

# *National Specificity of Set Comparisons in Three Languages: Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian*

Madina A. Tsalikova  
North-Ossetian State University  
named after K. L. Khetagurov  
Vladikavkaz, Russia  
tsalma07@mail.ru

Nina Zh. Khamgokova  
Faculty of Russian Language  
and General Educational Disciplines  
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia,  
Moscow, Russia  
ninahamgokova@mail.ru

**Abstract**—The given article presents the results of comparative analysis of set comparisons in three languages: Kabardian, Ossetian and Russian. We have analyzed the structural features of set comparisons and the reflection of national linguistic views of the world in them. The interest of the research focuses on the assertion of general and specific in object comparison, grounds for comparison, set language estimations, contained in reproducible units with comparative semantics. The results revealed significant differences in national languages. The meaning of a specific set comparison is determined by linguistic experience, that is intuitive knowledge of representatives of this or that culture, as the logical and comparative link between elements, characteristic for set comparisons, is fixed in the language consciousness of people as a figurative expression, notable for its reproduction. Knowledge of cultural realities, on which the image of a set comparison is based, is very important for the adequate perception of speech as well as for the correct understanding of its figurative meaning on the whole. And on the contrary, ignorance of them entails inaccurate or wrong understanding of the whole utterance in the process of oral communication. In the course of the research, we established that the set comparisons that are based on concepts and facts, related exclusively to history, culture, way of life, traditions and the like of the given people do not have a universal meaning, often contain onomastic components: toponyms and anthroponyms. The national and cultural component of semantics of such set comparisons is distinguished by the wealth of cultural connotations, historical, social, literary and other associations. The view of the world in different national cultures develops from different images, so the difference in mentality of North Caucasian ethnic groups from that of the Russian seems quite natural. People in North Caucasus and in Central Russia perceive and express the same universal concepts by means of their native language quite differently. It is also worth noting that the national specificity of set comparisons manifests in the ways and forms of figurative rethinking of real facts as well as in characteristic features of lexical, semantic and grammatical system of a specific language.

**Keywords:** *Russian language, Kabardian language, Ossetian language, set comparison, semantic equivalent.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

The linguistic view of the world of every ethnic group is reflected in the language as a set of cultural codes. The language of each ethnic group reflects the specific method of perception of the ways of the world, or of its linguistic view. The perception and comprehension of the world are different for each ethnic group: representatives of different ethnic groups see

the world through the prism of their language, which acts as an accumulator of national culture [1, 5, 7, 13, 15, 23]. Activation of anthropocentric accent in humanitarian research triggering intensification of interest in cultural linguistics is directly related to the study of the role of culture in the language and with the formation of “the national view of the world”. According to V.I. Karasik, the culturological approach to a language presupposes identification, on the one hand, of national and specific part of the dictionary, which includes words and phrases, expressing specific experience of people, using the given language, proper names, cultural and historical realities, common allusions, precedent texts, words with emotionally evaluating background, recognized precisely by the given ethnic group, etc. And, on the other hand, there is reference to words and expressions that are universal for all mankind [10, 11]. Set comparisons are certainly also included in the new paradigm of scientific knowledge since they, as all other reproducible units of a language, do not only conceptualize “the knowledge of human, naive view of the world and all types of relations of the subject to its fragments, but also program the participation of these language entities together with their use in inter-generation transfer of standards and stereotypes of national culture” [21]. One should also note that the judgments or concepts, expressed in set comparisons, their generalized, abstract meanings are often common for different peoples. It goes without saying that ethnic groups with different history; different conditions of life cannot have absolutely equivalent phraseological units. At best there might be partial equivalents (with matching semantic, stylistic and lexical parameters). More often set comparisons in different languages represent analogues, matching in meaning. We may assert that it is impossible to find analogues to some set comparisons in another language. Analogues of set comparisons in different languages usually possess different subject-matter and image. In every language we can find set comparisons, related to extralinguistic factors, revealing links of the language with people’s life and their culture. Only the description of all logical elements of comparison, on the basis of logical and comparative connections fixed in collective language consciousness gives the recipient the possibility of information to really represent a sign of an object, actions and his image [4, 6, 9, 12, 17]. Comparison is one of the most important ways to learn the world, names and evaluation of surrounding reality [8]. Such language phenomenon as set comparisons has high cultural meaning. Set comparisons are characterized by the possibility of reproduction, imagery,

brightness, expressiveness, brevity, clarity, subtlety and a high degree of usage in speech. V. M. Mokienko notes that “their images are taken from most topical and traditional spheres of a person’s life and activity” [16]. Set comparisons give us a possibility to consider them as means of manifestations of a national culture of Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian people. Examples in the Russian language have been selected from the “Dictionary of Set Comparisons” by V. M. Ogoltsev [19]. Examples in the Kabardian and Ossetian languages were taken from phraseological dictionaries. Nowadays, close links of a language with culture of an ethnic group are manifested, in particular, in set comparisons. The national specificity of set comparisons is also manifested in the difference of standards of comparison and stereotypical views in this or that culture. In them we can find the reflection of national originality of people, their nature, mentality, method of telling about the surrounding world, the manner of comprehension of phenomena and facts of reality and events taking place in it [20, 22]. Set comparisons need to be studied in detail since they give representation about the markings of these or those characteristics in language consciousness. There are no works on the considered problem at present, based on the material of the Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian languages. Everything stated above defines the topicality of the selected theme.

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Research in the areas of representation of mental features of a nation are pretty common in connection with the establishment of anthropocentric orientation of modern linguistic research. Due to their concise fixation of centuries-old cultural ethnos, set comparisons represent a reflection of national mentality. They relay peculiarities of perception of reality by representatives of ethnic groups, as well as the prevailing view about the relationship of man with the surrounding world. Research of set comparisons, images used in them and steady connotations, using linguistic and cultural analysis, seems topical for the formation of a full linguistic view of the world of different ethnic groups, identification of national symbols, rituals and stereotypes.

## III. Research Questions

The subject research is the semantic and grammatical organization of set comparisons in the Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian languages. The researcher sets the following tasks: 1) to analyze models of set comparisons in the Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian languages; 2) to explore the specificity of verbalization of standard and base comparison in set comparisons in the Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian languages; 3) to identify the axiological potential of set comparisons in the Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian languages.

## IV. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this article is to analyze set comparisons in the Russian, Ossetian and Kabardian languages to establish whether they represent the national perception of the surrounding world.

## V. RESEARCH METHODS

In this work the main method research is the descriptive one, including the comparative method and the method of definitive

and component analysis, analysis of structure and semantics, analysis of dictionary definitions, linguistic and cultural commenting.

## VI. Findings

The total characteristics. In the form, a set comparison, as L. A. Lebedeva notes, is “a multi-component formation, reflecting the logical formula of comparison, A-C as B, where A is the subject of comparison (what is compared), B – object (image) of comparison (that is what it is compared with), as - modus (indicator) of comparison, and C is the foundation (sign) of comparison” [14]. The Ossetian language, as well Russian and Kabardian is rich in set comparisons. Special words are used for their formation, mostly - in Ossetian the word хуызæн, in Russian похож or как, for example: зæды хуызæн хæларзæрдæ (Osset.) \* - как ангел добрый (Literally “good like an angel”); бегъымбарым хуэдæщ (Kab.) - словно пророк (Literally “like a prophet”); чызджы хуызæн уæздан (Osset.) - как девушка скромный (Literally “shy like a girl”); хъыджэбзым хуэдæу укытæхщ (Kab.) – как девушка скромный (Literally “shy like a girl”); куклайы хуызæн рæсугъд (Osset.) - как кукла красивая (Literally “beautiful like a doll”); гуащэм хуэдæу дахæщ (Kab.) - (как кукла красивая (Literally “beautiful like a doll”); стæгдары хуызæн мæллæг (Osset.) - как скелет тощий (Literally “skinny like a skeleton”); къупшхъэм хуэдæу гъурщ (Kab.) - skinny, bony, but the expression къупшхъэ хъун in the Kabardian language means “to become the one who ensures the continuity of lineage”.

In set comparisons in the Russian, as well as Ossetian languages, the indispensable component is the presence of a comparative conjunction, in Russian - как, словно, будто, точно, как будто, in Ossetian - цыма, хуызæн, уыйау and with the help of special formant (in this case flexion) -ау. In the Kabardian language for comparison хуэдæ is used (like something), нэхъей (as if), ещхъ (similar). It is interesting to compare set comparisons in three languages from the point of view of their semantics. Comparing, we may state that not all set comparisons in the Ossetian and Kabardian languages have an exact equivalent in the Russian language \* (examples of set comparisons in the Russian language are taken from V. M. Ogoltsev’s book “Concise Dictionary of Set Comparisons in the Russian language” for example:

*Как каша во рту (Russian.)* Literally “as if one has porridge in mouth”)

Цыма йæ дзыхы тæвд картоф и (Osset.) (Literally “as if one has a hot potato in the mouth”);

Ижьэм пиастэ жьдэль хуэдæщ (Kab.) - (Literally “as if one has porridge in the mouth”).

However do not excluded an almost literal translation, moreover, it can be found often enough:

*Как бездонная бочка (Russian.)* – (Literally “like a bottomless barrel”).

Енаббын боцкыйы хуызæн (Osset.) – (Literally “like a bottomless barrel”).

Фэндырэ лъащӕншӕ (Kab.) - (Literally “like a bottomless barrel”).

The main object of the comparison becomes a man, on relation to who the expressive value of the set comparison is manifested with maximum brightness. In both (presented) languages man is more often compared with domestic animals, objects of everyday life, wild animals, insects, birds, plants, objects of inanimate nature, mythical and cult creatures, natural phenomena; besides, comparison with other people is rather common - with certain well known persona as well as with typical representatives of social groups (divided into professional, social and other groups). Comparison with animals, plants, phenomena elements, representatives of another nation, church objects, insects, etc. are also used widely enough in all three languages, for example: сӕгъы хуызӕн, пысырайы хуызӕн, доны хуызӕн, цигайнаджы хуызӕн, скъаппы хӕйрадджы хуызӕн, мӕлдзиджы хуызӕн (Literally “like a goat”, “like nettle”, “like water”, “like a gypsy”, “like a donkey”, “like an ant”). The analysis of semantics of set comparisons on the whole and of their components allows asserting that these units are close in both languages.

We can distinguish such basic thematic groups of set comparisons (let us note that in this case we take units, having relative equivalence in languages under consideration, as examples):

### *6.1. Set Comparisons with Names of Animals*

Set comparison is a wide layer of actively used designs, representing a system of means of expression, in which internal form of a language manifests itself, as well as originality of national culture. In the Ossetian language with the word хуызӕн: рӕпӕбуйау роу – literally «как бабочка лёгкая», (literally “light as a butterfly”); сабыр фысы хуызӕн – literally «как баран тихий» (literally “quiet as a ram”); как бездомная собака, (literally “as a homeless dog) – literally “ӕнӕхӕдзар куыдзы хуызӕн”; ӕрра куыдзы хуызӕн - literally «как бешеная собака» (literally “as a mad dog”); цӕваг гапы хуызӕн - literally «как бык» (literally “as a bull”); ӕххоринаг бирӕгъы - literally «как голодный волк» (literally “as a hungry wolf”); хӕддаг сырды хуызӕн - literally «как дикий зверь» (literally “as a wild beast); ӕнтӕрд бирӕгъы хуызӕн - literally «как загнанный волк» (literally “as a hunted wolf”); тӕрхъусау тӕппуд, ӕнтӕрд рувасы хуызӕн - literally «как трусливый заяц» (literally “as a funky hare”); капнау сыф-сыфаг - literally «как шипящая змея» (literally “as a hissing snake”); куаг хӕрӕджы хуызӕн - literally «работа как у ишака» (literally “work like a donkey”); сӕгъы хуызӕн хӕддаг - literally «как козел» (literally “as a goat”); стӕрд роды хуызӕн - literally «как корова языком слизала» (literally “as if a cow licked it up”); нӕл гӕддӕйы хуызӕн - literally «как кот» (literally “like a tom cat”); рӕды фиумӕ кӕсӕгау - literally «как кот на сало» (literally “like a cat looks at fat meat”); куыдз ӕмӕ гӕддӕйы хуызӕн - literally «как кошка с собакой» (literally “like cat and dog”); хуылыдз карчы хуызӕн - literally «как мокрая курица» (literally “like a wet hen”). In the Kabardian language these are comparisons with the word хуэдӕ (as) – here are some comparisons with animals: мыщӕм хуэдӕу пӕщӕщ - literally «крупный как медведь» (literally “big as a bear”); хӕз бзаджӕ нӕхбей -

literally «словно злая собака» (literally “like a wicked dog”); хӕз бжыдзӕу гӕзлӕн - literally «дать взбучку» (literally “to beat black and blue”); хӕнӕу ӕфӕн - literally «напиться в стельку» (literally “to get stinking drunk”); хӕмрӕ джӕдурӕ хуэдӕу - literally «как кошка с собакой» (literally “like cat and dog”); хӕз ӕкӕуӕлӕпӕншӕм ӕщхӕщ - literally «как бездомная собака» (literally “like a homeless dog”); бажӕм хуэдӕу - literally «хитрый как лиса» (literally “crafty like a fox”); вым хуэдӕу лӕжӕн - literally «работать как вол» (literally “work like an ox”); хӕмпӕрышӕм хуэдӕу псынцӕщ - literally «легкая как бабочка» (literally “light like a butterfly”); мацӕ диям ӕщхӕщ - literally «похожа на застывшую саранчу» (literally “like a frozen locust; блящхуӕжбейм хуэдӕу шхӕн - literally «есть как голодный волк» (literally “eat like a hungry wolf”).

This same group of comparisons (with the word “as”) can be found in the Russian language as well: как мышь на крупе, как слон в лавке, как собака на сене, как злая собака, как королева на льду (literally “as mouse at grain, as elephant in a china shop, as dog in the manger, as wicked dog, as cow on ice”) and others.

### *6.2. Set comparisons with names of phenomena of inanimate nature*

Цыма йӕ тыныгъ ахаста - literally «как буря врывается» (literally “break in like a storm”); дымгӕйау къуызит кӕнын - literally «как ветер свистеть» (literally “whistle like a wind”); цыма зӕххы скъыды ныххауд - literally «как в воздухе растворился» (literally “as if dissolved in air”); закӕотау къӕвдайы фӕстӕ - literally «как грибы после дождя» (literally “like mushrooms after rain”); арвӕрттывдау фӕзынд - literally «как молния промелькнуть» (literally “flash like lightning”); артау судзын - literally «как на огне гореть» (literally “as if on fire”); ихы къӕртты хуызӕн - literally «как снег холодный» (literally “cold as snow”); хуры тыны хуызӕн - literally «как лучик солнца» (literally “like a sun ray”).

In the Kabardian language there is an expression уӕсым хуэдӕу къеггӕсын which means «достать быстро и в большом количестве» (literally “to obtain quickly and in large quantity”); бештоуж хуэдӕу шӕбӕ - literally «холодный как ветер с горы Бештау» (literally “as cold as wind from the Mountain Beshtau”); уафӕхуӕпскыу къӕлыдын - literally «разгневаться, разъяриться вспыхнуть как молния» (literally “flare up like lightning”); мафиӕм хуэдӕу къызыщӕнӕн - literally «вспыхнуть как огонь» (literally “flare up like fire”); мафиӕз лыгбӕу гуащӕн - literally «быть не в меру пылким, как огонь горячим» (literally “to be immeasurably fervent, hot as fire”); си дыггӕ - literally «мой луч солнца» (literally “my ray of sun”); си дыггӕ, си мазӕ - literally «мое солнце, моя луна (обращение к любимому человеку)» (literally “my sun, my moon (address to a beloved person)”).

A separate group of set comparisons with names parts human body may be singled out.

Цыма ӕнӕкбӕх у – literally «как без ног» (literally “as if without feet”); ӕнӕкбӕхы хуызӕн - literally «как без рук» (literally “as if without hands”); цыма йӕ дзыхы дон и уйау

- literally «как воды в рот набрал» (literally “as if one’s mouth is full of water”); маэ зæрдæйæ цыма дур æрхауди - literally «как камень с груди свалился» (literally “as if a stone fell from one’s breast”); цыма дзыхы тæвд картоф и - literally «как каша (горячий картофель) во рту» (literally “as if one has hot potatoes in one’s mouth”); цыма къуыры наббадт - literally «как кость в горле» (literally “as if a bone has stuck in one’s throat”); цыма мыл базыртæ разад - literally «словно крылья за спиной выросли» (literally “as if one has suddenly grown wings”); сджыты букеты (чъитта) хуызæн - literally «как мешок с костями» (literally “as a bag with bones”); зæрдæйы цыма кард атыыста - literally «как нож в сердце» (literally “as a knife in heart”); цыма маэ къухтæ баст сты - literally «как по рукам связанный» (literally “as if one’s hands are tied”); цыма йæ æвзагæй бастъæрдта - literally «как языком вылизал» (literally “as if licked up with tongue”); цыма йæ æвзаг аныхъуырда - literally «как язык проглотил» (literally “as if one has swallowed one’s tongue”); цыма йæ æвзаг бандзыг и - literally «словно язык отнялся» (literally “as if one has lost the power of speech”).

In the Kabardian language one can find the following constructions: и бзэр иубыда хуэдэщ - literally «как будто лишился дара речи» (literally “as if one has lost the power of speech”); и гур флæмыштым хуэдэу фыщцæщ - literally «сердце чёрное как уголь» (literally “heart black as coal”); дэп жьэражъэм хуэдэу плыжьыщ - literally «красный, как раскалённый уголь» (literally “as red as a red hot coal”); шу мафлæ - literally «огненный всадник» (literally “as a fiery rider”); къушцхъэ хужь - literally «голубая кровь (белая кость)» (literally “blue blood” (“white bone”)).

### 6.3. Set Comparisons with Names of Household Realities

Æнæбын боцкъайы хуызæн - literally «как бездонная бочка» (literally “like a bottomless barrel”); судзины бырынгъы хуызæн - literally «как булавочная головка» (literally “like a pin head”); feet цъыпынау - literally «как новый веник» (literally “like a new broom”); цыма авдæны баст у - literally «как в люльке» (literally “as if in a cradle”); къæппæджы бадагау - literally «как в мышеловке» (literally “as if in a mousetrap”); пецы баæгау - literally «как в печи» (literally “as if in a furnace”); цыма кхæдын у - literally «как дерево» (literally “like a tree”); цыма йæ ауындзæнын æрцауыгътой - literally «как на вешалке» (literally “as if on clothes hanger”); сындзытыл бадагау - literally «как на иголках» (literally “as if on needles”). Ossetian set comparisons are mostly polysemic, some of them have up to ten meanings, for example: in Russian: как камень – жесткий, твердый, прочный, тяжелый, неподвижный, бесчувственный, молчать, падать, идти ко дну, лежать на душе, висеть на шее. In Ossetian: куыдзы хуызæн - мæллæг, æххормаг, иузæрдион, фыдзæрдæ, бафæллайын, рæйын, хæцын, тæхын, нæмын, мæлын (as a dog - dying, hungry, loyal, tired etc.). In the Kabardian language: нывэм хуэдэу быдэщ - literally «жадный» (literally “greedy”); and псалъэр зэзым хуэдэу дыджц - literally «его слова горькие, как желчь» (literally “his words are bitter as gall”).

Thanks to the structurally semantic fullness of internal form, this clearly manifests extralinguistic component of the meaning, reflecting national features of centuries-old history of

people, their culture, everyday life, from ancient times up to nowadays. Semantic analysis of object comparison allows us to learn much about the history of people, their way of life, natural environment and other things, affecting their system of moral and ethical values as well as the formation of criteria of evaluation. It’s worth noting here that criteria of evaluation of speakers of the languages we are comparing are rather close as are the standards they re compared with. But nonetheless the national specificity is also, undoubtedly, here. Let us compare: in the Russian language - literally «как сирота казанская, как у тещи на блинах, как на курорте, как ракета, как робот»; in the Ossetian language - хъазыбеджы хохы хуызæн (literally “as mountain Kazbek”), etc. The comparisons, containing proper names, are also interesting; these are more often names of historical personalities, legendary or mythical characters: как Мамай прошел - literally “as if Mamay has passed here” (comparison with negative assessment), нæхи Къостайы хуызæн - literally “Like our Kosta” (comparison with positive assessment), characters from Narts epic - Сатанайы хуызæн - literally “Like Shatana” (comparison with positive assessment), etc. In the Kabardian language comparisons from Narts epic, the following is also used: бэдынокъуэ хуэдэу къэрущ - literally “strong as Badynokko”; Сэтэней хуэдэу дахэщ - literally “beautiful as Sateney”; (beautiful as flowers “Sateney”); comparison with wind - бештоужь хуэдэу - literally “the wind, blowing from the Mountains Beshtau”).

### 6.4. The Emotional Estimation of Set Comparisons

The ability for emotional estimation of set comparisons is also of interest for researchers. The set, reproducible semes of estimation contain non-syntactic comparative formations. Set comparative expressions (literally “to look as mouse at grain”, “cold as ice”), certainly, have great value for the research of the system of people’s values. Set comparisons possess vividly expressed national identity, as well as expressive and emotional fullness. In these units of the language, one can find not only names of phenomena, events, reflecting life and history of a given ethnic group, but their system of values as well.

Semantic analysis of object comparison allows us to learn much about the history of people, their way of life, natural environment and other things, affecting their system of moral and ethical values as well as the formation of criteria of evaluation. It is worth noting here that criteria of evaluation of the speakers of the languages we are comparing are very close. But nonetheless national specificity is also, undoubtedly, here.

In the Ossetian, as well as Russian and Kabardian languages, there are, for example, comparisons with cattle as negative assessment - these maybe contempt, pity, disapproval and so on. So, for example, an Ossetian will compare an ungrateful or dirty, or drunk man with a pig (чижи/æдзæллаг, æнæбалвырд / хуыйы хуызæн), a Kabardian will say (кхъуэм хуэдэу фиейщ – literally “dirty as pig”). A Russian will compare a fat or dirty, drunk or stupid man (literally “fat as pig”, as pig in oranges” and so on). Cattle for Russians represents: 1) poverty, darkness, ignorance; 2) sluttishness; 3) humility (to treat like cattle). An Ossetian will compare with cattle an ungrateful or blunt man. Donkey for Russians is - 1) a person working hard, resignedly and tensely; 2) overloaded, 3) opinionated.

For Ossetians it is: 1) an object understanding nothing (хæрæгæй уæлдай ницы æмбары) (literally “understanding nothing like donkey”); 2) weary, carrying out heavy work, bearing a heavy load. Kabardians will say about a persistent and hardworking man: 1) шыдым хуэдэу ерыщц - (literally “opinionated like donkey”); 2) шыдым хуэдэу йокъу - (literally “works like a donkey”). Dog for Russians is a miserable creature - beaten, homeless and hungry. Speaking about dogs, a Russian remembers about punishment, violence /literally “to love like a dog loves a stick”, literally “to beat like a dog” and so on. Basically this is the image of a sufferer or of an evil, pig-headed person / dog in the manger, stuck like a dog on something, etc.

For Ossetians, it is a goofy liar (куыдзы рæйд кæны – literally “barking like a dog”); a shameless impudent person (куыдзы цæсгом - literally “dog face”), irksome type (куыдз йæ къæдзилæй куыд бафæллайа), homeless - with negative assessment, more often about a tramp (æнæхæдзар куыдзы разил - базил цы каныс./ literally “why are you wandering about like a homeless dog?”), a servile man (мæ гуыр куыдзы хуызæн / literally “like a poor dog”). The last comparison expresses certainty that the man that is being discussed will do this or that thing – willy-nilly, but will still do, without fail. Kabardians compare bad life with canine life – хъæпсæукæ; about a plain man they say - хъæнкъу, “mock”, “not to let live” - хъæлупс шъын.

A hen in comparisons of both languages represents stupidity (literally “a lost hen, stupid, headless hen, chicken head, цъиусæр, æнæсæр карк, карчы сæри etc.). Kabardinian sayings are read as: Джэд нэхрæ джэдыкIæ нэхъ Iушц - literally “egg is smarter than chicken”; Джэдрæ пэт мæульæпхъащæ - literally “even hen is in search of food”.

An image of a cat almost matches in comparative units of the languages compared.

This is more often a carefree, easily living egoist. An Ossetian will say: a carefree, quiet life, like a tomcat’s - нæлгæдыйы цард (male gender of the animal is stressed here). A Russian will say: literally “screw up one’s eyes like a cat” - about a man in a state of bliss, full satisfaction. Besides, for Russians, a cat is a subject, distinguished by soft, soundless footfall; a bawdy man (march cat) or gourmet-predator (literally “looks at fat meat as a cat”), but Kabardians say about a man, who does not bear to eat hot food, джэду Iупæ (literally “with cat’s lips”), about people, who swear - хъæмрæ джэдумрæ хуэдæш (literally “cat and dog”).

The idea about an evil man for some ethnic groups is traditionally linked with predators - wolf, snake. Evil eye - literally “wolf’s eye, snake’s eye, looks like a wolf”, бирагъы сæстынгас, калымы сæстынгас, etc. Kabardians will say дыгъужьым хуэдэу еплъын (literally “looks like a wolf”).

The idea about craftiness is traditionally linked with fox (рувасы хуызæн) (literally “like a fox”). Speed, precipitancy is linked with fire: арты хуызæн згъорын (literally “run like fire”). Being busy, fussy is linked with a spinning top. Here we should note that for Russians, Ossetians and Kabardinians alike the behavior of a man in a state of confusion or experiencing a feeling of inconvenience, caused by an unpleasant conversation

or a nasty situation, is associated with a spinning top: (цъиллау ныззылди (Oset.) (literally “to spin like a spinning top”); Чыным хуэдэу мæкырахъуæ (Kab.) - literally “to be spinning like a spinning top”). But there is an opposite expression in the Kabardian language: чын хъæгуаруæ зехуэн - literally “to be idle, to chase in vain a double-edged spinning top”).

A strong, healthy man in the ethnic consciousness of Ossetians has contacts with deer (саджы сынтыл амад / literally “to be healthy like a deer” / саджы хуызæн ананиз у), or with mountain (хъазыбеджы хофы хуызæн) literally “like the mountain Kazbek”). Russians attribute these qualities to a bear, bull, oak and camel. Representatives of both ethnic groups will compare a man that is strong in spirit with a lion, a tiger; a noble one - with deer. Kabardians compare a strong man with a fallow deer (бланэм ещхъу къæруш, лъэщц – literally “strong, powerful as a fallow deer”). Both Ossetians and Russians associate a large man with a keg (with negative assessment) - literally “thick as a barrel”, puffed up - literally “like a barrel”, whereas in the Ossetian language comparison with a mountain is a positive one, in the Russian both positive and negative associations are possible. In the Russian, Ossetian and in Kabardian languages a heavy, awkward man will be compared with an elephant (шы хъубцъыб хуэдæ - literally “like a clumsy horse”, Iэддж-быдж ардуар хуэдæш - literally “clumsy like an elephant”, literally “He is clumsy like an elephant, but he should hurry up”) (F. Попов).

## VII. CONCLUSION

Each ethnic group in its national culture is universal as well as ethnonational, so in the semantics of each language there are reflected general, international components of cultures and components, reflecting the cultural originality of specific people. The universal semantic component is conditioned by the unity of the view of the world of people of different cultures, and this principle unity manifests itself at different levels of semantic organization of a language, and at the level of set comparisons. Intercultural commonality of three ethnic groups - Kabardian, Ossetian and Russian – is conditioned by the anthropomorphic versatility of the naive view of the world, which is captured in national languages. Differences in cultures can affect the fact that in different languages set comparisons, matching in subject-matter, can be different in connotative semantics (emotional and evaluative shades). Analysis of set comparisons in the Russian, Kabardian and Ossetian languages divides them into the following 3 groups with regard to their semantic equivalence: 1) set comparisons, which have a similar object and basis of comparison; these are full semantic equivalents; 2) set comparisons, which have a similar basis of comparison, but are different in the objects of comparison. They are semantic analogues in which the same meaning is encoded differently; 3) set comparisons, which have similar objects of comparison, but are different in the basis of comparison. Here one and the same subject and phenomenon is understood and described differently. Set comparisons of such type are neither semantic analogues nor equivalents.

In set comparisons of three languages, we used mostly images of the surrounding world: animals, objects of inanimate nature, objects of everyday life, less often - people, representatives of certain professions or ethnic groups. In the

course of the research, we have established that set comparisons, in whose basis there are the facts, phenomena, events, related exclusively to history, culture, life, traditions, customs, etc. of specific people and not having universal values, often contain onomastic components toponyms (geographic names), anthroponyms (proper names of people), which include names of really existing people and names of fantastic, mythical creatures, gods, demons and names of literary heroes. We must note that judgments or concepts, expressed in set comparisons, their generalized, abstract values are more often common for different peoples.

### References

- [1]. S. Arsaliev, "Ethnopedagogical technologies: best approaches and practices", *Recent Patents on Computer Science*, vol. 9. No. 2. pp. 173-184, 2016.
- [2]. L. Gatsalova, T. Novikova, L. Parsieva, "Cognitive Basis of Conceptual Borrowing", *International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sciences"*, vol. 50, 2018.
- [3]. L. Parsieva, L. Gatsalova, "Negative Features of Female Image in Ossetian Proverbs", *International Scientific and Practical Conference "Current Issues of Linguistics and Didactics: The Interdisciplinary Approach in Humanities and Social Sciences"*, vol 50, 2018.
- [4]. M.L. Apazhev, J.N. Kokov, *Kabardino-Circassian-Russian Dictionary*. Nalchik: Elbrus, 2008.
- [5]. A.D. Vagapov, Kh.B. Navrazova, "To the origin of adjectives of colors in Russian and Chechen languages", *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Chechen Republic*, No. 4 (33), pp. 85-89, 2016.
- [6]. Z.T. Dzabity, "Phraseological dictionary of the Ossetian language". Tskhinval: Printing production association RUO, 2003.
- [7]. T.V. Zhrebilo, "Integrative Onomastic Space of the regional version of the Russian Language in bilingualism", *Bulletin of Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University*, vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 111-128, 2017.
- [8]. E.M. Zhilyakova, K.K. Pavlovich, "Comparisons in the book of travel essays "Frigate "Pallas" of I. A. Goncharov", *Tomsk State University Bulletin. Philology*, No. 51, pp. 130-144, 2018.
- [9]. M.I. Isaev, "Materials for the Ossetian language phraseological dictionary". Moscow, 1964.
- [10]. V.I. Karasik, "The language circle: personality, concepts, discourse". Volgograd: Change, 2002.
- [11]. V.I. Karasik, "Semiotic types of concepts Questions of cognitive linguistics", No. 4 (33). p. 5-11, 2012.
- [12]. B.M. Kardanov, *Kabardino-Russian phraseological dictionary*. Nalchik: Elbrus, 1968.
- [13]. T.V. Krylova, "Woe from Wit: Assessment of the mind in the Russian Language Picture of the World", *Questions of linguistics*, No. 4. pp. 33-51, 2017.
- [14]. L.A. Lebedeva, *Sustainable Comparisons of the Russian Language: A Brief Thematic Dictionary*. Moscow: Science; Flinta, 2011.
- [15]. O.V. Lomakina, V.M. Mokienko, *Cognitive potential of the Ruthenian paremias against the background of the Russian and Ukrainian languages Rusin*, No. 3 (45), pp. 119-128, 2016.
- [16]. V.M. Mokienko, "Stable comparisons in the phraseology system Stable comparisons in the phraseology system", SPb.: Graisfald, 2016 p. 37-49.
- [17]. A.I. Molotkov, *Phraseological dictionary of the Russian language*. – Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1968.
- [18]. V.M. Ogoltsev, "Stable comparisons in the system of Russian phraseology". Moscow: Book house "LIBROKOM", 1968.
- [19]. V.M. Ogoltsev, "Concise Dictionary of Sustainable Comparisons of the Russian Language". Izhevsk, UdsU, 1994.
- [20]. A.R. Rakhimova, "Russian stable comparisons of pejorative semantics in the field of human character", *Philology and culture*, No. 1 (47), pp. 81-85, 2017.
- [21]. V.N. Telia, "Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic, and Linguoculturological Aspects." Moscow: School "Languages of Russian Culture", 1996.
- [22]. M.A. Tsalikova, "Study of sustainable comparisons in the Ossetian school", Vladikavkaz: North Ossetian State University Publishing House, 2011.
- [23]. M.G. Shkuropatskaya, U. Davaa, "National language picture of the world as a component of the language consciousness of the Russian and Mongolian language personality (comparative aspect)", *Tomsk State University Bulletin. Philology*, No. 1 (39), pp. 80-95, 2016.