

SUMMARY OF THE DISSERTATION

SMIRNOV IVAN

Analysis of lexico-semantic groups showed that secondary metaphorical nominations describing the person, first of all give a visualization of a person's character and behavior in society, sometimes described by his physical properties. Analysis of the above examples shows that defects are evaluated negatively in metaphors (stupidity, indifference, cruelty, and so on.) Misbehavior, low social status, as well as some of the physical and psychological qualities, are non-negative objectively, but redundancy and superfluity (emaciation, overweight, excessive height, and so on.). Metaphor is a universal mechanism in formation of emotional and evaluative nominations. Presence of positive or negative evaluative always indicates the presence of emotivity in the semantic structure of metaphors. There are not only figurative representation and evaluative information in a metaphor, but there are also an expression of a feeling and attitude, conscious emotions such as hatred, anger, meanness or conversely mind, justice and others. Integration of evaluations and emotivity in semantics of a metaphor makes it a mean of expression.

Use of the zoonyms in the secondary meaning must be distinguished from several other types of tokens: use of the zoonyms in the phrases offered by the dictionaries for translation of the language zoonyms - the standard of comparison; use of tokens for which the meaning "zoo" is not historically primary; use of the etymological homonyms or other zoonyms; use of token in a distorted spelling coinciding the same form with the zoonyms; use of the zoonyms in the composition, metamorphosis, idiomatically re-interpreted combinations and compound words. Modern lexical-phraseological system of the Chinese language is an area of structural-semantic and functional stylistic facts and phenomena being of great interest for linguistic science.

In the first chapter of the thesis there were represented theoretical foundations of metaphor study and has been showed the historical path of the study of metaphors from ancient times up to the present day. The paper presents the main directions of the study of metaphor. There was made a review of various papers of scientists who work in this area, such as M. Black, A Richards, J. Ortega y Gasset,

G. Lakoff, E. McCormack, G. N. Sklyarevskaya, N. D. Arutyunova, N. D. Shmelev and others. There are many scientific papers which were dedicated to metaphor. It is a subject matter of linguists and source of work object for writers, poets, artists, and journalists. The study of metaphor becomes more intensive, covering various areas of linguistics, literature, philosophy, psychology and cybernetics. Modern analysts consider the metaphorical expressions as one of the most important means of language designing and its expansion as a made of communication of both natural and science languages. They also identify other directions of metaphors usage. As the "universal" and "all-pervading" object, metaphor is found in various spheres of human activity. On the current stage of the development of linguistic science metaphor is investigating in linguistics (G. N. Sklyarevskaya, E. M. Wolf, O.I. Glazunova) in language of economics (E.V. Kolotnina), psychiatry (D. Gordon, D. Trunov), military sphere (A.G Guchin), philosophy (E. Cassirer, J. Ortega y Gasset). There is a huge number of works which are dedicated to the metaphor of scientific text (N. D. Artyunova, G. S. Baranov, G. G Kuliyeu, S. S. Gusev), to the metaphor of educational text (L. S Bilous, B. F. Kryukova, N. V. Pozdnyakova), and to the metaphor of media texts (A. N. Baranov, Y.N. Karaulov, M. R. Zheltukhina, E. I. Chepanova, T. A. Shiryayeva, etc.).

The second chapter gives the typological classification of languages, the history of language typology conception as a separate direction in linguistics. Linguistic typology is engaged in classification of languages regardless of the specifics of their work, it describes the internal structure of language in general. The paper presents the most important works in the field of language typology of such scientists as W. von Humboldt, E. Sapir, A. A. Reformatzki, V. M. Solntsev, V. I. Gorelov, etc. In the part of linguistic typology there were identified such typologies as genetic, structural, areal and comparative. In the second part we tried to reflect each category. Comparing the structures of Russian and Chinese languages, we come to conclusion that there is full difference between the grammatical means and derivation. Analysis of the typological features showed

that Chinese language keeps analytical trends, while Russian retains features of synthetic system.

In the third chapter there was carried out the comparative analysis of secondary meanings of Russian and Chinese languages. In the paper there was used the method of comparison of the original metaphors in Russian and their translation into Chinese. This method is concerned as traditional one, because during its usage we compare metaphors of the original text and their translation into another language. This comparison allows to reveal the facts of metaphorical images parallelism and simultaneously to show that some metaphorical meanings cannot be translated literally into another language, which is the evidence of existence of differences in the metaphorical models of this two languages. During the exploration there was identified a set of the most significant characteristics of the initial and secondary meanings: evaluative description of secondary meanings by gender identity, by the peculiarities of character, by behavior and habits, by physical characteristics. As a result we came to the following conclusions:

1. comparison of meanings by LSG showed that in both Russian and Chinese languages most metaphors convey the subtleties of character, internal state of a human, especially his behavior in society. Less attention is paid to the consideration of human`s external qualities;
2. analysis in terms of gender semantics has shown that most of metaphorical nominations have an ambivalent character, i.e. can be applied both to a man and a woman;
3. during the comparison of the meanings by evaluative semantics it was revealed that metaphorical names of man formed from the name of animal both in Russian and Chinese languages in general have a negative evaluative meaning;
4. the majority of words in Chinese and Russian languages have differences in a figurative sense, it makes up 64%, while the equal meaning was found in 35% of the examples. This gives us a reason to suppose that the majority of metaphorical meanings in Chinese and Russian languages either have a

similar connotative and cultural meaning, or are completely different from our ideas about these meanings;

5. comparison of meanings by three parameters - evaluative, gender semantics and LSG showed that from 71 of the initial meanings fully matched 34 tokens, it confirms that some of the secondary meanings in Russian and Chinese have the same evaluative characteristics in the process of person's nomination;
6. there were not found similar figurative meanings in LSG, but different by gender and evaluative semantics were revealed. From this we can assume that there are no secondary meanings in Russian and Chinese languages, which would be similar in terms of LSG, but different in gender and evaluative semantics.

The features which we highlighted allowed us to describe a particular meaning more adequately from the point of view of its position in the system of language and to compare it with the units of this order of another language. Comparative analysis of metaphorical nominations revealed how the differences in emotional and evaluative category are reflected in languages and allowed to see how the national-cultural connotation is implemented in language.