

Elena was not much different from Miss Jean Brodie's teacher. The girls went to her monastery to receive help and consolation. After all, firstly, she was brilliant in psychology, and secondly, it is always pleasant to visit the ministers of the church: “this evokes religious feelings and spiritual cleansing, with which it is good to return home” [1]. But they received nothing, except for evasive short phrases, unable to direct them on the right path. She did not fulfill her functions either as a clan authority or as a nun. What mattered to her was not trust, but the fact that they came to her for advice, showing a certain degree of dependence on her personality, for which she fought so hard in her youth. The same phenomenon was characteristic of Miss Brodie. The teacher didn't tell them what the curriculum required of her. She was interested in girls not as individuals, but only as objects that can be used for her own purposes. It was more important for her to know that she was the center of their life and the core of the clan.

Conclusion. Analyzing the structure of human psychology, Muriel Spark most vividly showed, using the example of teacher Jean Brodie and Sandy, the type of people who are realized by centralizing their power and subordinating a certain group of individuals. All their actions – Sandy and Jean Brodie – were undertaken based on their own interests, and thus it is impossible to gain authority in the group and build an auspicious climate in communication. The principles by which they were guided are similar to those of a totalitarian regime, and it ultimately fails. It is impossible to subdue people by taking control of all spheres of their activity, and hope for a carefree government. In the end, the exact same person may appear, eager to take a place on the throne, or a group of people who can realize their control. Therefore, Miss Brodie's policy was doomed to failure from the very beginning.

1. Spark, M. The prime of Miss Jean Brodie / M. Spark // Big online library [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/93140/mod_resource/content/1/PMJB.pdf. – Date of access: 17.10.2020.

COMPARISON OF POSITIVE EVALUATIVE CONNOTATIONS OF ZOOMORPHISMS IN THE RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Olga Kurganova

VSU named after P.M. Masherov, Vitebsk, Belarus

Nowadays we see a rapid development and transformation of the lexical side of a language. Evaluative lexicon is often an example of such changes. Its structure is directly related to the speaker's attitude to the phenomenon of reality and is built on associations, which are undergoing modifications. In this sense, zoomorphisms represent a special layer of the vocabulary of any language.

Zoomorphisms are a complex of linguistic units, reflecting the world of fauna, used to evaluate human activity or appearance [1]. The image of a person is an important element of the linguistic picture of the world, and an attempt to create the concept of “man” on the basis of zoomorphic components allows us to distinguish universal and ethnospecific features for each language. The coincidences, discrepancies and the specifics of using zoomorphisms for characterizing a person give us an opportunity to see the differences in the linguistic picture of the world with its objectivity and integrity for each language, which determines the relevance of the chosen topic.

Object of the research is positive evaluative zoomorphisms of the Russian and English languages.

Material and methods. The main methods used in the study were cultural-historical, comparative, hermeneutical and descriptive. The material for the research were positive evaluative zoomorphisms of the Russian and English languages, selected by means of continuous sampling methods from such dictionaries as the Oxford Dictionary, Cambridge Dictionary, Urban Dictionary and The Large Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language by Kuznetsov.

Findings and their discussion. In this study, we divided the zoomorphisms of the Russian and English languages into two groups: zoomorphisms used as terms of endearment addressed to a man, a woman or a child; zoomorphisms used as assessment of a physical or mental feature of a person [1]. The first group is mostly spread in the Russian language. Such groups of words are mostly used in relationships of close people and are formed with the help of a diminutive form which is built by special suffixes (-*ochk/-echk-*, -*ushk-/jushk-*). But there are also examples of the use of the basic forms of zoomorphisms in this context. In English, this group is not so widespread. One of the explanations can be the peculiarity of the word-formation system, namely, its analytical nature. However, it should be noted that there are nevertheless diminutive words, formed with the help of special suffixes, as well as the main form in addressing a man, woman and child. Zoomorphisms such as *begemotik*, *burunduchok*, *babochka*, *belchonok*, *vorobejchik*, *gusenichka*, *galchonok*, *gusenok*, *delfinchik*, *dikobrazik*, *drakonchik*, *ezhik*, *ezhonok*, *zhuchok*, *zyablik*, *lisenok*, *lan*, *lvenok*, *motylek*, *myshonok*, *solnyshko*, *svetlechok*, *slonenok*, *homyachok*, have one common semantic connotation: terms of endearment addressed to a man, a woman or a child. These examples have no English zoomorphic equivalents. In the case of addressing a person in the English-speaking country, it is more appropriate to use the following words: *honey*, *lovely*, *baby*, *sweetheart*, *sweetie*, *sugar*, *dear*, *darling*, *poppet*, *love*, *boo* and others. When choosing a lexical unit, communicants from this language environment often give preference to a group of words denoting fruits or sweets. Nevertheless, there are zoomorphisms in the Russian system that have equivalents in English, used when referring to a man, a child and a woman. Russian *zajka*, *zajchik*, *zajchonok* are equivalent to the English zoomorphisms

such as *bunny*, a *honeybunny*. *Zajka*, *zajchik*, *zajchonok* have the following semantics: 1) “terms of endearments in addressing to a child, a man or a woman”: *Ложись спать, зайчик* (‘Go to bed, bunny’) [4]. English *bunny*, *honeybunny* have the following semantics: 1) “used as terms of endearment in addressing to a child, a man, a woman”. In a colloquial speech a word *bunny* is used to emphasize the beauty of one’s girlfriend: *Man, I love my bunny* [3]. If to compare meanings of these examples, we can say that they are equal in their semantic structures and match in both languages. Russian *kotenok*, *kotik* and English *kitty* are in a special group of zoomorphisms that can be considered equivalent in their evaluative connotations but with some differences in the rules of their addressing. But English *kitty* is not used towards a man. For example, in the USA it is a very popular means for man to name their girlfriends: *Kitty, we are leaving for France in 4 weeks* [2]. It is also used in addressing to a child. As for Russian variants, they are used in addressing to everyone. Furthermore, it is one of the most popular zoomorphism among people. The second group of the evaluative lexicon is also represented by various examples. When compared Russian *orel* and English *hawk* we found out that they are different in their evaluative connotations. *Orel* is positive, *hawk* is negative one. The first one has the following semantic structure: 1) “a strong bird of prey of the hawk family with a curved beak, living in mountainous or steppe areas”; 2) “used as a symbol of a brave, strong, courageous person”. E.g.: *Положим, он не орел, но он человек добрейший, другим никому зла не делает, прекрасный семьянин* (‘Let’s say, he is not so brave but he is a kind person, he did no harm ever to anyone and he is a great family man’) [4]. According to this we see that the Russian equivalent does have a positive evaluative meaning. The English *hawk* has the following semantic structure: 1) “a strong fast bird of prey” (= a bird that kills other creatures for food); 2) “a person, especially a politician, who supports the use of military force to solve problems”; 3) “someone who believes that the government should take strong action in controlling the national budget, inflation”, etc.: *The hawks on the committee are worried that 6 per cent growth could trigger inflation* (‘Ястребы в комитете обеспокоены тем, что 6-процентный рост может спровоцировать инфляцию’) [2]. Russian *tigr* has as its equivalent English *tiger*. When comparing their meanings, we found out that they do have matching evaluative connotations. Both positive and negative. It should be taken into account that for the Russian zoomorphism it is more characteristic to be used in a negative sense. The superior feature of this animal’s image is fierce behavior. The semantics of *tigr*: 1) “a large predatory mammal of the cat family Panther, orange-yellow with black stripes”; 2) “a strong and imperious man”; 3) “a strong and aggressive person”. Frequently, this zoomorphism is popular for women to use it also in a colloquial speech to emphasize sexual energy of man expressed by his strong and imperious character. It has a positive meaning. For instance, «Ты **тигр!** Настоящий **тигр!**» (‘You are a lion!’) [4]. However, it is also possible to meet examples

where forms in a negative connotation are used. «Успокойся, *тигр!* Он ни в чем не виноват» ('Calm down, tiger! It is not his fault') [3]. As for *tiger*, it has the following connotations: 1) "a large wild animal of the cat family with yellowish-orange fur with black lines"; 2) "used to refer to someone who is very determined and strong"; 3) "a very energetic or persevering person"; 4) "a fierce, belligerent person". Examples of usage: 1) *The meekest, most submissive wife of today is a **tiger** by her grandmother's standards* (positive) [3]; 2) *You are just another fierce **tiger*** (negative) [3].

Conclusion. Zoomorphisms of the first group are the most spread ones in the Russian language. Often, Russian lexical units do not have equivalent evaluative connotations in English due to the peculiarities of the morphological system. Zoomorphisms of the second group are spread in both languages. There are examples that coincide – fully or in part – in their meanings regardless of the fact that their number is very small. But there are lexical units that do not have mutual elements in their semantics. It is explained by different cultural traditions and mentality of people of two societies, as well as by geographical position. All these features as a whole compile a different image of the same animal in two languages.

1. Broslavskaya, E. Etnokulturnyje osobennosti zoomorfizmov v russkom, ukrainskom i anglijskom / E. Broslavskaya. – Vestnik MSU, Moscow, 2001. – no. 6. – P. 49–52.

2. CIDO – Cambridge International Dictionaries Online [Electronic resource]. – 2000. – Access mode: /www.cup.org.-/esl./dictionary. – Access date: 04.10.2020.

3. Oxford Dictionary [Electronic resource]. – 2020. – Access mode: <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/>. – Access date: 04.10.2020.

4. Urban dictionary [Electronic resource]. – 2020. – Access mode: <https://www.urbandictionary.com/>. – Access date: 17.10.2020.

5. Tolkovyj slovar Kuznetsova [Electronic resource]. – 2020. – Access mode: <https://gufo.me/dict/kuznetsov?page=22&letter=%D0%B2>. – Access date: 17.10.2020.

ARTISTIC FEATURES OF "SONNET TO FORM" BY VALERY BRYUSOV

Pavel Lazarau

VSU named after P.M. Masherov, Vitebsk, Belarus

The relevance of this research is also due to the fact that interest in the literature of the turn of the XIX-XX centuries has again sharpened.

The form of a sonnet, for all its complexity, severity and conciseness, has the ability to remarkably reveal all the richness of a particular poetic language. The variety of rhymes, the rarity and value of all pictorial poetic means, the flexibility of its rhythms, the ability to obey various stanza types - all this appears with exceptional completeness in this most demanding of poetic forms.