

The Axiological Portrait of Quality and its Standard (Based on Comparative Phraseography)

VALERY MOKIENKO^{1*} and TATIANA NIKITINA²

¹Кафедра славянской филологии, Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Университетская наб., д. 11, RU-199034 Санкт-Петербург, Россия
Department of Slavic Studies, St. Petersburg State University, Russia

²Кафедра образовательных технологий, Псковский государственный университет, ул. Красноармейская, д. 1, RU-180007 Псков
Department of Educational Technologies, Pskov State University, Russia

Received: 26 March 2021 • Accepted: 21 May 2021

© 2021 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest



ANNOTATION

The paper presents the concept of a comparative topical dictionary of set similes, which allows to fully reflect the axiological parameters of phraseological material. The choice of the object of vocabulary description which is set similes (comparative phraseological units) is justified by their direct correlation with the category of evaluation and the individual value system. It is emphasized that in the act of phraseological nomination, axiologically oriented is the choice of the object of comparison that requires evaluation, and the image of comparison that refers the native speaker and the researcher to the sphere of origin of the turnover, to its history. These phraseological parameters have been thoroughly investigated on the material of various languages. However, bilingual dictionaries do not give a complete picture of the evaluative phraseological universals and the ethnocultural specifics of phraseological comparisons. A bilingual dictionary of a special type will help solve this problem, realizing the idea of parallel-contrastive representation of the material, which determines the relevance of our research presented in this article on the material of the Russian and Czech languages. The article deals with such theoretical issues of phraseology as the axiological potential of a comparative phraseological unit, the paradigmatics of the axiological space of comparative phraseology, axiological characteristics of the comparison standard, etc.

Referring to the dictionary entries formed within the framework of the concept, the feasibility of multi-directional linguoaxiological development of set similes in two sections of the comparative dictionary has been proved: from the general phraseological image to the meaning of phraseological units and their axiological orientation as well as from the meaning of a phraseological unit to methods of associative-figurative transmission of evaluative connotations.

* Corresponding author. E-mail: mokienko40@mail.ru

In the first case, the phrase-forming potential of the figurative cores representing the model manifestations of the evaluated attributes is revealed, while ethnoculturally determined discrepancies of the axiological charge of the image are commented on. In the second case, the attribute itself is characterized from the standpoint of its practical significance for speakers of different linguistic cultures. A model of parallel-contrasting dictionary macro-entry structuring is presented: the filling of parametric zones, the features of metalanguage use, and the graphic ways of displaying types of figurative-axiological correspondences.

KEYWORDS

Russian, Czech, phraseology, phraseography, set similes, linguoaxiology, a comparative dictionary, a comparison standard, evaluative connotations

Phraseological units of different types and of different languages have been studied intensively in the framework of linguoaxiology (axiological linguistics). This problematic field includes the study of the language representation of the basic values of culture, identifying axiological universals and ethnocultural specifics of value understanding and verbal display of reality.

The choice of a phraseological unit as an object of linguoaxiological research is more than justified. For example, while the vocabulary of the Russian language contains a little over 40% of evaluative units (ТИХОНОВА 2015: 133), in the field of phraseology, according to *The Large Dictionary of Russian Sayings* (МОКИЕНКО–НИКИТИНА 2013), this figure exceeds 80%, and the evaluation component is recognized as one of the main components of the meaning of a phraseological unit by such authoritative phraseologists as A. Kunin, V. Zhukov, V. Teliya, and V. Mokienko (БИРИХ–ВОЛКОВ–НИКИТИНА 1993: 53–54). Thus, any phraseological dictionary that implements an adequate parameterization of the material can be qualified as axiological.

Not only the choice of object nomination that demands evaluating and which receives it in evaluative connotations of the idiom but also the phraseological image forming these connotations that reminiscent of a native speaker and researcher to the area of the origin of the unit and its history is axiologically focused in the act of phraseological nomination. Special attention paid to these phraseological parameters in comparative studies, including those performed on Russian and Czech material (МОКИЕНКО 2020, СТЁПАНОВА 2013, СТЁПАНОВА 2018), allows us to speak about their linguoaxiological value. As for the representation of phraseology in bilingual dictionaries, it does not give a complete picture of the evaluative phraseological universals and unicities. The authors of such dictionaries, in accordance with their goals, offer users the optimal translated equivalents of phraseological units of the source language, without developing a complete cross-language phraseological parallelism. It seems possible to solve this problem in a special type of a bilingual dictionary that implements the idea of parallel-contrastive representation of the material of two languages. The concept of such a comparative vocabulary is developed by lexicographers on Russian and Lithuanian material of phraseme-forming nests with the image cores of zoonyms and ethnonyms (ВОРОБЬЕВА–НИКИТИНА 2010) as well as on the lexical and phraseological material of food metaphors in the Russian and Italian languages (ПОМАРОЛЛИ 2018). In this contrastive description of phraseological units in the macro-entry under a common component (image core) that reveals its productivity in each language, some general and specific ethnocultural deterministic acts of evaluative phrase-forming are identified.



Even greater possibilities for the comparative representation of axiological semantics of phrasemes and proverbs are provided by a topical (or topically synonymous) comparative dictionary (or topic section of the dictionary), where the headings of macro-entries reflecting the meaning of phraseological units grouped on the principle of semantic generality can be oriented evaluatively. The material inside the macro-entry will be arranged according to the parallel-contrastive principle, which will reflect the phraseological content, and therefore the relevance of this fragment of the axiosphere for native speakers. Here, the evaluation nuances and figurative structure of correlative expressions are compared, and the unique motives of the nomination that produce the evaluation of phrasemes are revealed.

The purpose of this paper is to present the possibilities of representing the axiological potential of phrasemes in a comparative topical dictionary, the concept of which is currently being developed by us. Russian and Czech set similes, or comparative phraseological units, are chosen as the object of the dictionary description. The evaluation potential of phraseological units of this type is especially high due to the fact that they display the results of the comparison as a cognitive process of evaluating the realities of the surrounding world.

1. THE AXIOLOGICAL POTENTIAL OF A COMPARATIVE PHRASEOLOGICAL UNIT

As it is known, the structure of the act of speech implementation of a comparative phraseological unit corresponds to the logical structure of the simile, which includes the following elements: (A) the subject, i.e. the bearer of the characteristic; (B) the basis of comparison, i.e. the characteristic by which the subject is compared with the standard of the attribute; (C) the object of comparison, i.e. the standard characteristic. In most judgments of this type, the conjunction *как – jako* is used to express the logical-grammatical relations: *Городничий* (A) *глуп* (B) *как сивый мерин* (C) (Н. В. Гоголь: «Ревизор») (БСНС 2008: 8); *Já* (A) *tám hlad* (B) *jako vlk* (C) (SČFP 1983: 6). As a language unit, comparative phraseology (set similes) includes components (B) and (C), which is reflected in the basic phraseological dictionaries of comparisons of the Russian and Czech languages: *хитрый как лиса* (БСНС 2008: 348), *молчать как рыба* (БСНС 2008: 584), *(být) černý jako noc* (SČFP 1983: 228), *psát jako prase* (SČFP 1983: 285). In some cases, keeping the tradition of usage, the compilers include the element (A) in the heading unit. For example, among Russian set similes that characterize a healthy, strong person and are built according to the scheme “(B) как (C)” (*здоровый как бык, здоровый как дуб, здоровый как конь*, etc.), we can see the expressions *девка как репка* (БСНС 2008: 571), *парень словно из железа скован* (БСНС 2008: 194); confer the Czech material in the same topical group: *(být) zdravý jako dub, zdravý jako křen, zdravý jako hřib*, etc. as well as *(to je) holka jako lusk* (SČFP 1983: 194), *(to je) kluk jako tambor* (SČFP 1983: 356), where the basis of comparison is implicit but is easily recognized by the comparison standard, which is the core component (figurative core) of a comparative phraseological unit.

The choice of the comparison standard, which is based on a stereotypical and in most cases ethnocultural deterministic idea of the highest degree of manifestation of the characteristic, determines the axiological orientation of the expression in the act of phrase formation.

When receiving a phraseological unit, the decoding of its axiological component is provided by the background knowledge and value attitudes of the native speaker related to a core image:



сидеть как барыня (disapproving), *дочки как бочки* (humorous, ironic); *to je jako mlátit prázd-nou slámu* (disapproving); *hrát jako Paganini* (approving).

It is under the core image that comparative expressions are usually placed in dictionaries, where their axiological semantics is transmitted by emotive-evaluative marks and interpretations, which even in non-contextual dictionaries convey the expression of the turn of speech due to intensifier components (*очень, сильно, чрезвычайно*, etc.), general evaluative vocabulary (*хороший, великолепный, плохой, скверный*, etc.) and particular evaluative components of definitions (*глупый, безобразный, полезный*, etc.).

The axiological saturation of set similes is especially high in cases when the evaluation item acts as the basis for comparison and sets both the evaluation parameter (the quality of the subject) and the evaluation vector (positive or negative): *глупый как пробка, красивый как картинка; (být) ošklivý jako opice, (být) krásná jako Venuše*. And in the topical dictionary, these characteristic words also determine the evaluation angle of the categories that they become names for.

If the alphabetic-core lexicographic development of the material reveals and compares the associative-figurative axiological potential of the core word nomination, “the reality which has a natural, biological, and artefact materiality” (КОВШОВА 2016: 30), a macro-entry topical dictionary presenting a characteristic word in the header as the starting point of the description is a pragmatic quality assessment, the properties of the object (evaluative priorities reflects the arrangement of the material), and the selection of set similes gives an idea about the imaginative incarnations of the axiological ideas of a native speaker concerning the properties and quality. In the first section of the projected comparative dictionary of Russian and Czech set similes, it is intended to implement this approach in the description of the material, which is reflected in the title of the section: “From meaning to image”.

2. THE AXIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF QUALITY IN THE COMPARATIVE TOPICAL DICTIONARY OF PHRASEOLOGY

Let us present the concept of a macro-entry of a comparative topical dictionary of Russian and Czech set similes based on the material of phraseological units that display the particular evaluative sensory (according to N. Arutyunova’s classification) meaning of “soft” (easily yielding to pressure or compression, elastic, non-rigid).

According to the dictionaries, the sources of our research (БЧС 2008, СЧФ 1983), softness as a positive property is noted by Russian and Czech similes in such important objects in everyday life as fabric, fur, human hair, and animal hair. Positive emotions among the representatives of both linguistic cultures are caused by soft young grass, and Russians also perceive snow cover and a well-plowed field this way. Common standards of softness in the figurative structure of reclamation-charged expressions that characterize these realities are velvet, moss, silk, and for Russians, it is also a pillow and a feather bed. The positively assessed softness of certain types of food (meat and fruit) is transmitted in the Czech language through the comparison with other products: bread, cake, and butter. Russians compare crumbly boiled potatoes to a rich white



bread. The image parallel of positive associations is of interest: soft and delicious food → silk (for Czechs) and → velvet (for Russians).

We observe a higher demand for food quality among the native speakers of Czech, who negatively assess the undesirable softness of food by comparing it, for example, to meat with rags and overdone fruit with feces.

The set similes that state softness as a negative quality of other natural and artefact objects do not coincide in denotative correlation: Russians have numerous expressions that characterize softened and overripe mushrooms (they are compared to pancakes or cotton wool), while Czechs like to make comparisons with too liquid concrete solutions, paints, or other mixtures used in economy (the associations are with dirt, porridge, and feces), and not sufficiently elastic balls or tires are associated with household slippers. With the common axiological vector of the similes, the characteristic of the state of flabby, weak muscles differs in the image basis: *как кисель* in Russian and *jako bláto, jako hadry, jako polívka* in Czech.

In a comparative phraseological dictionary, this material can be presented in the following way: absolute image-axiological parallels are joined by the sign of equality = in the graphical centre of the entry, partial similarity of the image structure is marked with the sign ~~, while complete image differences are presented in two columns due to alphabetically arranged core components, the denotational correlation is put in brackets, the axiological parameter is represented by the signs + and – (the expressions with different evaluative meanings are indicated by the combination of these signs: +-).

МЯГКИЙ – МЁККÝ

+ *мягкий как бархат* (молодая трава, мох, ткань, кожа человека, шерсть животного, мех, снег, мягкая еда) (БСНС 2008: 37) = + *je to hebké / měkké jako samet* (mladá tráva, mech, látka, pokožka člověka, srst zvířete) (SČFP 1983: 311)

+ *мягкий как мох* (вспаханное поле, пашня, земля) (БСНС 2008: 406) = + *(být) měkký jako mech* (hmota, hustá kožešina, latka) (SČFP 1983: 202–203)

+ *мягкий как шелк* (волосы, мех, ткань) (БСНС 2008: 757) = + *(být) hebký jako hedvábi* (vlasy, jídlo, zvl. kaše) (SČFP 1983: 109)

- *мягкий как воск* (размякшее твердое вещество, материал) (БСНС 2008: 120) = - *(být) měkký jako vosk* (materiál, látka, často proti požadované tvrdosti) (SČFP 1983: 386)

- [*мягкий*] *как каша* (вязкая, густая, липкая масса; тающее мороженое, снег) (БСНС 2008: 251) = - *je to jako kaše* (roztékající se zmrzlina, tající sníh, málo hutný beton; hustý roztok barvy, chemikálie, polévka) (SČFP 1983: 149)



<p>+ <i>мягкий как земля</i> (рыхлое вещество, масса) (БСНС 2008: 220)</p> <p>+ <i>мягкий как перина</i> (что-л. пушистое, невесомое, легкое [чаще] снежный покров) (БСНС 2008: 492)</p> <p>+ (<i>мягкий</i>) <i>как пух</i> (эластичная, приятная на ощупь ткань, кожа, густой мех, волосы; рыхлая, лёгкая для обработки почва) (БСНС 2008: 553)</p>	<p>+ (<i>бýt</i>) <i>měkký jako maslo</i> (ovoce a jiné jídlo) (SČFP 1983: 199)</p> <p>+ <i>maso je jako dort</i> (měkké a velmi chutné maso) (SČFP 1983: 87)</p> <p>+ <i>maso je jako chleba</i> (měkké a chutné maso) (SČFP 1983: 87)</p>
<p>+ <i>мягкий как вата</i> (что-л. пушистое, податливое, легкое; рыхлый пористый гриб) (БСНС 2008: 84)</p> <p>+ <i>мягкий (пухлый) как подушка</i> (части тела человека, игрушка, кот) (БСНС 2008: 515)</p>	<p>(+–) <i>je to jako bačkora</i> (je to příliš měkké – míč, pneumatika a pod.) (SČFP 1983: 37)</p> <p>+ (<i>boty</i>) <i>jsou jako bačkory</i> (pohodlně vyšlapané a příjemné) (SČFP 1983: 37)</p> <p>+ <i>maso je jako hadry</i> (rozvařené maso, bez chuti; též měkké, dobře uvařené maso) (SČFP 1983: 108)</p> <p>+ <i>být jako perník</i> (z perníku) (1. být nekvalitní – velmi křehký, nepevný, měkký – dřevo, cihla a jiný materiál; 2. být velmi dobrý a měkký – jídlo) (SČFP 1983: 262)</p>
<p>- <i>мягкий как блин</i> (размякший, перезревший гриб) (БСНС 2008: 51)</p> <p>- <i>мягкий как булка</i> (размякший гриб) (БСНС 2008: 72)</p> <p>- [<i>мягкий, рыхлый</i>] <i>как кисель</i> (пухлое тело; слабые, дряблые мышцы) (БСНС 2008: 255)</p> <p>- <i>мягкий как поросёнок</i> (пухлое, мягкое тело) (БСНС 2008: 527)</p> <p>- <i>мягкий как холодец</i> (что-л. мягкое, студенистое) (БСНС 2008: 724)</p>	<p>- <i>je to jako bláto</i> (je to příliš měkké a mazlavé – jídlo, malta) (SČFP 1983: 43)</p> <p>- <i>mít svaly jako bláto</i> (<i>j. hadry, j. polívku</i>) (mít svaly velmi slabé a měkké) (SČFP 1983: 43)</p> <p>- <i>je to (měkké) jako houba</i> (je to nežádoucně měkké, chatrné, nepevné – dřevo a jiná obvykle pevná hmota) (SČFP 1983: 118)</p> <p>- <i>je to jako sračka</i> (<i>sračky</i>) (je to příliš měkké, řídké, mazlavé – rozvařené ovoce, jídlo, roztok barvy a pod.) (SČFP 1983: 327)</p> <p>- (<i>být</i>) <i>měkký jako tvaroh</i> (být nepevný, chatrný – materiál užitý na stavbu, konstrukce, stavba samotná starším nebo špatnou kvalitou) (SČFP 1983: 364)</p>

In a full-format entry, emotional and evaluative notes as well as axiologically oriented interpretations and contexts can be used. However, the schematic representation of the entry allows us to draw conclusions about the areas of the subject world and the world of nature for the native speakers of each language. The axiological characteristic of the feature included in the title of the dictionary entry is particularly relevant: in this case, it is the experienter characteristic “soft”, the presence and degree of manifestation of which is evaluated from the point of view of practical value in economic activities, requirements for the quality of food, aesthetics of life and body, etc.



The figurative metaphorical meaning of the characteristic word *мягкий* implemented in the combinations *мягкий человек*, *мягкий характер* is based on the similarity of sensations, which reflect the common components of the polysemic word's meanings in the explanatory dictionary: 1. 'такой, который легко поддается, уступает при надавливании, прикосновении и вызывает ощущение чего-то приятного, нежного'; [...] 6. 'кроткий, уступчивый, поддающийся какому-л. воздействию, напору' (БТС 2000: 567). The axiological potential of this lexico-semantic variant of the word in its negative orientation is revealed and intensified by Russian and Czech set similes, among which we found only one figurative correlation in the dictionary materials: *мягкий (мяжок) как воск* (БСНС 2008: 120) = (*být*) *měkký jako vosk* (SČFP 1983: 386) – 'about an excessively gentle, compliant person or about a weak-willed, passive person who is easy to subdue'.

In the comparative topical dictionary, softness as a quality of a person's character in phraseological reflection can be represented in the second part of the dictionary entry *МЯГКИЙ – МЁККÝ*, which was discussed above. The subtitle "About man" will open a general field here with the development of the parallel *мягкий (мяжок) как воск = (být) měkký jako vosk*. Russian set similes reflecting the figurative specifics of the evaluative expressions *мягкий как глина*, *мягкий как тесто*, *мягкий как шёлковый* and the Czech expressions (*být*) *jako bláto*, *být jako perník (zperníku)*; *být jako zmarcipánu*, (*být*) *měkký jako tvaroh* will be presented in two columns, and functional-semantic comments in brackets will reflect the range of possible objects of the evaluation characteristic: an adult or a child, a physically weak person, a manifestation of a gentle character in relation to a certain situation, etc.

3. THE PARADIGMATICS OF THE AXIOLOGICAL SPACE OF COMPARATIVE PHRASEOLOGY IN LEXICOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION

As shown on the material of set similes with the meaning of "soft", the macro-entry of the topical comparative dictionary of phraseological units fully represents synonymous series of expressions structured taking into account their axiological orientation: positive or negative.

Axiological oppositions are developed by phraseologists and paramiographers on the material of phraseological units-antonyms (ТАМБИЕВА–ЧЕРКАСОВА–ШВЕЛИДЗЕ 2019) and topical groups of proverbs that reflect values and anti-values (ЛОМАКИНА–МОКИЕНКО 2018). According to the principle of axiological dyads (*wealth – poverty*, *God – devil*, *good – evil*, *health – disease*, *truth – lies*, etc.), the categories of paremiological collections of the 19th century (ДАЛЬ 2009, ČELAKOVSKÝ 2000) and modern dictionaries of proverbs (МОКИЕНКО–НИКИТИНА 2011) are structured. The ideal form of representation of phraseological axiological dyads is the dictionary of phraseological units-antonyms: 300 such antonymic phraseoparadigms on the material of the Russian language are lexicographically developed by E. Mardieva (see МАРДИЕВА 2007).

In the topical dictionary of set similes, along with the turns of phrase, potential members of axiological oppositions and units that do not enter into such oppositional relations will be developed. This determines the distant arrangement of the expressions that represent opposite-vector elements of evaluation dyads, as required by the principle of uniform structuring of dictionary entries. Lexicographic representation of paradigmatic relations of antonymy and axiological divergence of the expressions is realized through the system of mutual references.



Thus, from the entry **МЯГКИЙ – МЁККÝ**, the reader will get to the entry **ТВЕРДЫЙ – TVRDÝ** by reference (and in the electronic version of the dictionary by hyperlink), from which he or she will learn about the commonality of spheres of negative evaluation of excessive hardness of the object. First of all, these are food products: bread (it is represented as hard as a stone in both cultures, Czechs also view it as a whetstone, while Russians see it as a flint) and meat (as a sole). Besides these common or similar figurative expressions, we note the negative vector of evaluation in Russian similes of hardened bread with lead and iron as well as in Czech expressions, where it is compared with horn. The general negative evaluation similes of hard meat with a harness (Czechs) and with the bark of a tree (Russians) are based on various figurative associations. In addition, apples and other small fruits, individual, often round, pieces of food can be the carriers of the undesirable quality: increased hardness (in Czechs' view, as a shot, and in Russians', as a bullet, as peas). Among the similes with a wider denotative range within the subject world, we also find absolute figurative correspondences, e.g. *твёрдый как кость – to je jako kost*; *как сталь – to je jako ocel*; *как скала – to je jako skála*; *как железо – to je jako železo*; partial similarities with image cores belonging to the same topical group of vocabulary, e.g. *как алмаз – to je jako křemen*, and completely different images, e.g. *как пень, как картошка* in Russian and *to je jako koráb* in Czech.

A positive evaluation characteristic of a person with a strong character, strong-willed, fundamentally defending his position is realized in the two languages by comparing such a person and his character with granite, rock, and iron. The references to the antonyms in the entry **МЯГКИЙ – МЁККÝ** will allow to get an idea of the evaluation dyad both within each of the languages and in the interlanguage aspect: *мягкий (мягok) как воск* (БСНС 2008: 120) = *(být) měkký jako vosk* (SČFP 1983: 386) // *твёрдый как гранит* (БСНС 2008: 150) = *být tvrdý jako žula (ze žuly)* (SČFP 1983: 412); *твёрдый (крепкий) как скала* (БСНС 2008: 614) = *být tvrdý jako skála* (SČFP 1983: 316); *твёрдый как железо; как из железа [скован]* (БСНС 2008: 194) = *být jako ze železa* (SČFP 1983: 408), including denotative-axiological parallels with different image basis, e.g. *[мягкий, рыхлый] как кисель (дряблые мышцы)* (БСНС 2008: 255) = *mít svaly jako bláto (jako hadry, jako polívku)* (SČFP 1983: 43) // *мускулы как из стали* (БСНС 2008: 651) = *mít svaly jako z ocele* (SČFP 1983: 453).

Such antonymic blocks in the electronic format of the comparative topical dictionary of set similes can be developed in a separate field and opened by a hyperlink. In the traditional book format of the dictionary, phraseological antonyms that represent axiological dyads can be included in the same macro-entry if they represent the same object, the same action, and the state in all its variety of qualitative characteristics. Let us illustrate this point of our concept with a fragment of the following dictionary entry:

ГОВОРИТЬ – MLUVIT
– **БЫСТРО / RYCHLE**

строчить (говорить) как пулемет (как из пулемета) (БСНС 2008: 550–551) = *mluvit jako kulomet* (SČFP 1983: 180)

язык как мельница; молоть как мельница (БСНС 2008: 348) ~ *huba tu jede jako mlejn* (SČFP 1983: 206)



<i>трещать как сорока</i> (БСНС 2008: 646), <i>язык как молотилка</i> (БСНС 2008: 400), <i>как</i> <i>горохом сыпать</i> (БСНС 2008: 147) и др.	<i>huba mi jede jako kolovrátek</i> (SČFP 1983: 163), <i>huba mi jede jako trakař</i> (SČFP 1983: 151) и др.
---	--

- МЕДЛЕННО / POMALU

<i>говорить как сани по песку тащить</i> (БСНС 2008: 591), <i>говорить как будто три</i> <i>дня не ел</i> (БСНС 2008: 165) и др.	<i>leze to z něj jako z chlupaté deky</i> (SČFP 1983: 78–79), <i>mluví jako když se mu</i> <i>chce a nechce</i> (SČFP 1983: 78–79) и др.
--	--

- ГРОМКО / HLASITĚ, ZVUČNĚ

реветь как бык (БСНС 2008: 77) = *řvát jako bejk* ~ *mít hlas jako bejk (jako tur)* (SČFP 1983: 39)

голос как гром (БСНС 2008: 153) ~ *burácet jako hrom* (SČFP 1983: 123)

<i>галдеть (кричать) как на базаре</i> (БСНС 2008: 29), <i>говорить как в бубен бить</i> (БСНС 2008: 68)	<i>mít hubu jako cikánka</i> (SČFP 1983: 62)
--	--

- ТИХО, СЛАБЫМ ГОЛОСОМ / TIŠE, SLABĚ

голосок как бабий волосок (БСНС 2008: 113) ~ *mít hlásek jako [panímámin] vlásek*
(SČFP 1983: 381)

<i>блеять как коза (козленок)</i> (БСНС 2008: 267), <i>пищать как мышь подкопённая</i> (БСНС 2008: 419)	<i>mít hlásek jako konipásek</i> (SČFP 1983: 164), <i>mluví jako když má smrt na jazyku</i> (SČFP 1983: 324), <i>kuňkat jako žaba</i> (SČFP 1983: 406)
---	---

In the same way, other axiological oppositions noted by researchers of this topical group of comparative phraseological units can be reflected in the given dictionary macro-entry: 'говорить много' [to speak a lot] – 'говорить мало' [to speak a little]; 'говорить невнятно' [to slur] – 'говорить четко, красиво' [to speak distinctly, have an eloquent tongue]; 'говорить неприятным скрипучим голосом' [to speak in an unpleasant strident voice] – 'говорить приятным красивым голосом' [to speak in a pleasant nice voice]; 'говорить разумные вещи' [to say reasonable things] – 'говорить глупости' [to say nonsense], etc. (ЗИНОВЬЕВА–АЛЕШИН 2013, БОБРОВА 2013, ВОРОБЬЕВА 2018).



4. THE MODEL COMPONENT OF A SIMILE: THE AXIOLOGICAL POTENTIAL IN A COMPARATIVE ASPECT

In the first part of the comparative dictionary of set similes, which was presented above, when implementing the principle of topical layout of the material, we focus on the general semantics of set expressions and its axiological component. Thus, the value ideas of peoples about the most significant phenomena, objects, and qualities are reflected. And already in this case, the role of the figurative core displaying the standard or anti-standard of the evaluated attribute in the formation of the estimated value of the set construction is clearly visible. In the cognitive act of comparison during phrase formation, an axiologically oriented linguistic consciousness selects the standard of the attribute being evaluated, guided by ethnoculturally determined ideas about the norm and antinorm, about the ideal and the relevance / irrelevance to it. It is not by chance that such attention is paid to a linguistic-cultural comparative study of set similes in the direction from the figurative core to the axiological semantics of set construction (ВОРОБЬЕВА 2016, КУЗНЕЦОВА 2016, КУЗНЕЦОВА 2019). Such studies reflect the connection of the core components of comparisons with the codes of national culture, reveal the features of a pragmatic and figurative understanding of the facts of the surrounding reality, the specifics of standardization of attributes, and the axiological filling of linguistic images by representatives of different linguistic cultures.

Adequately presenting this specificity in a lexicographic format is the task of the second part of comparative topical dictionary of set similes. The title of this section (“Worlds of images”) reflects the principle of the material arrangement: set similes are combined under the stem-shaped components, and those, in their turn, can be grouped alphabetically under the headings in accordance with the topical reference. So, in the section “Natural materials and substances”, among others, Russian and Czech phraseological units with the core word *воск* – *vosk* will be developed, in the section “Food products and meals”, comparisons with the component *марципан* – *marcipán* will be included, and under the heading “Animal world”, we will find, for example, *морж* – *trož*. Below, by the example of these dictionary entries, it will be shown how the parallel-contrasting arrangement of the material allows us to compare the phrase-forming activity of the core component of the comparison, the range of its figurative associations and evaluative connotations. Interlanguage associative-like parallels are marked on the left side of the entry with an equal sign =, while partial matches of the figurative structure of correlative phraseological units are indicated by the sign ~. Unique associative-like implementations of the core component in set similes of one of the languages are introduced by an asterisk *, and motivational gaps corresponding to them in another language are marked with the sign —:

<i>воск</i> (БСНС 2008: 120)	<i>vosk</i> (SČFP 1983: 386)
<p><i>мягкий (мягок) как воск</i></p> <p>1. ‘о ставших мягкими (обычно твердых) веществах’</p> <p>2. ‘об излишне мягком, уступчивом человеке; о безвольном, нерешительном, пассивном человеке, которого легко подчинить’</p>	<p>= (<i>бýt</i>) <i>měkký jako vosk</i></p> <p>= 1. (máteriál, látka, často proti požadované tvrdosti) ‘byt velmi měkký a tvarný, nepevný’</p> <p>= 2. (člověk povahou) ‘být velmi dobrušredný, laskavý a snadno se nechat uprosit; být pásivní povahy a snadno se dát ovládat’</p>



<p><i>мягкий (мягок) как воск</i> 1. ‘об излишне мягком, уступчивом человеке’ 2. —</p>	<p>~~ <i>být tvarný jako vosk</i> = 1. (člověk povadou) ‘pod nátlakem vše poslušně dělat’ * 2. ‘rychle a snadno se něčemu učít, přizpůsobovat’</p>
<p><i>белый (желтый) как воск</i> ‘о бледном, болезненного цвета лице, коже’</p>	<p>~~ <i>být (bledý) jako z vosku (jako vosk)</i> ‘v důsledku nemoci, přestálé hrůzy být v tváři nepřirozeně bledý, bezbarvý’</p>
<p>* <i>жить как воск мять</i> ‘о легкой, беспроблемной, простой жизни’</p>	—
<p>* <i>таять как воск</i> ‘о быстро слабеющем, чахнущем (от болезни, тоски и т. п.) человеке’</p>	—

<p><i>морж</i> (БСНС 2008: 404)</p>	<p><i>mrož</i> (SČFP 1983: 214)</p>
<p><i>фыркать как морж</i> ‘интенсивно, громко пыхтеть, отфыркиваться’</p>	<p>= <i>funět jako mrož</i> ‘těžce, silně a hlasitě dýchat nosem, hodně funět’</p>
<p><i>усы как у моржа</i> ‘о чьих-л. длинных и отвисших усах’</p>	<p>= <i>mít fousy (kníry) jako mrož</i> ‘mít mohutné, převislé, nápadné kníry’</p>
<p>* <i>плавать как морж</i> ‘о закаленном, хорошем пловце, не боящемся холодной воды’</p>	—

<p>* <i>марципан</i></p>	<p><i>marcipán</i> (SČFP 1983: 198)</p>
—	<p>* <i>být jako z marcipánu</i> 1. (člověk i dítě v důsledku výchovy) ‘být velmi jemný, křehký, slabší; být choulostivý, neotužilý a málo odolný’ 2. (průmyslový výrobek, materiál) ‘být nápadně křehký, nepevný, lámat se, bořit se’</p>
—	<p>* <i>zacházet s někým / něčím jako s marcipánem</i> ‘zacházet s někým, s něčím, chovat se k někomu velmi ohleduplně, opatrně a jemně; bedlivě chránit někoho před nepohodlím nebo jinými potížemi; úzkostlivě chránit něco před rozbitím, poškozením’</p>

Thus, we see the absolute axiological irrelevance for the Russian linguoculture of the confectionery product name *marzipan*, popular among Czechs. Hence there is the zero phrase-forming productivity of the product name as a “representative” of ideal quality in Russian. A positive evaluation of winter swimming which strengthens health is reflected in the axiologically charged Russian simile of a good swimmer with the walrus that feels confident in cold water. Perhaps a



similar comparative structure was an intermediate step in the formation of the lexical metaphor: *walrus* ‘a lover of winter swimming in open-air waters’. Comparing the axiological potential of the figurative cores *воск* and *vosk*, along with general evaluative connotations (disapproval) and the denotative correlation of Russian and Czech comparisons (too soft materials, a person with a soft character, and a pale face), we note the specific development of the idea of softness in images of positively coloured Russians and Czech similes which show access to the highest level of the value system, i.e. vital, spiritual, utilitarian, etc.: *жить как воск мять* ‘о легкой, бесппроблемной жизни’ [about an easy, trouble-free life], *быт tvarný jako vosk* ‘rychle a snadno se něčemu učít, přizpůsobovat’ [to quickly and easily learn something, to adapt to something].

5. CONCLUSION

The axiological environment of the phraseological dictionary is extremely large due to the specifics of the described material: evaluation (often negative) is characteristic of most phraseological units, and in the sphere of set similes (comparative phraseological units) almost every unit is axiologically charged because the act of comparison in its essence is the act of evaluating an object, establishing its relevance / irrelevance to the norm, relevance to the sphere of values / anti-values. Evaluation as a universal category of culture in specific comparisons of different peoples receives a specific language embodiment, primarily due to axiologically labelled figurative cores representing the reference manifestations of the characteristics being evaluated. A comparative study of the family of words of set similes united by a common core component reveals the estimated potential of this reference phraseological image in each of the linguistic cultures. And the optimal way to present its “axiological portrait” in a lexicographic format is a parallel-contrast arrangement of comparisons of the two languages in a dictionary entry. The combination of vocabulary entries into topical rubrics on the sphere to which their reference figurative components belong allows us to talk about the axiological potential of entire nomination systems: the natural world, the human world, the objective world (specification can be made within these topics). This is how the material is organized in the section “Worlds of images” in the comparative Russian–Czech dictionary, the concept of which is presented in this paper.

The parallel-contrasting principle of material arrangement is also implemented in the section titled “From meaning to image”, where, according to our concept, a macro-entry is opened with a heading that represents the basis of comparison and reflects the feature by which objects are compared (as a rule, the basic component of the phraseological meaning is the same, which is intensified in the axiological act of comparison). Under this heading, all the imagery of the standard-carriers of a given attribute is united and implemented in synonyms-similes. Thus, we obtain a whole axiological characteristic of the attribute which is also not devoid of ethnocultural specificity.

The designed dictionary is not translatable. It is intended for a reader who speaks Slavic languages or studies them. With the parallel arrangement of set similes in the right and left parts of the dictionary entry, the lexicographic parameterization of the material is also carried out in parallel in the source language (Russian or Czech). When targeting a dictionary to a wider audience of users, the concept of a metalanguage may vary: it is possible, for example, to use a translation in each part of a comparative entry in parallel or a unilingual metalanguage interpretation of a material.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND FUNDING

The study is funded by the Russian Science Foundation (project No. 20-18-00091 implemented at St. Petersburg State University).

REFERENCES

- ČELAKOVSKÝ 2000 = ČELAKOVSKÝ F. L. *Mudrosloví národu slovanského ve příslovích*. Praha: Lika klub, 2000.
- МОКИЕНКО 2020 = МОКИЕНКО V. M. České ekvivalenty nové ruské frazeologie. *Bohemistika* 2020/2: 217–231.
- СЧФР 1983 = ČERMÁK F. *Slovník české frazeologie a idiomatiky. Přirovnání*. Praha: Academia, 1983.
- СТЕРАНОВА 2013 = СТЕРАНОВА L. Тенденции развития русской фразеологии (на фоне чешской). *Slavia* 82 (2013): 203–212.
- СТЕРАНОВА 2018 = СТЕРАНОВА L. Отражение свойств и качеств человека во фразеологической картине мира (в русско-чешском сопоставительном плане). *Slavia* 87 (2018): 316–324.
- БИРИХ–ВОЛКОВ–НИКИТИНА 1993 = БИРИХ А. К., ВОЛКОВ С. С., НИКИТИНА Т. Г. *Словарь русской фразеологической терминологии*. Ред. проф. В. М. Мокиенко. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1993.
- БОБРОВА 2013 = БОБРОВА М. В. Народная фразеология тематической группы «Говорение» в семантико-аксиологическом аспекте. *Уральский филологический вестник. Психолингвистика в образовании* 2013/4: 126–135.
- БСНС 2008 = МОКИЕНКО В. М., НИКИТИНА Т. Г. *Большой словарь русских народных сравнений*. Москва: «Олма Медиа Групп», 2008.
- БТС 2000 = КУЗНЕЦОВ С. А. (ред.) *Большой толковый словарь русского языка*. Санкт-Петербург: «Норинт», 2000.
- ВОРОБЬЕВА 2016 = ВОРОБЬЕВА Л. Б. Названия птиц в русских и литовских устойчивых сравнениях. В кн.: Мокиенко В. М. (ред.) *Устойчивые сравнения в системе фразеологии*. Санкт-Петербург: СПбГУ, Greifswald: Universität Greifswald, 2016. 178–184.
- ВОРОБЬЕВА 2018 = ВОРОБЬЕВА Л. Б. Характеристика речевой деятельности человека в русских и литовских устойчивых сравнениях. В кн.: Большакова Н. В. (ред.) *Культурный ландшафт пограничья: прошлое, настоящее и будущее*. Псков: Псковский государственный университет, 2018. 126–131.
- ВОРОБЬЕВА–НИКИТИНА 2010 = ВОРОБЬЕВА Л. Б., НИКИТИНА Т. Г. К концепции русско-литовского словаря языковых образов. В кн.: *Русская речь в современных парадигмах лингвистики*. Т. 2. Псков: ПГПУ, 2010. 234–239.
- ДАЛЬ 2009 = ДАЛЬ В. И. *Пословицы русского народа*. Москва: «Русский язык Медиа», 2009.
- ЗИНОВЬЕВА–АЛЕШИН 2013 = ЗИНОВЬЕВА Е. И., АЛЕШИН А. С. Русские устойчивые сравнения, характеризующие манеру речи человека (на фоне шведского языка). *Вестник Челябинского государственного педагогического университета* 2013/12-2: 215–228.
- КОВШОВА 2016 = КОВШОВА М. А. К вопросу об аксиологической модальности загадок: что на свете всех милее? В кн.: КУПИНА Н. А. (ред.) *Аксиологические аспекты современных филологических исследований*. Екатеринбург: «Ажур», 2016. 29–33.
- КУЗНЕЦОВА 2016 = КУЗНЕЦОВА И. В. Персонажи Библии в словацких сравнениях (на фоне других языков). *Studia Slavica Hung.* 61 (2016): 45–67.



- Кузнецова 2019 = Кузнецова И. В. Ориентализмы-антропонимы в южнославянских сравнениях. *Studia Slavica Hung.* 64 (2019): 71–83.
- Ломакина–Мокиенко 2018 = Ломакина О. В., Мокиенко В. М. Ценностные константы русинской паремииологии (на фоне украинского и русского языков). *Русин* 2018/4: 303–317.
- Мардиева 2007 = Мардиева Э. Р. *Словарь фразеологических антонимов русского языка*. Нефтекамск: Башкирский государственный университет, 2007.
- Мокиенко–Никитина 2011 = Мокиенко В. М., Никитина Т. Г. *Народная мудрость: русские пословицы*. Москва: «Олма Медиа Групп», 2011.
- Мокиенко–Никитина 2013 = Мокиенко В. М., Никитина Т. Г. *Большой словарь русских поговорок*. Москва: «Олма Медиа Групп», 2013.
- Помаролли 2018 = Помаролли Дж. Концепция сопоставительного лингвокультурологического словаря пищевой метафоры на материале русского и итальянского языков. *Вестник Томского государственного университета* 434 (2018): 40–49.
- Тамбиева–Черкасова–Швелидзе 2019 = Тамбиева Ф. А., Черкасова Г. В., Швелидзе Н. Б. Антонимические оппозиции в сфере глагольной фразеологии со значением поведения. *Вестник Пятигорского государственного университета* 2019/1: 48–53.
- Тихонова 2015 = Тихонова М. А. «Словарь оценочной лексики русского языка» как способ интерпретации аксиологической семантики. *Вестник РУДН. Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика* 2015/3: 131–140.

