the nature of the tropes of speech used in them. Along with the structural-content parameters, an important role in the analysis of comparisons is played by the functional characteristics of latter, primarily due to their trope nature.

According to Slavic linguists, a trope is a special use of a lexical unit associated with the implementation of the language and the word of the stylistic function, and not by any value,

considered at the level of the language system, regardless of the contextual and situational conditions of its functioning. However, not every implementation of the stylistic function has a tropic nature. Thus, in a literary work, trope becomes a stylistic device of the trope type due to its participation in the creation of an aesthetic function, thereby giving rise to an additional functional load of the trope.

Besides aesthetic, there are other functions of trope.

1. Cognitive function that characterizes the trope as a means of cognition and development of reality.
2. Cultural function, which lies in the fact that culture creates the basis of trope formation.
3. The function of semantic indeterminacy, characteristic of systems that are focused on the uncertainty of truth. In a culture where rhetorical richness is a tradition, the trope is part of the neutral fund of the language.
4. Emotional function, which lies in the fact that the trope reflects appraisal and emotiveness of its creator, his personal view of the world.
5. Economic function, characterized by the fact that a complex content can be conveyed by a trope, it has a semantic capacity.
6. Transformational function, which lies in the fact that tropes increase the possibility of conveying new meanings, new characteristics through the main word.
7. Representative function that allows you to designate a specific subject, to evoke an idea about it. Any speech is characterized by a similar function, however, it is precisely with the help of trope that a particularly specific and accurate image appears.
8. Expressive function, which consists in enhancing the expressiveness of speech with the help of tropes.
9. Influencing function, subdivided into attractive (controlling the attention of the addressee — strengthening/weakening expressiveness and pictoriality), persuasive (enhanced expressiveness and pictoriality) and suggestive (suggestion)

Another function of tropes is considered to be the formation of text categories on their basis. Text category is a feature inherent in any text. So, for example, the category of personality reflects the image of the author and provides a choice of certain language means. The text-forming functions of tropes and figures of speech are considered.

Conclusions. Thus, comparisons can perform various functions in the text. First, they serve to convey information concisely and efficiently. Comparison is one of the linguistic devices that expand the repertoire of available linguistic tools. Secondly, they are able to function at a cognitive level, since they allow to create new, alternative ways of thinking. In discourse, they may also perform more specific functions, depending on the style of the text. For example, logical comparisons play an important role in scientific texts [2, p. 8]. Moreover, the value of comparison in a text is undeniable and is due to the following reasons:

- 1) exaggeration of a weak parameter of the object of comparison with the same parameter, but more strongly manifested on the object of comparison;
- 2) correlation according to the parameter established by the basis of comparison.

Список літератури

1. Бабелюк О. Стилiстичнi засоби i прийоми крiзь призму лiнгвосинергетик. *Вiсник КНУiС Серiя Фiлологiя*. Том 14, No 1. 2011. С. 7–17.
2. Fromilhague C. *Les Figures de Style*. P. : Nathan, 1995. 233 p.
3. Hussein R., Sawalha M. Corpus-based Study of Similes in British and American. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*. 2016. Vol. 7. № 2. P. 49–60.
4. Ortony A. *Metaphor and Thought* / 2nd ed. N. Y. : Cambridge University Press, 1993. 145 p.

5. Shamisa S. Rhetoric. Tehran : Payamnoor Publication, 2004. 45 p.

References

1. Babeliuk, O. (2011). *Stylistychni zasoby i pryiony kriz pryzmu linhvosynerhetyk* [Stylistic means and techniques through the prism of linguistic synergists]. *Visnyk KNLU. Serii Filolohiia* [Bulletin of Kyiv National Linguistic University. Series Philology], vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 7–17.
2. Fromilhague, C. (1995). *Les Figures de Style*. Paris, Nathan Publ., 233 p.
3. Hussein, R. & Sawalha, M. (2016). Corpus-based Study of Similes in British and American. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 49–60.
4. Ortony, A. (1993). *Metaphor and Thought*. 2nd ed. N. Y., Cambridge University Press Publ., 145 p.
5. Shamisa, S. (2004.). *Rhetoric*. Tehran, Payamnoor Publication, 45 p.

Дата надходження рукопису 29.11.2022

Мета. Метою статті є визначення основних підходів до вивчення порівняння в лінгвістиці.

Методи. Основні наукові результати отримано із застосуванням комплексу загальнонаукових і спеціальних методів дослідження, а саме: аналізу та узагальнення наукової літератури з проблем порівняння в мовознавстві; теоретичне узагальнення, аналіз і синтез; цілісний та інтегральний підходи до вивчення порівняння в мовознавстві; порівняльний, описовий та аналітичний методи.

Результати. Під порівнянням розуміється уподібнення зображуваних предметів, явищ, фактів. Ще одне розуміння порівняння — це образний лексичний вислів, основою якого є порівняння двох предметів, явищ тощо, після розгляду якого посилюється сприйняття першого явища шляхом підкреслення його ознак і властивостей. Деякі можуть означати наявність у порівняння таких властивостей: роздільний зв'язок порівнюваних понять, розчленована номінація, структурність, семантична поліфункціональність, поліфункціональність.

Зарубіжні дослідники сходяться з вітчизняними вченими в розумінні порівняння як інструменту, за допомогою якого встановлюється подібність двох понять. Порівняння можна типологізувати за різними ознаками — структурою, семантикою, стійкою зв'язністю елементів, їх функціональними характеристиками тощо. Кожна з класифікацій важлива як для розуміння мовної сутності порівняння, так і для повноцінного аналізу порівняльних конструкцій у мові конкретного письменника. Порівняння з іншими тропами характеризується широкою різноманітністю структурної організації. Класичний поділ порівнянь на прості й витримані важливий для стилістичного аналізу художнього тексту, у якому значну роль можуть відігравати як прості, так і витримані порівняльні конструкції, підкоряючись комунікативному задуму автора.

На думку дослідників, порівняння — це троп, який утворюється на основі образного зіставлення двох предметів чи явищ і являє собою тричленну конструкцію, яка складається з експліциту суб'єкта, об'єкта та порівняльного модулятора. Інші вчені виділяють два типи порівнянь з точки зору семантики. До першої групи вони відносять нейтральні порівняння, специфічні, за допомогою яких мовець відтворює об'єктивно існуючі характеристики явищ. До другої групи порівнянь належать тропи, що мають оцінний елемент або стилістично виразні компоненти змісту. Відповідно до класифікації, розробленої К. Фромільхейгом, виділяють об'єктивні та суб'єктивні порівняння. Об'єктивні порівняння створюються мовцем на основі конкретного фізичного досвіду, а суб'єктивні впливають з окремих асоціацій.

Під стійкими порівняннями, або порівняльними фразеологічними одиницями (ПФО), зазвичай розуміють порівняльні фразеологізми (ПФ) семантики. Вони мають яскраво виражену оціночну функцію — оцінка може бути як позитивною, так і негативною. Стійкі порівняння характеризуються такими властивостями фразеологізмів: стійкістю, вмотивованістю (як фразеологізми), експресивністю, відтворюваністю. Головною ознакою стійких порівнянь є звичайна, а не випадкова образність окремих порівнянь. Зроблено важливе уточнення щодо ПФО, зазначивши, що вони виконують підсилювальну функцію порівняно з метафоричними тропами, у яких ця функція виражається більш імпліцитно.

Ключові слова: порівняння, троп, зіставні фразеологізми, фразеологізми.