

Linguoaxiological Features of Adjectives' Semantics, Describing a Person in Terms of Politeness in Tatar, Russian and English Languages

Flyura Rifkhatovna Avazbakieva

Kazakh Humanities and Law University, 010000,
The Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana, Korgalzhyn, 8

Abstract: This article explores adjectives in Tatar, Russian and English languages, which contain characteristics on the level of politeness. Until now this lexico-semantic group has not attracted the attention of researchers of Tatar, Russian or English languages. Relevance and novelty is also due to the comparative nature of the study and its axiological orientation. The author has established the basic principle of lexemes differentiation in the lexico-semantic group (LSG), namely the axiological and identified two major lexico-semantic subgroups (the LSSG) and lexico-semantic micro-groups (LSMG). The field principle for describing the semantics of adjectives of the three languages was used in this article. Considerable attention was paid to the identification of linguocultural specificity of *politeness* conceptualization that exists in the minds of Tatar, Russian and English native speakers. The *politeness* concept was clearly represented in the categories of metaphorical and idiomatic expressions. In accordance with the nature of the evaluative semantics and its place in the semantic structure of the word, all analyzed adjectives are attributed to two basic semantic types: DE - 1 (words with combined descriptive and evaluative components) and DE - 2 (words with the dominant evaluative component).

Key words: Linguoaxiology • Cultural linguistics • Linguistic worldview • Axiological semantics • Semantic field • Lexical and semantic analysis • Lexico- semantic group • Seme • Metaphor

INTRODUCTION

Problems of studying axiological semantics are the focus of modern linguists due to the fact that it is this aspect that discloses the value orientation of native speakers associated with human cognitive activity, determined by a complex set of epistemological, ethical, philosophical, cultural and sociological problems [1]. According to G. Lakoff, "only in a broad range of disciplines, such as philosophy, psychology, logic, anthropology, sociology and etc. there is the most significant progress in the development of linguistics not as a study of the linguistic elements distribution, but as the study of man and his values through the language" [2]. This explains the growing interest of scientists and linguists to linguoaxiological problems, the particular "linguoaxiological boom" in the linguistics of the last decade started with the fundamental works of N.D. Arutiunova, E.M. Wolf, V.N. Telia, L.M. Vasiliev, N.A. Lukianova, et al. The aim of investigation is to study the

linguoaxiological aspect of the semantics of adjectives describing the person in terms of politeness, in Tatar, Russian and English languages. The importance of the study of this group of adjectives from linguoaxiological position is that the analysis at the level of LSG allows identifying the axiological orientation of the society and the native speakers' mentality of certain culture. Thus, in view of the above, it seems appropriate to consider first the linguocultural specificity of the idea of "good manners" in three studied languages.

Linguocultural Understanding of the Concept of "Politeness" in the Linguistic Worldview of Tatar, Russian and English Peoples: Value attitude of the speaker or writer to the object is expressed by a large number of words. "According to the traditional semantic definition of the parts of speech, adjectives indicate an inherent feature of an object", most vividly express the evaluative meaning and occupy a special place among other parts of speech [3].

Lexical representations of the "politeness" concept are the following lexemes: *tyartiplelek*, i.e. *good manners*, *politeness* (Tatar language), *politeness* (English language), *vospitannost'*, i.e. *good manners*, *politeness* (Russian Language). Politeness, of course, can be attributed to the most important human values. G.A. Bagautdinova wrote about different nature of values: "In our opinion the value /disvalues can be considered at different levels, for example at the physiological material, social, spiritual, moral, intellectual, emotional etc." [4].

Good manners is a form of social and ethical ideal, meaningful in a civilized society and providing regulations of communicative interactions of the members of society. As such, it includes such basic meanings, as *knowing the rules of conduct in society, acquired as a result of good upbringing and following these rules* (Russian language); *zhambiyatta urnashkan adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarena buysinu* (Tatar language); *following the rules of good manners and behaviour, accepted by society* (English language).

Linguocultural approach starts from the values which are actual for the culture and represented in the language as set phrases, aphorisms, etc. Etymology of the word, the history of its development, the associations and values are a fact of culture. It is also important that the study of these adjectives from linguo-axiological positions is impossible without semasiology and its basic concepts, such as lexico-semantic groups, semantic field, the inner form of the word, etc. Axiological aspect of semantics of adjectives is closely associated with ethno-cultural peculiarities of perception and conceptualization of notions, realities and phenomena. An axiological fragment of the linguistic worldview (LWV) reflects certain human's vision in terms of his interpretive selective attitude to the world, conditioned by the specificity of the ethnic mentality, world view and world outlook [5].

Comparing the articles of lexicographic sources in Tatar, Russian and English languages, we relied on the interpretation proposed in the dictionary of S.I. Ozhegov, as in the scientific research, it is the closest to the understanding of politeness. S.I. Ozhegov defines *politeness* as "behavioral skills, instilled by family, school and environment and manifested in public life" [6]. Such a conception of politeness, as an external manifestation of *upbringing* in manners and behavior of the person and as compliance with the rules of proprieties and etiquette, allows distinguishing it from other manifestations of personality: internal (moral and ethical,

aesthetic, philosophical, psychological) and external physical and so on. It is this interpretation of good manners that formed the basis for distinguishing the lexico-semantic groups of adjectives describing the person in terms of politeness, which are the subject of this research.

This understanding of good manners is also reflected in everyday awareness of native speakers. Thus, the phrase "*vospitanniy chelovek*", *tyartiple keshe*, *well-bred man* means for Tatars, Russians and English people first of all a person following all generally accepted rules of conduct, a man with good manners and respect in relation to others.

The considered concepts of good manners and bad manners are universal and are included in the semantic universe of almost all the world's languages, including Tatar, Russian and English. The value priorities are fixed in set phrases, proverbs, sayings, aphorisms and phrases of the outstanding representatives of their people - philosophers, artists, writers and thinkers. They suggest that the representatives of various ethnic cultures associate such notions as *courtesy*, *manners*, *decency*, *respect and modesty* with politeness.

In the Tatar culture based on Islamic traditions, the notion of a well-mannered person first of all includes modesty: *Adam balasinin tabigate shundiyy - in tiynak keshenen da kunelenda egoizm yashi. Tiynaklik ul tabigat birgan siyfat tugel. Tiynaklik - ul tarbiyalelek bilgese* (V. Nukullin). A very important feature of a well-bred man for the Tartars is respect for parents and elders. See, for example: *Keshelirgi mahabbat ul ata ananni, irenne, balalarinni yaratudan bashlana* (proverb); *Atisena kul kutargan malay Vatanga da kul kutara ala bit* (proverb); *Oenda yalkaulik kurmasi bala yalkau bulmiy* (proverb); *Atisenen durakligi malaenda mul bula* (G. Avzal); *Yashau zakoni ata-anadan algan tarbiyane uz balana kaytarip birune talap ita* (proverb).

Moral interpretation of politeness, the search for the ethical foundations of the external behavior, courtesy and manners are distinctive for Russian language consciousness. Most appreciated is not just the compliance with the rules of behavior, the politeness itself, but the inner human need in a polite and tactful behavior and his sincerity. The most indicative in this respect is the opinion of A.P. Chekhov: *Well-mannered people respect the personality and therefore are always courteous, soft, polite and pliant*. See also: *The true and the best courtesy are based on sincerity. True politeness is inseparable from respect of the person and impossible without it* (N.V. Schelgunov).

Native speakers of English Language regard *the ability to behave in society* as the most important quality of the personality, moreover it serves as the 'setting' of the inner world of a person and adds lustre to him: *Knowledge may give weight to a person, but only mannerliness can add lustre to him* (F. Chesterfield). The politeness of the British people's imagining necessarily implies the existence of good manners.

The study of adjectives describing the person in terms of politeness from linguoaxiological positions implies identification of the nature, character and place of the evaluative component in the lexical meaning of the analyzed words, as well as the establishment of the system relations inside the meaningful groups, which is impossible without semasiology, without resorting to such basic concepts as lexico-semantic groups, semantic field, the inner form of the word, etc. Therefore, it seems appropriate to further consider these questions.

Semantic and Axiological Aspects of Adjectives Positively Characterizing a Person in Terms of Politeness: A comparative analysis at the level of LSG provides a more complete determination of the specificity of the semantic structure of the considered adjectives, allows identifying systematicity in the organization of lexical material in different languages, establishing its stylistic differentiation and thus determining the LSG as a part of the worldview of people in its human, universal and specific idioethnic manifestations.

As a result of understanding of the nature of the evaluative meaning, its place in the semantic structure of words and the contextual dependence we have identified three types of words: lexemes with purely descriptive meaning (type D), with purely evaluative meaning (type E), words with descriptive and evaluative components in meaning (type DE), the latter type is divided into two subtypes: with a dominant descriptive component (subtype DE-1) and the dominant evaluative component (subtype DE-2).

Adjectives *tyartiple*; *vospitanniyi*; *well-bred* act as dominant representations for all lexemes that make up the lexico-semantic group. By the nature of the evaluative component and its place in the lexical meaning, the adjectives mentioned above refer to the type, called DV-1, which integrates both the descriptive-conceptual and evaluative components. The evaluative seme is a component of the semantic structure of lexical meaning and is distinguished by practically zero dependence on the context. In other words, the evaluative sign (+) is fixed in the semantics of the words *tyartiple*; *vospitanniyi*;

well-bred, reflecting steady positive attitude of native speakers to the compliance with social and cultural norms of behavior in society.

The adjective *tyartiple* in the Tatar language is defined as follows: *zhamgiyatta urnashkan adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarena buysinu*; in the Russian language *vospitanniyi (well-mannered)* is characterized as *following the commonly accepted rules of conduct*; in English *well-bred* is construed as *following the rules of good manner and behaviour, accepted by society*. Thus, the meanings *zhamgiyatta urnashkan adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarena buysinu* (I.A. Abdullin, G.H. Ahunzhanov. Tatar telenen anlatmali suzlege); *compliance with the generally accepted rules of behavior* (D.N. Ushakov. Great Dictionary of the Modern Russian Language); *following the rules of good manner and behavior, accepted by society* (A.S. Hornby. The advanced learner's dictionary of current English) will act as common class meanings for the members of the lexico-semantic subgroup in the studied languages. LSPG with positive sign differs by the number of units in the Russian language and in Tatar and English languages their number is the same. In the Tatar language the number of adjectives positively describing a person in terms of politeness is 32, in Russian – 26 and in English - 32.

Basing on the research by J. Katz and D. Bollinger, who studied the semantic theory and atomization of meanings we divided the semantic field in all three languages into groups depending on the differentiation of semantic components. J. Katz wrote in his paper that the semantic features allow formulating some empirical generalizations about the meaning of linguistic units [7]. Following Katz, D. Bollinger developed the theory of indicators, where all the words are combined on the basis of general differential semes [8]. Thus, in the Tatar language LSSG is divided into two micro-groups, which are located in the heart of the semantic field and are combined by differential semes: *tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarena buysinu*; *tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarenen keshenen echke donyasy belyan yarashui*.

Further we have distinguished one micro-group, with the seme: *yahshi belem, tarbiya algan.*, which is concentrated in the periphery.

In the Russian language LSSG is also divided into 2 micro-groups in the center of semantic field, which are united by the following semes: *adherence to external rules of conduct; compliance of outside behavior with the inner world of human being*.

The micro-group 1 with a common seme *well-mannered* is in the periphery of the field.

In English, there are two micro-groups in the center of the field: *following the rules of good manner and behavior, accepted by society; the conformity of external behavior to the inner world of man.*

The 1st micro-group with a common differential seme *well educated, brought up* is in the periphery of the field.

Units of the semantic macrofield in the Tatar language may also be differed by distinctive features. For instance, the meaning: *tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarena buy sinu*, with additional differential seme such as *tishki* is common for the adjectives *adaple, gadatle, igtibarli, insafli, tubanchelekle, himmatle, yagimli. Ahlakli, ilgazak, iltifatly, ihtiramly, ihtiramchil, kechelekle, myanle, totnakly, tienki* are united by the following differential seme: *tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarenen keshenen echke donyasi belyan yarashui*. The adjective *takyallefle* has a meaning of *tichki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyaren artik totuchi* with differential semes *artik, adap-ahlyak kagiydalyaren*. The seme *tishki* allows combining this adjective with *adaple, gadatle, igtibarli, insafli, tubanchelekle, himmatle, yagimli*. The mentioned lexemes refer to the semantic type, called DE-1, which combines both the descriptive and evaluative components. Evaluative seme is a part of the semantic structure of the word. It is stable, virtually independent of the context, as long as the evaluative sign is based on the descriptive properties of an object which are exposed to native speakers' value conceptualization.

The adjectives *abiz, intelligent, belemle, ziyali, maglumatli, magrifatle, ukigan, ukimishli, kulturali, myadyani, myadyaniyatle* are stylistically neutral and belong to the near periphery. In comparison with the core, their frequency is lower. Adjectives mentioned above are united by an optional seme *yahshi belem, tarbia algan*. By the nature and location of the evaluative seme in the semantic structure these adjectives are attributed to the type, called DE-2, i.e. to the words with both descriptive-conceptual and evaluative components, but the evaluative seme is not based on objective properties of denotatum and, accordingly, is not included in their semantic structure. The lexical meaning of *well-bred* reflects minor signs of denotatum and is non-essential for them. Therefore, the semantics of adjectives of this LSMG is distinguished by contextual dependence. In other words, their semantics reflects inessential features, which however can occur in a specific context. Compare: *Bik shap harakteristika yazdi. Min talantli da ikyan,*

belemle da ikyan (R. Batulla "Valiya"); Avildan kuilgan Hamidulla Tohfatullinnin uli Albert yat ilda da yugalmagan, ukigan, keshe bulgan (R. Batulla "Baylanchek uy").

It is worth noting that the meaning *yahshi belem, tarbia algan* is non-substantive for the words *abiz, intelligent, belemle, ziyali, maglumatli, magrifatle, ukigan, ukimishli, kulturali, myadyani, myadyaniyatle*. It arose on the basis of associative perceptions of the native speakers of English, for whom good manners are closely related to culture, education and belonging to intelligentsia. The concepts *good-manners, education, erudition, culture, intelligentsia* are interdependent and this feature is a common for both Tatar and Russian language worldviews. Tartars and Russians metonymically transfer the qualities of a well-mannered man to their typical language speaker - educated and erudite person, belonging to intelligentsia.

In the far periphery there are adjectives derived by metaphorization. According to Charles Forceville, the linguistic metaphor is a universal linguistic category and reflects the subcultural differences [9]. Thus, a metaphor is not just one of lexico-semantic methods of word-formation, but also a way of attitude and understanding of the surrounding objects and phenomena, where specific characteristics of a nation's thinking are fully realized.

Thus, in the Tatar language the adjective *nyazyakyatle* with a positive evaluative sign metaphorically characterizes a well-mannered person. *Elegant, graceful girl* is the primary meaning of the combination *nyazyakyatle kiz*. It is metonymically converted into a meaning of *delicate, polite girl*. In the linguistic consciousness of Tatars such external aesthetic qualities as *grace, elegance* are metonymically transferred to the characteristic of behavior, i.e. *delicacy, politeness*. Metaphorical nominations belong to the type DE-2.

Two lexico-semantic micro-groups with the meaning *following generally accepted rules of behavior* were distinguished in LSSG of Russian language. The general meaning of the 1st LSMG is *observing external rules of conduct*, the meaning of the 2nd LSMG is *matching external behavior to man's inner world*. In the first LSMG the number of lexical units is much larger. The common is the meaning *external rules of conduct*, where the additional differential seme is *external*. LSMG includes the following lexemes: *genteel, decorous, bonton, polite, correct, courteous, helpful, decent, complaisant, obliging and ceremonious*. They are of the type DE-2, as their lexical meaning combines descriptive

and evaluative components and the latter is a part of the semantic structure of words, stable and independent of the context.

The second LSMG combines the following adjectives: *sustained, delicate, deferential, friendly, discreet, tactful and respectful*. They differ from the semantics of the first micro-group by the differential sense *compliance with inner world*. Adjectives in this LSMG also belong to the type DE-2 as they are characterized by the presence of descriptive and evaluative components in their lexical meaning. The evaluative semantics firmly takes the place in the semantic structure of words and does not depend on contextual conditions. This microgroup includes lexemes, which emphasize that a person complies with the generally accepted rules of behavior not formally, but demonstrates his/her own internal moral qualities and feelings, namely a sense of tact, delicacy, respect, honor and kindness to others and restraint.

According to the semantics, members of this LSMG are boundary and cross-cutting with adjectives that characterize the moral-ethical and emotional qualities of a person, namely *good, honest, warm-hearted, calm, friendly*, etc. This is precisely why the adjectives of this LSMG enter into coordinative syntactic relationship with them in the context. See, for example: He was **friendly** and **tender** with her, but still addressing to her, in his tone and caresses there was a sliding shadow of light mockery and a gruff arrogance of a happy man (Anton Chekhov "The Lady with the Dog"); The only thing, that she was not like before: from a short-haired, round-faced and bright-eyed girlie she has turned into a short, slim, slender girl, quiet, reserved and gentle (I.A. Bunin "Bad Grass").

In the periphery of the semantic field there is LSMG with the meaning "having good education, manners." It includes three lexemes: *intelligent, cultured, educated*, they are united by the optional sense "educated" and are included in the semantic type DE-2. The meaning "well-bred" is not primary for the words *intelligent, cultured, educated*. It is an additional, indirect meaning that metonymically arose on the basis of associative views of the native speakers of Russian. The Russians link education and politeness, culture and manners, belonging to the intelligentsia and good manners. In the far periphery there are adjectives *glossy, polished, sophisticated, refined*, which are metaphorical nominations of the well-bred person with brilliant manners. Thus, for the Russian-speaking people the person with the signs of mannerliness is associated with an object, which has been adzed, cleaned, polished,

shaped and glossed, i.e. an object of long and hard work with the view of improvement. A well-bred person can be compared to the detail that was put through thorough refinement, cleaning, polishing and eventually the result was a beautiful product that strikes the eye with its perfection.

The adjective *well-bred* with an integrating sense *following the rules of good manner and behavior, accepted by society* is the core of the semantic field of adjectives positively describing the person in terms of politeness in English. Adjectives *affable, amiable, attentive, bland, civil, complaisant, courteous, gracious, mannerly, obliging, polite, suave, urbane* are united by a common meaning *following the external rules of good manners and behavior*, with the additional differential sense *external*. Adjectives *demure, discreet, deferential, respectful* are united by the differential sense *conformity of external behavior to the inner world of man*. Adjectives *courtly and genteel* have a meaning *very polite, with good manners*, where the differential senses *very and good manners* are distinguished. The differential sense *good manners* allow uniting these adjectives with lexico-semantic microgroup *affable, amiable, attentive, bland, civil, complaisant, courteous, gracious, mannerly, obliging, polite, suave, urbane*.

In the center there are adjectives that reflect the primary meanings of LSPG with an average degree of value intensity with relevant neutral stylistic coloring: *affable, amiable, attentive, bland, civil, complaisant, courteous, courtly, deferential, demure, discreet, genteel, gracious, mannerly, obliging, polite, respectful, suave, urbane*. Depending on the nature of the evaluative component and its place in the semantic structure they can be attributed to the semantic type, called DE-1, characterized by inclusion of evaluative component in the semantic structure of words and contextual stability.

Cultivated, refined, slick, smooth, sugary, thorough-bred are adjectives with metaphorical nominations. They are included in the far periphery of the semantic field, in the English language. The phrase *cultivated person* is associated with the *cultivated soil*. The expression *refined manners* is primarily associated with the product cleaned from impurities (compare with similar imaginative representation of the adjective *refined* in Russian). The same is valid for the phrases *slick, smooth, sugary man*. The implicative meaning of the expression *thorough-bred person* is formed on the basis of the perception of purebred animals; this figurative idea is apparently typical for the Anglo-American world view, it is observed neither in Tatar nor in Russian language world-views.

Linguoaxiological Specificity of Semantics of Adjectives with the Negative Evaluation of a Person in Terms of Politeness:

According to the statistical analysis, the number of adjectives with a negative evaluation in three languages prevails. This linguistic phenomenon was noted by linguists and psychologists long ago. The psychological explanation for this asymmetry is that the negative aspects of being are perceived by a person much more intensely than the positive factors that are seen as natural, normal and therefore less emotional [10]. In the Tatar language the number of adjectives with a negative evaluative sign is 45, in Russian – 38 and in English - 51.

In the Tatar language in the center of lexico-semantic subgroup (or LSSG) there are 2 LSMG with general semantics: *tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyaren bozu; tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarenen keshenen echke donyasi belyan yarashui;*

and 3 LSMG in the periphery of the field: *moral totkarlikli bashlanishnin yukligi; bik kileshmyagan tartipsez kilanish; tieshle belem, tarbiya almagan.*

In Russian, the LSSG is divided into two central LSMG with a general meaning: *not observing the rules of decorum, violating them; external behavior that agrees with the inner world of a human being;*

and three peripheral LSMG with the meanings: *the lack of moral restraint; extremely reprehensible, completely unacceptable for indecency, shamelessness; non educated, bad-mannered.*

Similarly, 2 LSMG are in the heart of the semantic field in English: *not following the external rules of good manner and behaviour; conformity of external behaviour to the inner world of man.*

In the periphery there are 3 subgroups with a general meaning: *absence of moral restrictive principles; extremely blamable, immoral behavior; not being well-educated and brought up.*

The core of the semantic field in the Tatar language is the adjective *tyartipsez* with the integrating meaning *zhamgiyatta urnashkan adap-ahlyak kagiydalyaren bozu*. First LSMG has five lexical units: *adapsez, tyarbiyasiz, gadatsez, igtibarsiz, insafsiz* united by a common meaning *tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyaren bozu*, with the additional differential seme *tishki*. Adjectives of the second LSMG *dorfa, tupas, tirpagay, iltifatsiz, myansez, totnaksiz, tokse, sansiz, holiksiz* are united by the differential seme *tishki adap-ahlyak kagiydalyarenen keshenen echke donyasi belyan yarashui*.

In the heart of the semantic field there are words: *adapsez, gadatsez, dorfa, igtibarsiz, iltifatsiz, insafsiz, myansez, tyarbiyasez, totnaksiz, tokse, tupas, tirpagay,*

sansiz, holiksiz. We attribute them to the semantic type DE-1, which combines two kinds of meanings - descriptive and evaluative. In the near periphery of the semantic field there are adjectives *arsez, bitsez, oyatsiz, yozsiz, pirdimsiz, somsez, tartinusiz, takyallefsez, hayasiz* with the differential seme *moral totkarlikli bashlanishnin yukligi*. In the far periphery there are adjectives *azgan, azgin, ahlaksiz, vulgar, yogyansez, hamnarga* with a low frequency, which are combined by the connotative seme *bik kileshmyagan tyartipsez kilanish, tatish*. In the far periphery there is LSMG with the meaning *bad-mannered, non educated* consisting of adjectives: *ziyasiz, intelligent tugel, kulturasis, myadyaniyatsez*. They are united by the optional seme *tieshle belem tyarribiya almagan* and relate to the type DE-2 with *suppressed* descriptive properties of denotatum and the prevalence of the evaluative component of semantics that metonymically transformed a descriptive properties to evaluative meanings.

System semantic relationships of words in the language have formal representational properties. Thus, a negative evaluative component in considered adjectives of Tatar language is expressed by the affix *-siz /-sez* or auxiliary word *tugel* with the meaning *absence of the characteristic*, deprivation, ref.: *adapsez, gadatsez, insafsiz, tyartipsez, namussiz, yozsez, myadyaniyatsez, ziyasiz, intelligent tugel* etc.

Adjectives *azman, kerpele, nyazyakyatsez, ertlach, tezgensez, toerle, tirpi* are formed by metaphorization and are usually used in an informal style of speech. They are located in the far periphery of the semantic field. Implicative meaning of the adjective *azman* is based on the direct meaning of *bastard, mongrel*. Thus, in the Tatar national worldview the phrase *azman keshe* primarily relates to an illegitimate child, as well as to cross-bred animals born from different species. The lexemes *illegitimate* and *mongrel* in the direct meaning have the potential negative semes, which are actualized to describe a dishonorable, ill-mannered person. In the expression *nyazyakyatsez kiz* the implication meanings *"undelicate", "impolite"* are formed on the basis of the direct meaning *"inelegant, ungraceful girl."*

In the expressions *tirpi eget; toerle, ertlach, kerpele keshe* a variety of figurative and metaphorical associations are bound with adjectives. So, visual representation of *bristling, sticking out, disheveled* is bound with *tirpi*, but *bumpy* and *lumpy* are connected with the adjective *toerle*. The figurative meaning of the phrase *tezgensez keshe* is based on the direct meaning *without reins, without bit*. The metaphorical meaning of the expression *ertlach eget* is based on the primary meaning a *pock-marked*, that is, in Tatar language

worldview an ill-mannered person is compared with the person infected by deathful disease and provoking disgust by his appearance. The adjective *kerpele* is formed from the cognate noun *kerpe*, i.e. rude and impolite people are associated with spiny hedgehog in the Tatar language. The etalon of crude, shameless person who intrudes everywhere in the Tatar language is a cow, see, e.g., the idiom *mulyak sier*. In general, in the Tatar language worldview the negative human qualities including arrogance, shamelessness, impudence are often attributed to the cow, see, e.g., *mogezsez sier*, *mogezsez sier shikelle*.

The dominant feature of the semantic field of the analyzed LSSG with a negative sign in the Russian language is the adjective *ill-mannered* with an integral seme *non-compliance with the common standards of conduct*, or *their violation*. The seme mentioned above is present in all the units of the field.

Units of this semantic field may have various distinctive features. For example, for the adjectives *impolite*, *ill-bred*, *indecorous*, *indelicate*, *incorrect*, *obscene*, *unobliging*, *discourteous* the common is the meaning of *non-compliance with decorum (external rules of propriety)*, where an additional differential seme is *external*. The adjectives *tactless*, *rude*, *passionate*, *disrespectful*, *unfriendly*, *short-tempered*, *tactless*, *irreverent* are combined by the differential seme *match of the external behavior to the inner world*. All the above mentioned adjectives (*tactless*, *rude*, *impolite*, *passionate*, *bad-mannered*, *indecorous*, *indelicate*, *incorrect*, *irreverent*, *obscene*, *unfriendly*, *short-tempered*, *tactless*, *disrespectful*, *unobliging*, *discourteous*) can be attributed to the semantic evaluative type DE-1.

In the near periphery of the semantic field there are adjectives which are stylistically marked, related to a low style, namely conversational, colloquial. In comparison with the core, their frequency is lower; they can be attributed to the semantic type DE -1: *insolent* (colloquial, low colloquial), *shameless* (colloquial), *unceremonious*, *importunate* (archaic) with the differential seme *absence of moral and restraining core in behavior*. In the far periphery there are adjectives *vulgar*, *impudent*, *unbridled*, *rollicking*, *barefaced*, *boorish*, *loutish*, *rough-mannered* used in the low style of speech, united by connotative seme *extremely reprehensible, completely unacceptable for indecency and shamelessness*.

As we have noted above, formal representational properties of the negative semantics of this LSSG in the Russian language may include the prefixes *ne-*, *bes-*

analogous to the English prefixes *im-*, *non-*, *un-*, *dis-* conveying the meaning *the absence of any sign: short-tempered, tactless, impolite, disrespectful*, etc.

Adjectives *uncouth*, *cheeky*, *spoiled*, *licentious* and *wild* are formed by metaphorization in the Russian language. For Russian-speaking people a *bad-mannered person* is associated with certain images, which are reflected in the metaphorical nominations. *Uncouth* correlates with the bar of irregular, angular shape or an unheven log of wood in need of treatment. The process of metaphorization may be accompanied by a partial reforming of the word, for example, by adding suffixes or prefixes. For example, the prefixes [raz-; ras-] in the Russian analogues to *spoiled*, *licentious*, which have the meaning of cancellation and have the same root, cognate with the verbs [razvyazat', raspoyasat', raspustit'] meaning *to spoil*, for which the original meaning is *to dissolve, to divide, to remove the belt*. Thus, the phrases *cheeky young man*, *disheveled demeanor*, *loose morals* in the conceptual picture of the world of Russian-speaking people are associated with excessive freedom and unrestrictedness.

The above adjectives with metaphorical meanings relate to the figurative types of metaphors. The adjective *wild* with the meaning *boorish* is attributed to the cognitive metaphor, resulting from a shift in the compatibility of predicate words (transfer of meaning). The primary meanings of the adjective *wild* are being in a primeval state (referring to people), uncultivated (plants), feral, non-domesticated (for animals): for example, *the wild tribes*, *wild apple*, *wild forests*, *wild duck*. Secondary meaning *uncultured*, *uneducated*, *rude* indicates synonymous relations with adjectives *rude*, *vulgar*, *obscene*, *indecorous* with a meaning *not in accordance with a highly developed public*.

For adjectives with a negative evaluation sign in the English language the dominant is the adjective *ill-bred* with archiseme *not following the rules of good manner and behaviour, accepted by society*. Similarly to the positive adjectives the adjectives with a negative sign *discourteous*, *impolite*, *inattentive*, *indecorous*, *uncivil*, *ungentle*, *ungracious*, *under-bred*, *ill-mannered* are united by the common meaning *not following the external rules of good manner and behavior*, where the additional differential seme is *external*. Adjectives *abrupt*, *boorish*, *churlish*, *gruff*, *loutish*, *rowdy*, *rude*, *surlly*, *uncouth* have the same differential seme *conformity of external behaviour to the inner world of man*. LSMG of adjectives, concentrated in the center, has an average degree of evaluative intensity with appropriate neutral

stylistic coloring. They can be rightly attributed to the semantic group DE-1, as they are characterized by the equality of denotative and evaluative components in the semantic structure, the independence of the meaning from the context and con-situation. In the near periphery of the semantic macrofield there are adjectives with frequency that is lower compared with the core. This LSMG includes adjectives *defiant, gross, impudent, impertinent, insolent, perky, saucy, unceremonious* with differential seme *absence of moral restrictive principles*. In the far periphery there are adjectives *blatant, pert, rakish, uncontrollable, unruly, vulgar* with a low frequency, used in the low style of speech, united by the connotative seme *extremely blamable, immoral behavior*. In the extreme periphery there are adjectives *illiberal, illiterate and uncultured*. They are united by the optional seme *not being well-educated and brought up*.

In the English language the negative evaluative semantics of words in the considered LSSG has specific formal and representational qualities, namely the prefixes *im-, in-, un-, ill-, dis-*, with the meaning *the absence of any indication or its cancellation: impolite, inattentive, unruly, uncivil, ungentle, ill-bred, ungracious, discourteous*, etc.

The adjectives with a metaphorical meaning, located in the far periphery are *barbarian, barbaric, barbarous, bearish, blunt, coarse, crude, cur, rough, rugged, rustic, savage, tough, unbridled, wanton and wild*. In the English linguistic worldview adjectives *coarse, crude, rough, rugged* are associated with the idea of the subject of poor quality, which is in need of treatment. The expression *cur person* said that the ill-mannered people are figuratively compared to a mongrel. The phrase *rustic man* gives us an idea of a country bumpkin, a simple person with uncouth manners. The direct meaning of the adjective *bearish* has the same root with the noun *bear*. The behavior of this animal can be characterized by clumsiness, rudeness, so the metaphorical meaning of the adjective *bearish* is formed on the basis of the image.

In accordance with the typical views of English speakers who see an analogy between upbringing and purity of the breed, the boorish behavior is compared with the half-bred, pedigreed horse. See, for example, the set phrase *hair about the heels* (colloquial), which means bad manners. The literal translation of the *hair above the pasterns* (the horse) is considered as a sign of a bad breed of the horse. This association served as a basis for the origin of metaphorical meaning in the idiom *hairy about (at or in) the heel (or the fetlocks)* (jargon) - *uncouth, ill-*

mannered [initially only about the non-pedigreed horses]; see Bit hairy at the heel. Definitely not out of the top drawer (A. Christie, "Murder in the Mews").

The implicative meaning of the adjectives *blunt, tough* emerges from the idea of blunt objects and sturdy, dense material. The metaphorical meaning of the adjectives *barbarian, barbaric, barbarous, savage* is related to the ideas about barbarians, savages and primitive society. The implicative meaning of the adjective *wanton* is formed on the basis of the direct meaning – *random, uncontrolled and wild (about plants, natural phenomena)*. The adjective *unbridled* has the same root with the noun *bridle*, denoting the subject for reining horse. Thus, the *unbridled, licentious* person in the English linguistic worldview, as in the Russian view of the world is compared with wild, unbroken horse that can not be bridled. *Wild* refers to the cognitive metaphor, resulting from a shift in the combinability of predicate words (transfer of the meaning). In a figurative meaning of the word several meanings are actualized: 1) boorish, uncultured people; 2) short-tempered, uncontrolled; 3) immoral.

CONCLUSION

The comparative study of the axiological and semantic aspects of adjectives describing the person in terms of politeness, allowed, firstly, to examine linguocultural ideas of the native speakers of different languages, represented in the adjectives of this LSG, secondly, to determine the complexity of their semantic structure, to identify basic semantic subgroups on the evaluative sign within a given LSG and further - micro-groups within the sub-group and third, to compare the linguoaxiological features of the semantics of adjectives included in the selected subgroups, micro-groups in Tatar, Russian and English languages.

Taking into consideration all of the above mentioned aspects, we can conclude that:

- The concept politeness is universal in different linguistic cultures: a well-bred person is understood by native Tatars, Russians and Englishmen primarily as a person who observes the generally accepted rules of behavior as a person with good manners, respectful in relation to the others. The unique features of the investigated concept for the Tatar linguo-culture are modesty and respect for elders and parents. In the Russian language there is

the moral and ethical orientation of "good manners" and in English the indicators of good upbringing are first of all good manners and proper behavior.

- A body of language units, nominating the level of politeness in Tatar, Russian and English languages was identified. The basic principle of differentiation of the semantics of adjectives is the axiological sign. The analyzed LSG is divided according to this principle into two subgroups (LSPG): LSPG of adjectives with a positive sign and LSPG of adjectives with a negative evaluative sign. Adjectives with a negative sign dominate in all the studied languages on their number.
- The division of the lexico-semantic subgroup of adjectives with positive and negative evaluation of politeness into micro-groups is based on the general differential semes, which may be the same in the three considered languages and may differ reflecting the mentality of native speakers.
- National and specific features of Tatar, Russian and English languages in some way are manifested in metaphors. For example, in the Tatar language the ill-bred man is associated with untidy appearance: spiky, disheveled hair: *tirpi eget*; in the Russian language with complete freedom, unlimitedness: *cheeky, ungirt, dissolute* person; in English – with a blunt object: *blunt man*.
- Most adjectives of the considered LSG are referred to semantic type DE-1, i.e. to the words combining the descriptive and evaluative components and the latter one is a part of the semantic structure of adjectives, as an evaluative sign is based on objective properties of the denotation that have a specific value meaning for the individual. A smaller number of adjectives of this LSG belongs to the type DE-2, which is characterized by weakening and sometimes the loss of a descriptive component of the content, for example, in the process of the figurative rethinking of speech, metonimization and metaphorization.

REFERENCES

1. Temirgazina, Z.K., 2010. Linguistic Axiology: Evaluative Expressions in the Russian Language. Pavlodar: ECO, pp: 310.
2. Lakoff, G., 1974. Humanistic Linguistics. Washington: Georgetown University Press, pp: 106.
3. Pustet, R., 2005. Adjectives. Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. 2nd edition, Eds., Brown, K. and A. Anderson, Elsevier, pp: 61.
4. Bagautdinova, G.A., 2006. Axiological Linguistics: Linguistic Value of Linguistic Units and Values Expressed by Linguistic Units. III International Baudouin Readings: I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay and Modern Problems of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, pp: 132-135.
5. Karaulov, Yu. N., 2010. Russian Language and Linguistic Identity. Moscow: LKI, Editorial URSS, pp: 264.
6. Ozhegov, S.I. and N.Y. Shvedova, 1997. Russian Dictionary. Moscow: Russkiy Yazyk, pp: 97.
7. Katz, J., 1966. The Philosophy of Language. New York: Harper & Row, pp: 155-175.
8. Bolinger, D., 1967. The Atomization of Meaning. In: "Readings in the Psychology of Language", pp: 432-448.
9. Forceville, C., 2006. Non-Verbal and Multimodal Metaphor in a Cognitivist Framework: Agendas for Research. Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives. Eds., Kristiansen, G. and M. Achard. Berlin, New-York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp: 380.
10. Retunskaya, M.S., 1989. Implementation of Emotional and Evaluative Capacities of Words in Speech Activity. Bulletin of Kharkov University, 399: 81-85.