THE SYNONYMIC PARADIGM OF THE CONCEPT *TOLERANCE* (ON THE MATERIAL OF ENGLISH, GERMAN, RUSSIAN, UKRAINIAN LANGUAGES)

СИНОНІМІЧНА ПАРАДИГМА КОНЦЕПТУ *ТОЛЕРАНТНІСТЬ* (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ, НІМЕЦЬКОЇ, РОСІЙСЬКОЇ, УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВ)

LUDMYLA YUDKO,
PhD in Philology, associate professor

ЛЮДМИЛА ЮДКО,
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9075-7047
yulud2010@meta.ua

National Academy of the Security Service of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine
✉ 22, M. Maksymovych Str., Kyiv, 03022

Національна академія Служби безпеки України
✉ вул. М. Максимовича, 22, Київ, 03022

ABSTRACT

The present article is dedicated to the problem of verbalization of the concept TOLERANCE in the linguocultures of Great Britain, Germany, Russia and Ukraine. The use of the methodology of concept analysis at the overlapping of linguocultural and linguo-cognitive approaches offered by L. Kompantseva is put forward. The methodology based on the following parameters: semantic analysis of the keyword which nominates the concept; lexical-semantic analysis of systematic links; etymological analysis of the key words; semantic analysis of direct and indirect nominations; interpretive semantic analysis of hyperlinks; interpretive semantic analysis of the contexts; interpretive analysis of associations related to the investigated concept; analysis of the key ideas which determine the investigated concept. Based on associative dictionaries, dictionaries of synonyms and the associative experiment, the synonymic paradigm of the concept has been investigated. The article substantiates the use of the term "thematic group"; common and distinctive thematic groups of synonyms of the concept TOLERANCE verbalizer in the English, German, Russian and Ukrainian linguocultures have been defined, and its component analysis has been held. The associative analysis made it possible to define common and specific thematic groups in the studied linguocultures. The following thematic groups are recognized as specific: "satisfaction", "reward", "endurance", "fortitude", "impartiality" – English linguoculture; "tranquility", "right of free movement and residence", "nobleness", "generous nature", "adverture", "generosity", "freedom of actions" – German linguoculture; "gentleness", "pride", "freethinking" – Russian linguoculture; "humanity", "mutual respect", "mutual understanding", "mannerliness" – Ukrainian linguoculture. The results of the study demonstrated a disproportion of actualization of the concept TOLERANCE, due to extralinguistic

factors, historical, socio-political, philosophical features of formation of national views of the world.

Key words: concept; view of the world; synonymic row, thematic group, component analysis.

Introduction. The timeliness of the proposed research is determined by the study of the concept TOLERANCE as a part of the socio-cultural gestalt which defines a constructive vector in the multi-ethnic communication space. In modern discursive practices the concept TOLERANCE acquires topical emphasis as a mean of achieving peace and prevention of conflicts, because lack of the concept TOLERANCE in discourses of the modern society violates the basic principles of its socio-communicative organization: it undermines the principles of democracy, leads to violations of individual and collective human rights. However, high level of tolerance is favourable to the strengthening of the democratic state system, civil society, and national unity. "The concept TOLERANCE can be attributed to basic ideas that shape the image of the state's information policy" (Kompantseva, 2016: 94)

Theoretical background. The concept is the subject of study in many humanitarian sciences: cognitive linguistics (N. Slukhai, O. Snytko, I. Sternin, G. Lakoff), linguocultural studies (I. Holubovska, V. Karasyk, A. Wierzbicka and others), linguistic philosophy (J. Baudrillard, L. Brutian, J. Habermas), sociolinguistics (O. Potebnia, V. Rusanivskyi, E. Sapir, H. Löffler) etc.

L. Kompantseva, the founder of the Ukrainian school of thought investigating Internet communication, offers a methodology of concept analysis at the overlapping of linguo-cultural and linguo-cognitive approaches. The methodology involves determination of the discourse-forming function of concepts in network communications based on the following parameters: 1) semantic analysis of the keyword which nominates the concept; 2) lexical-semantic analysis of systematic links: synonyms and antonyms; 3) etymological analysis of the key words and some lexemes from the synonymic row; 4) semantic analysis of direct (the word in the direct meaning) and indirect (the word in figurative meaning) nominations; 5) determination of semantic relations of concepts with other notions of the virtual culture; 6) interpretive semantic analysis of hyperlinks, where the concept nomination is the keyword; 7) interpretive semantic analysis of the contexts in which the concepts of virtual reality are used; 8) interpretive analysis of associations related to the investigated concept (based on data of an associative experiment, associative dictionary, etc.); 9) interpretive analysis of proverbs associated with the investigated concept; 10) analysis of the key ideas which determine the investigated concept and play a significant role in shaping of the sphere of concepts in the virtual space.

Factual material analysis. Any concept could be closely dependent on the context, subtext and individual cultural experience of the person. (Gryshchenko, 2016: 80-84). It should be noted that "a subsense is a distinct word meaning that appears to be motivated by usage context: the specific situational context in which the word (and the utterance in which the word is embedded) occurs. However, the distinct sense disappears in other contexts.

This suggests that subsenses lack what Cruse calls full autonomy: the degree of conventionalization that secures relative context-independence and thus identifies distinct senses" (Evans, Green, 2006: 332).

This study was carried out based on the materials of online associative dictionaries which provide synonymic rows and associated words to the lexeme tolerance.

The use of dictionaries of synonyms to establish associative relations is fair, as they register a semantic paradox – "eventually a great number of notions appear as apparent synonyms to each other, which suggests the idea of their real correlation in "life", their "similarity" (Stepanov, 2004:. 915-916).

The online synonymic dictionary of the English language (The Free Dictionary) provides seven semantic groups of the lexeme tolerance: 1) mindedness: impartiality, liberality, allowance, variation, magnanimity, lenity, tolerance; 2) endurance: stamina, patience, forbearance, toleration, sufferance, tolerance; 3) clemency: indulgence, lenience, leniency, tolerance, toleration, forbearance; 4) kindness: generosity, benevolence, compassion, magnanimity, tolerance, munificence, open-handedness, charity; 5) condescension: tolerance, sufferance, deference, patronage; 6) gratification: lenience, forbearance, tolerance, understanding, patience, gratifying, indulgence; 7) indulgence: leniency, tolerance, understanding, clemency, patience, mercy, charity (Oxford Learners Dictionary, 1986).

German-language synonymic row is divided into ten semantic groups: (Duden, 2007): 1) Duldsamkeit: Großzügigkeit, Behutsamkeit, Geduld, Gnade, Hochherzigkeit, Liberalität, Nachsicht, Rücksicht, Verständnis, Freizügigkeit, Großmut, Langmut, Milde; Schonung, Toleranz; 2) Spielraum: Toleranz; 3) Großmut: Nachsicht, Uneigennützigkeit, Freizügigkeit, Toleranz, Hochherzigkeit; 4) Geduld: Friedfertigkeit, Gelassenheit, Gleichmut, Milde, Nachsicht, Toleranz, Langmut; 5) Rücksichtnahme: Achtung, Beachtung, Berücksichtigung, Nachsicht, Einfühlungsvermögen, Respekt, Schonung, Teilnahme, Toleranz, Rücksicht; 6) Großzügigkeit: Toleranz, Nachsicht, Duldsamkeit, Liberalität, 7) Edelmut: Freigebigkeit, Großmut, Großherzigkeit, Großzügigkeit, Duldsamkeit, Hochherzigkeit, Selbstlosigkeit, Toleranz, Güte, nobles Verhalten, Generosität; 8) Freizügigkeit: Großmut, Toleranz, Duldsamkeit, Nachsicht, Schonung, Großzügigkeit, 9) Vergebung: Geduld, Gnade, Großzügigkeit, Milde, Mitleid, Schonung, Toleranz, Verzeihung, Entgegenkommen, Duldsamkeit, Duldung, Indulgenz, Verständnis, Behutsamkeit, Entschuldigung, Nachsicht; 10) Gelassenheit: Gleichmut, Langmut, Toleranz, Ausdauer, Milde, Nachsicht, Beständigkeit, Friedfertigkeit, Ruhe, Sanftmut, Beharrlichkeit, Schonung, Geduld.

The Department of Psycholinguistics of the Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences (RAS) started a tradition of replenishing the associative dictionary by native speakers in the online mode. An associative experiment was launched on the Internet page of the RAS with the involvement of a large number of recipients in the paradigm of the stimulus-response-frequency. The results of the associative experiment with the stimulus tolerance (Russian Associative Dictionary) can be divided into 7 thematic groups: 1) либеральность: либерализм; 2) нетребовательность: невзыскательность, вольтерьянство, мягкость, снисхождение,

попустительство, снисходительность, тряпичность, потакание, неразборчивость, беспритязательность, скромность, непритязательность, неприхотливость, малотребовательность; 3) свободомыслие: вольмыслие, вольнодумие, вольнодумство, 4) терпение: терпеливость, терпимость, снисхождение, чаша терпения, мука, притерпелость, упорство, настойчивость, долготерпение, многотерпеливость, выдержка; 5) мягкосердечность: приятность, беззлобие, мягкосердечность, беззлобность, бархатистость, размеренность, незлобность, незлобивость, лиризм, незлобие, кротость, легкость, сговорчивость, нерезкость, податливость, ласка, уступчивость, плавность, пластичность, нежность, бархатность, пушистость, шелковистость, снисхождение, эластичность, хрупкость, спокойность, женственность, малоупругость, теплота, кроткость, ласковость, отзывчивость, покладистость, деликатность, добродушие, доброта, лирика; 6) терпимость: терпение, приемлемость, удовлетворительность, сносность, веротерпимость, снисходительность, снисхождение, небезнадежность, терпеливость; 7) гордовитость: покровительственность, высокомерие, высокомерность, снисхождение, снисходительность (Russian Associative Dictionary).

The study of the data taken from synonymic (Buriachok, 2007), (Martinek, 2007) and associative (Butenko, 1979), (Online Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language) dictionaries of the Ukrainian language has shown that in none of them synonyms and associative rows of the verbalizer of the concept TOLERANCE are registered. Therefore, to determine the features of perception of the verbalizer of the concept TOLERANCE by native Ukrainian language speakers, an interpretive analysis of associations related to the considered concept was held, based on the data of the associative experiment conducted in network resources (https://www.facebook.com/, https://www.hellotalk.com), where 100 persons aged from 18 to 50 participated. The results allowed to determine an associative row to the verbalizer of the concept TOLERANCE: 1) терпимість: терпіння, терпимість, адаптація; 2) стриманість: виваженість, спокійність; 3) поблажливість: поступливість, врівноваженість; 4) взаєморозуміння: безконфліктність, витримка, розуміння, плюралізм; 5) компроміс: консенсус, поступка, ліберальність; 6) взаємоповага: повага, уважність, доброзичливість, ввічливість; 7) людяність: співчуття, доброта, людяність, милосердя, чутливість, примирення; 8) вихованість: щирість, порядність, адекватність, стійкість, рівновага, помірність, лояльність.

Classification and generalization of the experience, distinguishing and description of categories, and their detailed research is the subject of many linguistic studies by such linguists as I. Arnold, L. Vasyliev, M. Kocherhan, G. Ipsen, W. Porzig, J. Trier and others. According to V. Evans and M. Green "a semantic network for a single lexical item consists of multiple related senses might consist of a number of distinct senses that are peripheral and hence not strictly predictable with respect to the prototype, but which are nevertheless motivated by the application of general cognitive mechanisms. In addition, this model predicts the emergence of senses that

are intermediate with respect to the prototype and the peripheral senses" (V. Evans and M. Green, 2006: 332). Then follows Langacker who points out that "there should not be any difference in kind between conceptual structure and semantic structure; there is only a terminological distinction, the former being general the latter specifically linguistic" (Langacker, 1987: 98). According to the theory of Trier, English lexical, or verbal, fields correspond to the conceptual domains. W. Porzig offered the concept of lexico-syntactical field, i.e. simple relations (valence properties of words) which consist of a verb and a subject or an object, or an adjective and a noun (see – eye) (Vasiliev, 1971). G. Ipsen distinguished lexico-grammatical fields which include etymologically different words, and which as a part of one semantic system acquire common grammatical features. Thus, part of the conceptual view of the world (the combination of spheres of concepts, domains, and concepts) are reflected in the linguistic units of the view of the world, united in lexical-semantic fields (Vasiliev, 1971).

A lexical-semantic group is a combination of words based on the intralingual principle, i.e. a combination based on at least one common lexical paradigmatic seme (or at least one common seme) following the feature of invariance, and which can exist only as a combination of units of one part of speech (Vasiliev, 1971). To lexical-semantic groups belong not only synonymic rows, but also antonymic groups etc., connected by the community of specific system-based relations. Besides, words in lexical-semantic groups can be connected by gender-aspect relations, i.e. they can have hyponymic relations or involve conversion (Kocherhan, 2004); a lexical-themantic group can include lexemes of different notional parts of speech provided they reflect a common sphere of reality, and are specified by the theme of the work, its genre features, as well as by social, temporal and local facts which influence the formation of the author's individual style (Makar, 2009: 118).

Table 1. Thematic groups of reactions triggered by the stimulus tolerance in the languages of study: contrastive analysis based on the data of lexicographical sources and the associative experiment

THEMATIC GROUPS	*ELC	GLC	RLC	ULC
Nobleness	+			
Generosity	+			
Mutual respect				+
Mutual understanding				+
Endurance, fortitude	+			
Mannerliness				+
Freethinking			+	
Pride			+	
Kindness, heartiness	+	+	+	+
Satisfaction, reward	+			
Compromise			+	
Gentleness			+	
Liberality		+	+	

	ELC	GLC	RLC	URC
Humanity				+
Simple tastes		+	+	
Impartiality	+			
Liniency	+	+		+
Right of free movement and residence		+		
Forgiveness, indulgency, pardon, mercy	+	+		
Freedom of actions		+		
Tranquility		+		
Restraint		+		+
Tolerance	+	+	+	+
Patience	+	+	+	
Advertence		+		
Generous nature		+		

*ELC – English linguoculture; GLC – German linguoculture; RLC – Russian linguoculture; URC – Ukrainian linguoculture

The associative analysis made it possible to define common and specific thematic groups in the studied linguocultures. The common ones are as follows: "kindness", "heartiness", "tolerance" – for English, German, Russian and Ukrainian linguocultures; "leniency" – for English, German and Ukrainian linguocultures; "patience" – for English, German and Russian linguocultures; "forgiveness", "indulgency", "pardon", "mercy" – for English and German linguocultures; "simple tastes", "liberality" – for German and Russian linguocultures; "restraint" – for German and Ukrainian linguocultures. The following thematic groups are recognized as specific: "satisfaction", "reward", "endurance", "fortitude", "impartiality" – English linguoculture; "tranquility", "right of free movement and residence", "nobleness", "generous nature", "advertence", "generosity", "freedom of actions" – German linguoculture; "gentleness", "pride", "freethinking" – Russian linguoculture; "humanity", "mutual respect", "mutual understanding", "mannerliness" – Ukrainian linguoculture.

Conclusion. "The world does not consist of sets of attributes with an equally probable chance of co-occurring. Instead, the world itself has structure, which provides constraints on the kinds of categories that humans represent within the cognitive system" (Evans, V., Green, M., 2006: 265).

The differences of the synonymic paradigm of the concept TOLERANCE in the studied linguocultures are indicative of the disproportion of its actualization in the conceptual national views of the world; this is caused, first of all, by the extralinguistic factors, historical, socio-political, philosophical features of formation of national views of the world. The paradigm of the concept TOLERANCE in the studied linguocultures develops continually, and is replenished by new semantic representations.

Tolerance is being increasingly adopted by the world community as a style of progressive way of thinking. Investigation of problems of tolerance is ranked as a leading one among psycholinguistic researches, as the essence of this phenomenon can be defined only by means of overlapping different

disciplines. Currently the discourse of tolerance is becoming the tool for manipulating public opinion. Its influence is based on psycholinguistic principles which haven't been defined by contemporary science to the fullest extent. This very problem constitutes the prospect for further investigation.

References

1. Arnold, I. V. (1984) Lexico-Semanticheskoe pole v jasyke i semanticheskaja setka texta. Text kak object complexnogo analysa v vysshem uchebnom savedeniji [Lexical-Semantic Field in the Language and Semantic Network of the Text. Text as an Object of Comprehensive Analysis in a Higher Educational Institution]. Leningrad. Publishing House of Leningrad University.

2. Butenko, N. P. (1979) The Dictionary of Associative Standards of the Ukrainian Language. Lviv. Vishcha shkola.

3. Collins English Dictionary. (2006) London. Harper Collins Publishers.

4. Deutsches Synonymwörterbuch http://synonyme.woxikon.de/synonyme/toleranz.php.

5. Duden C. Das Online Wörterbuch / C. Duden. – Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, 1993–1995. [Electronic source]. – Available at: http://www.wortschatz.informatik.

6. Duden. Deutsches Universalwörterbuch (2007) – Mannheim; Wien; Zürich : Dudenverlag, – 960 S. [Electronic source]. – Available at: http://www.duden.de /Toleranz.

7. Evans, V., Green, M. (2006). Cognitive Linguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

8. Harper, D. (2001) The Online Etymology Dictionary / D. Harper. – NY : Oxford University Press, – 1480 p.

9. Hornby, A. (1995) Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary / A. S. Hornby. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, – 1430 p.

10. Gryshchenko Y. The concept of fate in american science fiction literature. Advanced Education, 2016, Issue 5, 80-84. DOI: 10.20535/2410-8286.66886

11. Kocherhan, M. P. (2004) Lexico-Semantic System / M. P. Kocherhan // Ukrainska mova: Entsyklopediia // Editorial Board: V. M. Rusanivskyi (co-chairperson), O. O. Taranenko (co-chairperson), M. P. Ziablyk et al. – K. : Publishing House «Ukrainska Entsyklopediia» imeni M. P. Bazhana, – p. 305–306.

12. Kompantseva, L. F. (2006) The Philosophy of the Internet : the School of Bernard Lonergan and Slavic Practices : [monogr.] / L. F. Kompantseva. – Luhansk : Znanie, – 352 p.

13. Kompantseva, L. F. (2016) Social communications for the security and defense sector. / L. F. Kompantseva. – Kyiv : Vydavets Karpenko, 476 p.

14. Langacker, R. W. (1987). Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, 1: Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

15. Macmillan Dictionary. Retrieved January, 2018, from MIT, http://www.macmillan dictionary.com/dictionary/british/tolerance

16. Makar, I. S. Lexical Microsystems as Determinants of the Author's Individual Style. / I. S. Makar // Aktualni Problemy Filolohii ta Perekladoznavstva. – 2009. – Iss. 4. – p. 117–120.

17. Martinek, S. (2007) Ukrainian Associative Dictionary / S. Martinek. – Lviv: Publishing House of Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. – 468 p.

18. New Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus of the English Language. – London : Lexico Publications, Inc., 1993. – 1248 p. P. 202.

19. Online Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. Retrieved January, 2018, from MIT, http://rozum.org.ua/index.php?a=srch&id.

20. Oxford English Dictionary (1986) / [ed.by R. W. Burchfield]. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1435 p.

21. Oxford Learners Dictionary. Retrieved January 3, 2018, from http://www.oxfordlea rnersdictionaries.com/definition/toleranceq/tolerance

22. Russian Associative Dictionary (1996) / Y. N. Karaulov, Y. A. Sorokin, Y. F. Taracov and others. – Moskow, Astrel, 1996 [Electronic source]. – Available at: http://www.tesaurus.ru/dict/dict.php.

23. Stepanov, Y. (2004) Constants. Dictionary of Russian culture. Moskow : Akademycheskyi Prospekt, 991 p.

24. The Dictionary of Synonyms of the Ukrainian Language (2006) [A. A. Buriachok, H. M. Hnatiuk, S. I. Holovashchuk, H. N. Horiushyna]. – K. : Naukova dumka, 955 p.

25. The Free Dictionary [Electronic source]. – Available at: http://www.thefreediction nary.com/tolerance.

26. Vasiliev, L. M. (1971) The Theory of Semantic Fields // Voprosy Jazykoznanija. – 1971. – № 5.