



Comparative Collocations as Cognitive Classifiers are Bases of Lexical Categories

Alla NIKISHOVA¹ Elena KRYVONOSOVA²

Keywords	Abstract
Cognitive Classifier Comparative Collocation Supporting Component Lexeme Substance of Expression	The paper is devoted to the linguistic phenomena of cognitive classifiers and the way they are defined in the Russian, English and French languages. Different aspects of the cognitive approach in linguistics science are considered as the legitimate interdisciplinary paradigm. The concepts are presented from several viewpoints. The comparative collocations are given a detailed examination covering the processes determined by national and cultural specific background. The need to study comparative constructions in the language is due to the fact that the mechanism of comparison occupies an important place in human thinking. Comparisons play an important role in the formation of the conceptual picture of the world, clarify and concretize the person's ideas about objects and phenomena. The analysis of comparisons allows us to penetrate into the deep mechanisms of cognitive processes of ordinary consciousness. The category of cognitive classifiers is one of the least developed in linguistics. The importance of determining the composition and functions of cognitive classifiers in the structuring of the conceptual sphere and semantic space of the language determines the relevance of the work. The presence of common standards of comparison for different linguistic cultures is explained by the fact that there is almost the same reflection in the language of universal practice. The analysis of the material also reveals significant differences in the standards of comparison, which are determined by differences in cultures associated with realities, historical events, peculiarities of natural conditions and traditions.

Article Info

Received: 13.05.2019

Accepted: 26.06.2019

Online Published: 27.06.2019

Cited as (APA): Nikishova, A. & Kryvonosova, E. (2019). Comparative collocations as cognitive classifiers are bases of lexical categories. *International Journal of Current Approaches in Language, Education and Social Sciences (CALESS)*,1(1), 45-61.

¹Assoc. Prof. Dr., Belarusian State Technological University, Department of Intercultural Communications and Technical Translation, Belarus, alla_nikishova@mail.ru

²Sen, Lec., Belarusian State Technological University, Department of Intercultural Communications and Technical Translation, Belarus, ekrivonosova@tut.by

1. Introduction

Deciding on priorities in teaching is a pedagogical necessity recognized by many TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) experts (e.g. Collins, 1998; Crossley & McNamara, 2011; DeVillez, 2003). Numerous studies have been concerned with identification (e.g. Crossley & McNamara, 2011) or re-evaluation (Weston, Crossley, McCarthy & McNamara, 2011) of the factors affecting language learners' performance. Various factors such as lexical proficiency (Nakamaru, 2011), cognitive mechanisms (Bourke & Adams, 2010), and higher-order processes (Sparks & Gonschow, 2001) have been considered. In addition, another line of research in applied linguistics has been growing over the last decade, which has placed its focus on the study of cognitive aspects of language perception and production.

Cognitive science is considered as the legitimate interdisciplinary paradigm that can cover and re-examine many research problems in applied linguistics and TEFL (Segalowitz, 2010). The study of intelligence is a prolific research paradigm in cognitive psychology. One of the factors which seem to be of great importance is narrative intelligence (Pishghadam, Baghaei, Shams & Shamsaee, 2011). As the name implies, narrative intelligence deals with the narrative capabilities of individuals, which can be a potential factor for effective language learning. Another type of intelligence which seems to be relevant is verbal intelligence. It is defined as the ability to express what one has in mind. There is evidence that verbal intelligence has a meaningful relationship with academic achievement (Fahim & Pishghadam, 2007), and fluency (Pishghadam, 2009). All in all, we are facing two dimensions dealing with the nature of the ability: linguistic and cognitive. With this in mind, this paper attempts to study the high-order processes or intelligence factors in language production. Linguistic features under investigation include knowledge of grammar, breadth, and depth of vocabulary; high-order capacities included in the study are verbal and narrative intelligences.

The category of cognitive classifiers is one of the least developed in linguistics. The importance of determining the composition and functions of cognitive classifiers in the structuring of the conceptual sphere and semantic space of the language determines the relevance of the work.

One of the modern directions of language science is cognitive linguistics, which "studies the peculiarities of assimilation and processing of information with the help of language signs" (Popova, 2001). The subject of cognitive linguistics is the study of

linguistic means (words, phrases, texts) that represent certain concepts in language and speech (Popova & Sternin, 2001).

The cognitive approach in linguistics is carried out by joint efforts of specialists from different fields of knowledge: psychology, philosophy, logic and cybernetics. Recently, a special role has been given to linguists, as language has become considered as the main source of information about the cognitive structures of consciousness and intelligence.

The emergence of modern cognitive linguistic science associated with the writings of American authors Ray Jackendoff, George Lakoff, Ronald Langacker, and some others. A characteristic feature of modern cognitive linguistics is the variety of directions of cognitive linguistic research (Boldyrev, 2000). The nature and types of concepts and conceptualization are studied by axiological linguistics. The matter of the universal values is the correlation between national, class and human, temporal and eternal, natural things and their place within the society. The system of values being spiritual ties of the civilization focuses on the English teaching process as the development of the humanistic values through realization of language values by means of axiological linguistics. Thus, the argument on the social component of English teaching process as adaptation of the individual within the society in the course of studying the foreign languages confirms the statement that axiology is closely connected, bounded up with foreign language teaching as a way of accommodating native values with alien culture and traditions (Barsalou, 2002).

The study of language and thinking shows that the basis of knowledge about the world is such a unit of mental information as a concept. E. S. Kubryakova defines the concept as an operational, meaningful unit of thinking, unit or quantum of structured knowledge (Kubryakova, 1994).

Since the reflection of the world in the human consciousness is carried out by means of concepts different in their content, organization and way of representation, there are different types of concepts: representations (mental pictures), schemes, concepts, frames, scenarios (scripts), gestalts. According to the degree of stability, the concepts are divided into stable and unstable. In the form of expression concepts can be verbalized and hidden. The degree of abstraction distinguish abstract and concrete concepts. Lexical, phraseological, syntactic concepts are considered according to the method of representation in the language. Concepts by their individual characteristics enter into systemic relations of similarity, difference and hierarchy with other concepts. All varieties of concepts form the concept-sphere, which "is a system formed by intersections and interlacements of numerous and diverse structural associations of

groups of concepts that are "grouped" into chains, cycles, branches like trees, are constructed as fields with center and periphery, intertwine and flow into each other" (Likhachev, 1993). Thus, the concept-sphere is an "ordered set of concepts of the people" (Popova & Sternin, 2001).

Concept-sphere of different nations differ in the composition of concepts, principles of their organization. The richer the culture of a nation, its folklore, literature, science, fine arts, historical experience, religion, the richer the concept-sphere of the people.

The best access to the description and definition of the concept nature is provided by the language. Language opens access to the unobservable cognitive world of man, the structures of his consciousness. Language units, language categories and language classes point to the content of information that has already become a product of human processing and has found its reflection and fixation in language forms.

Research in the field of cognitive linguistics allowed revealing cognitive mechanisms of categorization of the phenomena of reality taking into account the ratio of linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge, conceptual and lexical-semantic information. The authors of modern publications are unanimous in the fact that the categorization reflects the human perception of the structure of the real world. The grouping (categories) sorts the results of refraction of reality (Goldberg, 2000; Zalewskaya, 1999).

Rosch notes that the real world is structured and this is reflected in the human consciousness in the form of a system of categories. Each category is characterized by an internal structure, which is based on the inequality of the members of the category: in each category there are psychologically the most selected objects, i.e. central, focal, typical elements of the category, called prototypes, and less typical, non-focal, peripheral elements (Rosch, 1983).

Cognitive classifiers are manifested in the conceptual sphere as conceptual features used to combine concepts similar in any respect, and are represented in linguistic semantics as integral and differential semes. Cognitive classifiers combine and differentiate both images of objects of reality and linguistic units (Popova & Sternin, 2001).

Recently, there have been works in which the authors use the term "cognitive classifier" and raise the question of the composition and functioning of cognitive classifiers on the material of specific thematic groups of vocabulary. The material of some studies leads the authors to the understanding of the cognitive classifier.

Cognitive classifiers are important factors in gaining knowledge about the world. Lakoff was the first who drew attention to this phenomenon. (Lakoff, 1988). Lakoff

claims that there are classifiers in people's minds which systematize objects and phenomena of the world.

Let us demonstrate some examples. Lakoff showed how native Japanese speakers categorize objects and phenomena on the basis of the *hon* classifier. However, the language element *hon* is normally used with the names of long, thin, inflexible objects, e.g. sticks, pencils, candles, poles, there are numerous examples of using this element with designations of the phenomena that seems to have nothing in common with these objects, i.e. with the designations of strikes in baseball, phone calls, injections, etc. On the basis of the observations and analysis, Lakoff conclusively establishes that the relationships between the knowledge about these objects and phenomena are united in the consciousness of native speakers in the mental category of the *hon* classifier. Lakoff referred to the concepts of the basic level of the category. The objects of the second group (strikes and serves in baseball, phone calls, injections) that in his opinion do not have these features are located at some distance from the center of the category. Lakoff emphasizes the cognitive status of the classifiers described by him. The research conducted by Lakoff on the function of cognitive classifiers has been developed in linguistics. The understanding of the cognitive classifier proposed by Popova is worth discussing. Popova shows that cognitive classifiers can be detected via analysis of the meanings of polysemous words. Russian and English names of dishes for drinking and pouring liquids were chosen for analysis. The scientist demonstrated that the lexemes' affinity (units of the substances of expression) can be considered as a material expression of the cognitive classifier. Thus, the lexeme "glass" is used for the name of dishes made of glass, indicates that native English speakers combine a number of "tableware concepts" on the basis of the cognitive classifier "glass" (Popova 1996; Popova & Sternin 2001: 83-88).

In fact, the potential pedagogical implications of a cognitive linguistics approach have already received researchers' attention and are dramatically gaining momentum. Langacker (2008) expressed optimism that language teaching would fare better when guided by notions from cognitive linguistics. He explained, "compared to other approaches, cognitive linguistics offers an account of language structure that —just from the linguistic standpoint— is arguably more comprehensive, revealing, and descriptively adequate". Tyler (2012) argues that the cognitive linguistics approach has the potential to provide rich insights into the relatedness of, organization of, and motivation for the core and many "exceptional" uses associated with aspects of lexis and grammar and ultimately, these insights offer language learners a more coherent and explanatory description of the language. Quite a few experiments have been

carried out to illustrate the effect of the cognitive linguistics approach to second language learning, especially for English (ESL) and German (GSL).

Boers & Lindstromberg's (2008) edited volume presents numerous recent studies on the applications of the cognitive linguistics approach in learning general vocabulary, idioms and phrasal verbs. As for polysemies and the semantic networks of individual words, Verspoor and Lowie (2003) found that teaching the central meaning of a word first facilitated more accurate interpretation of unfamiliar extended meanings. In their experiment with Dutch-English learners, the cognitive group presented with the core sense of the tested words outperformed the traditional group in both initial learnings of meaning extensions and long-term memory of the extended uses. Csábi (2004), Beréndi, Csábi & Kövecses (2008) undertook experiments teaching the meanings of hold and keep to L1 Hungarian learners. The cognitive group that received a teacher's explanation of the polysemy networks and the motivations for the targeted extensions outscored the traditional group in immediate and delayed post-tests.

All these experiments provide evidence that systematically alerting students to the central sense and/or the motivation of meaning extension of a polysemy can help promote more appropriate use and long-term retention of lexical items.

However, to our knowledge, in the field of Chinese pedagogy, the same type of empirical study is yet to be conducted despite the considerable body of literature theoretically arguing the value of the cognitive linguistics approach in teaching Chinese classifiers. Therefore, the present study aims to fill this gap by testing whether presenting polysemy networks and motivations for extensions can facilitate English speaking learners' initial learning, long-term memory as well as extended use of Chinese classifiers. The hypothesized result is a positive effect of the cognitive linguistics approach exists not only in initial learning and long-term retention but also in learners' identification of new uses.

2. Methodology

When analysing comparative collocations we have made an attempt to demonstrate our understanding of a cognitive classifier based on the above-mentioned observations. It is possible to find the expression of the cognitive classifier in the common component of several comparative collocations.

We define a comparative collocation as a phrase, which is implemented in speech as part of the comparison and is used to describe the object of comparison. The comparison expresses the mapping of objects and phenomena, which man considers as similar in some features. Three main components are compared: 1) the theme – the

name of the object, which is compared; 2) the supporting component (reference word) – the name of the object, which is compared to the theme; 3) the basis, expressing a sign, defined by man as similar to the compared objects (Nazarov, 2000; Solomakha, 2003; Shevchenko, 2003). The elements of the comparative collocation are only the basis and the supporting component.

In the literature we have surveyed, the object represented by the supporting component is regarded as the reference standard of the feature that is actualized in comparison (Sheigal, 1990), i.e. the sample which the phenomena, objects of the real world are compared with. Thus, the reference word "crawfish" (рак) in the comparative collocation "red as crawfish" (красный как рак) names the object, which is the reference standard of red colour for Russian speakers.

3. Findings

Let us consider comparative collocations in the Russian, English and French languages with the bases "красный", "red" or "rouge", respectively, describing the person and the details of person's appearance. These comparative collocations are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative collocations in Russian, English and French with the bases "красный", "red" or "rouge"

Красный как	As red as	Rouge comme
(вареный) рак	a (boiled) lobster (омар)	une écrevisse (cuite) рак (вареный)
мак	raspberry (малина)	un homard (омар)
пион	a cherry (вишня)	un coquelicot (мак)
кумач	a beetroot (свекла)	une pivoine (пион)
	a turkey-cock (индюк)	un coq (петух)
	a fire (огонь)	une cerise (вишня)
	a flame (пламя)	du feu (огонь)
	a rose (роза)	une tomate (помидор)
	blood (кровь)	un dindon (индюк)
		un oeuf de Pâques (Пасхальное яичко)

Comparative collocations in each of these languages have a common basis but differ in their supporting components.

The common basis of "red" (красный) in Russian comparative collocations signals that native speakers of the Russian language mentally combine the reference standards of red colour: crayfish, poppy, peony and red bunting. We can assume that they are

united around the concept that reflects a common feature for them - a tint of red colour. This concept is a cognitive classifier. We suppose that the word "red" is a material expression of the cognitive classifier *a tint of red colour*. Since the mental association of these objects is caused by the perception of them as reference standards of red colour, this association is a cognitive category of "Reference standards of red colour". Names of reference standards form the lexical category "Reference standards of red colour".

Similarly, the cognitive classifier of *a tint of red colour* in the French language is distinguished by the common ground of "rouge". The names of the reference standards: *ecrevisse (cuite)* – lobster (boiled), *coquelicot* (poppy) – cherry, *pivoine* (peony) – beetroot, *tomate* (tomato) – rose, *coq* (cock) – turkey-cock, *cerise* (cherry) – fire, *feu* (fire) – flame, *oeuf de Pâques* (Easter egg) make up the lexical category "Reference standards of red color" in the French language.

Thus, on the material from Russian, English and French languages the cognitive classifier *a tint of red colour* is distinguished. The category "Reference standards of red colour" consists of basic components with comparative phrases. The material expression of this cognitive classifier are the supporting components of comparative collocations "красный", "red and "rouge".

Being found in all three languages, lexical categories "Reference standards of red colour" have a similar structure in these languages, but differ in the composition of the elements included in them.

The prototypical core and periphery are distinguished in the category structure. The prototypical core consists of the supporting components of established comparative collocations. The category "Reference standards of red colour" may also include a significant number of other units remaining beyond the prototype core. This is due to the fact that man perceives other objects as red (e.g. red bag, red tie, red notebook, etc.). It is possible to say: "He turned red like this tie". Consequently, these objects can also be conceptualized as reference standards, but since they are not fixed in the established comparative collocations, their names will go to the periphery of the category. Reference standards of red colour that fixed in the established comparative collocations are psychologically distinguished by native speakers compared to other potential reference standards.

There are equivalents as well as specific elements for each category in the Russian, English and French languages as part of the prototypical cores.

In the Russian and French languages, the comparative collocations with equivalent reference components are recorded: "красный как рак (red as a crayfish)" and "rouge

comme une ecrevisse", "красный как мак (red as poppy)" and "rouge comme un coquelicot", "красный как пион (red as peony)" and "rouge comme une pivoine". Therefore, for the prototypical core of the Russian and French cognitive categories three reference standards are common: crayfish, poppy and peony. In the English and French languages, the comparative collocations with equivalent reference components are recorded: "red as a turkey-cock" and "rouge comme un dindon", "red as a fire" and "rouge comme du feu", "red as a cherry" and "rouge comme une cerise", "red as a lobster" and "rouge comme un homard". Four standards are common for the prototype core of the English and French categories: turkey-cock, fire, cherry, lobster. In the Russian and English languages, the comparative collocations with equivalent reference components are not recorded. This testifies the lack of common elements in the prototypical core of the Russian and English cognitive categories.

4. Discussion

The composition of the prototypical core of the lexical category "Reference standards of red colour" was determined with an objective indicator – dictionary dataset on established comparative collocations. To specify the composition of the peripheral elements of the category a number of special techniques should be involved. We employed the methods of contrast analysis and experiment.

The possible periphery of the category for one of the languages is revealed as a result of the contrastive analysis of the categories of the same name in several languages. Thus, the word rose (rose) is included in the core of the English category "Reference standards of red colour". As the comparative phrase "as red as a rose" is established, it is fixed in the dictionary. The word tomato (tomato) is included in the core of the French category "Reference standards of red colour". As the French comparative collocation "rouge comme une tomate" is also established, it is fixed in the dictionary. A native Russian speaker can also see in a rose and tomato such a tint of red colour, and perceive these objects as standards of red colour. However, for the Russian language, the names of the objects "rose" and "tomato" will be on the periphery of the category "Reference standards of red colour", as the comparative collocations "red as a rose" and "red as a tomato" are not recorded in the dictionaries of the Russian language.

To find out what objects native Russian speakers perceive as standards of red color, an experimental survey of informants was conducted. The participants were asked to complete the collocation "red as ..." that would characterize a person. Among the responses received, the reference components "rose" and "tomato", which are not included in the established comparative phrases were recorded. The experiment

confirmed that these supporting components would be included in the Russian category of "Reference standards of red colour", but would be located on the periphery, while their equivalents in the English and French categories belong to the core.

Lakoff highlights that "Metaphorical thought, in itself, is neither good nor bad; it is simply commonplace and inescapable. Abstractions and enormously complex situations are routinely understood via metaphor. Indeed, there is an extensive, and mostly unconscious, system of metaphor that we use automatically and unreflectively to understand complexities and abstractions." (Lakoff, 1988:12). He put an emphasis that the composition of a category could not be predicted, but could be explained. We have made an attempt to explain some differences in the composition of the studied category in the Russian, English and French languages.

5. Suggestions

In order to identify how universal and ethno-specific colour standards can be in different linguistic cultures, we compared English, French and Russian established comparative collocations with the component "red", extracted by the method of continuous sampling from phraseological dictionaries. The similarities in the three languages we analysed are, first of all, in the fact that objects belonging to the same class of realities act as a standard of colour. Thus, among the standards of red in English, French and Russian languages are the following semantic categories: "flora", "fauna", "sources of light and heat", "food", "artifacts", "religion and mythology".

It is important that the composition of these categories may vary considerably. The most extensive is the group "flora", which in turn is divided into subgroups "vegetables", "fruits and berries" and "flowers".

In the subgroup "vegetables" there is only one common standard of red colour for the language: tomato. The Russian language is also characterized by comparisons with poppy and peony. In the subgroup "fruits, berries" also coincides only one standard: cherry, a cherry and "une cerise" in English and French, respectively.

The subgroup "flowers" within the category "flora" has one common standard of red colour for linguocultures: poppy, in addition, the standard of peony is allocated in Russian, and in English – rose.

It is important to note that differences in the three languages are manifested not only in the different composition of the general groups but also in the presence or absence of a category. Thus, the group "light and heat sources" is identified only in English and French. The common words are the English standard "a fire" and the French standard "du feu".

The category "food" is also represented in all three linguistic cultures. In addition to the general standard of comparison for the Russian and French languages: a crayfish, it is also allocated a (heated) lobster and "un homard", "Omar" in English and French as a standard.

Some categories are specific to only one of the languages we compare. Thus, in the category "fauna" the name of bird "un coq" (cock) is only in French, the category includes also the following names "a turkey-cock" and "un dindon" that are identified in English and French.

The category "artifacts" stands out only in the Russian language and it has in its composition a standard reflecting culturally specific realities: "red bunting" (кумач).

The category "religion and mythology" is also revealed only in the French language "un oeuf de Pâques" - Easter egg.

Comparative analysis of the standards of red in English, French and Russian linguistic cultures reveals similarities and differences. Common to the three languages are two semantic categories: "flora" and "food". At the same time, all three components of the group "flora" coincide: "vegetables", "fruits, berries" and "flowers". The flora group is the most extensive in all three languages. The other semantic groups occur only in two or even one language. Only in Russian the category "artifacts" stands out.

The national unique features, specific cultural background account for the metaphor. For example, in the Russian language, there is a comparative collocation "red as a bunting". It is known that red bunting (red cotton fabric) was quite a popular attribute of the Soviet past of our country. The lack in the English and French languages of comparative collocations with the equivalents of the Russian word "кумач" pinpoints a particular significance of this object for Russian cultural tradition. Similarly, the lack of a comparative collocation in the Russian language with a reference component equivalent to the English unit a (boiled) lobster and the French unit un homard (lobster) can provide an explanation. In English and French cultures, unlike Russian, lobster is a common constituent of the diet.

Colour is one of the constants or one of the principles of culture, which can serve as a kind of model of development, reflecting the ways of formation, development, consolidation in the common cultural memory, also nationally coloured, culturally significant concepts. Since color is a component of culture, it is surrounded by a system of associations, interpretations, is the embodiment of a variety of moral and aesthetic values. The word "colour" is emotionally charged initially. It does not only denote colour, but also seeks to express the attitude of the speaker. Colour can be expressed

explicitly, by direct naming colour or tint of colour. Colour can be expressed implicitly by naming the object, the colour which is fixed in everyday life or culture at the level of traditions. The main principle of constructing a word-formation model provides for the necessary participation in the phrase component with the name of colour, the lexical meaning is in the first component, it determines the emotional colouring, expresses additional features, sometimes enhances or helps to express the idea economically. The idea of correlating colour with its reference is the basis of the well-known cognitive theory of Vezhbitskaya. In her opinion, the colours in the language are not abstract, but they are associated with some significant human objects in the world, associated with a particular colour. General meaning is very important. According to this theory, languages differ in the number of colours, not in their quality, that is, not in the colour reference standard. If in any language there is a word "red", then its prototype, according to Vezhbitskaya (1999), will necessarily be a universal common word, for example, "blood". It is clear that the role of a universal prototype is difficult to associate with plants or animals, as for the speakers of other languages, the names of objects of wildlife may be unknown. However, such universality can lead to the impoverishment of languages in determining the semantics of colour meanings. Linguistic evidence of this approach is that "linguistics studies the behavior of "the real linguistic units, in this case, the colour names". It is interesting to compare the compatibility of names of natural objects with adjectives of colour in attributive constructions in different languages or comparative phrases "red as a crayfish". For English, the most revealing is the expression "red as a fox". Linguists divide colour meanings into two groups – basic (absolute) and tint. Absolute colour meanings, in turn, are divided into chromatic, calling the seven colours of the rainbow spectrum (red, orange, yellow, green, blue, deep blue, purple), and achromatic (black, white, gray). All other colour meanings are called tints and are distinguished by colour rendering. Fadeeva (2010) defines colourative composites. To denote the nominative status of colour units, it is appropriate to refer to the notion "concept" and "concept of color designation". The term "concept" has long been used by linguists, it has been interpreted as a mental formation that in the process of thinking stands for an indefinite set of objects of the same kind. The concept can replace both real objects and some aspects of the object or real actions, and can also be a real substitute for very accurate, but purely mental functions. The process of formation of the concept can be represented as a process of simplification of the perceived diverse reality to the minimum, which are determined by the limited resources of human memory and human consciousness. The concept is interpreted as the concept of everyday philosophy, which is the result of the interaction of a number of factors, such as

national tradition, folklore, religion, ideology, life experience, images of art, feelings and value systems. Concepts form a kind of cultural layer that mediates between man and the world.

As a linguistic notion, "concept" makes it possible to consider the ideal mental essence, that is, the units by which we think about the world, mental education, constituting the categorical basis of language and creating a generalized image of the word, objectifying the model of consciousness. According to Kubryakova (2004), the concept is an operative meaningful unit of memory, mental lexicon, conceptual system and language of the brain, the whole world is reflected in the human psyche.

Vezhbitskaya, (1999), believes that colour concepts are associated with certain universal elements of human experience and that these universal elements can be roughly defined as day and night, the sun, fire, flora and fauna, sky and earth, etc. According to the scientist, our colour sensations emerge in the brain, and not in the world around us, their nature is largely determined by human biology (which unites us within certain limits with primates).

6. Conclusion

The analysis asserted that in the Russian, English and French languages the lexical category "Reference standards of red colour" is formed around the cognitive classifier *a tint of red colour*. The material expression of cognitive classifier is the basis of comparative collocations. Differences in the composition of the Russian, English and French categories show that the choice of the reference standards for the description of a person's appearance by native speakers is determined by national and cultural specific background.

The need to study comparative constructions in the language is due to the fact that the mechanism of comparison occupies an important place in human thinking. Comparisons play an important role in the formation of the conceptual picture of the world, clarify and concretize the person's ideas about objects and phenomena. The analysis of comparisons allows us to penetrate into the deep mechanisms of cognitive processes of ordinary consciousness, which is "an effective method of identifying relevant features of the national conceptual sphere. According to researchers, sustainable comparisons are a valuable source of information about the culture of the people. This is due to the fact that as an amplifying component of any comparison is an object, phenomenon or image that is directly related to the living conditions of native speakers of a given language and is the standard of color perception for a given linguistic and cultural community. Thus, the standard of comparison, which lies at the

heart of imagery, becomes a kind of familiar, dominant in the different items, events or persons from the point of view of the everyday-a cultural experience, properties. Stable comparative turns show, on the one hand, the General characteristics of the life of different peoples, and on the other – the features of their lives and life reflected in the creative thinking of the human team.

The presence of common standards of comparison for different linguistic cultures is explained by the fact that there is almost the same reflection in the language of universal practice. However, the analysis of the material also reveals significant differences in the standards of comparison, which are determined by differences in cultures associated with realities, historical events, peculiarities of natural conditions and traditions.

References

- Barsalou, L. (2002). Being there conceptually: Simulating categories in preparation for situated action. In N. L. Stein, P. J. Bauer, & M. Rabinowitz (Eds.), *Representation, memory, and development: Essays in honor of Jean Mandler*, 1-15. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Beréndi, M., Csábi, S. & Kövecses, Z. (2008). Using Conceptual Metaphors and Metonymies in Vocabulary Teaching. In: Frank Boers, & Seth Lindstromberg (eds.). *Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Teaching Vocabulary and Phraseology*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 65–100.
- Boers, F. & Lindstromberg, S. (2008) *Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Teaching Vocabulary and Phraseology*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Vol. 31 (4), Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 396.
- Boldyrev, N.N. (2000). *Когнитивная семантика*. Тамбов: Изд-во Тамб. ун-та, 123.
- Bourke, L. & Adams, A. (2010). Cognitive constraints and the early learning goals in writing. *Wiley Online Library. Journal of research in reading*. Vol. 33(1), 94-110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2009.01434.x>
- Collins, J.L. (1998). *Strategies for struggling writers*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Crossley, S.A., & McNamara, D. S. (2011). Text coherence and judgments of essay quality: Models of quality and coherence. In L. Carlson, C. Hoelscher, & T. F. Shipley (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1236-1241. Austin, TX: Cognitive Science Society.

- Csábi, S. (2004). A Cognitive Linguistic View of Polysemy in English and its Implications for Teaching. In: Michel Achard, & Susanne Niemeier (eds.). SOLA: Studies on Language Acquisition. Series: Cognitive Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, and Foreign Language Teaching. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter, 233-256.
- DeVillez, R. (2003). Writing: Step by step. Dubuque, IO: Kendall Hunt.
- Fadeeva, T.M. (2010). The Main Units Expressing Definite Objects of Compound Epithets. In: Bulletin of the Moscow Region State University. Series: Russian philology, vol. 5, 24-30.
- Fahim, M. & Pishghadam, R. (2007). On the role of emotional, psychometric, and verbal intelligences in the academic achievement of university students majoring in English language. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9, 240-253.
- Ferris, D.R. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49-62.
- Goldberg, V.B. (2000). Структурные связи в лексико-семантическом поле языка. Тамбов: Изд-во ТГУ им. Г.Р.Державина, 232.
- Kubryakova, E.S. (1994). Начальные этапы становления когнитивизма: лингвистика психология - когнитивная наука. *Вопр. языкознания*. №4, 26-34.
- Lakoff, G. (1988). Мышление в зеркале классификаторов. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М, Вып. XXIII: Когнитивные аспекты языка, 12-51.
- Lakoff, G. (1991). Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf. *Viet Nam Generation: A Journal of Recent History and Contemporary Issues*, Vol.3. The Sixties Project. Retrieved 2018-10-04.
- Langacker, R.W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 584.
- Likhachev, D.S. (1993). Концептосфера русского языка. *Изв. РАН. Сер. лит. и яз.* №1, 3-9.
- Nakamaru, S. (2011). Making (and Not Making) Connections with Web 2.0 Technology in the ESL Composition Classroom. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, EJ927073, v38 n4, 377-390.

- Nazarova, I.V. (2000). Типология компаративных единиц в когнитивном аспекте (на материале русского и французского языков): Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Воронеж, 178.
- Sparks, R., & Gonschow, L. (2001). Aptitude for learning a foreign language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 90-111.
- Pishghadam, R. (2009). Emotional and verbal intelligences in language learning. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, 3(1), 43-64.
- Pishghadam, R., Baghaei, P., Shams, M. & Shamsaee, S. (2011). Construction and validation of a narrative intelligence scale with the Rasch rating scale model. *International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 8(1), 75-90.
- Порова Z.D. (1996). Семантическое пространство языка как категория когнитивной лингвистики. *Вестн. Воронеж, гос. ун-та. Сер. 1, Гуманит. науки. №2*, 64-68.
- Порова, Z.D. (2001). Из истории когнитивного анализа в лингвистике. *Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики. Воронеж*, 7-17.
- Порова, Z.D. & Sternin, I.A. (2001). *Очерки по когнитивной лингвистике. Воронеж: Изд-во Истоки*, 83-88.
- Rosch, E. (1983). Prototype classification and logical classification. The two systems. In E. F. Scholnick (ed.), *New Trends in Cognitive Representation*. Erlbaum, 73-86.
- Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive bases of second language fluency*. New York: Routledge.
- Sheigal, E.I. (1990). *Градация в лексической семантике: Учебное пособие к спецкурсу. – Куйбышев*, 96.
- Shevchenko, A.N. (2003). Сравнение как компонент идиостиля писателя - билинга В. Набокова (на материале русско- и англоязычных произведений автора): Дис.: канд. филол. наук. – Саратов, 182 с.
- Solomakha, V.A. (2003). Признак как медиатор межполевых связей в лексиконе носителя языка: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Тверь, 17.
- Tyler, A. (2012) *Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Learning: Theoretical Basics and Experimental Evidence*.
Routledge.
- Verspoor, M. & Lowie, W. (2003). Making sense of polysemous words. *Language Learning* 53, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 547–587.
- Vezhbitskaya, A. (1999). *Семантические универсалии и описание языков*. М., 1999.

Weston, J.L., Crossley, S.A., McCarthy, P.M., & McNamara, D. (2011). Number of words versus number of ideas: Finding a better predictor of writing quality. In Proceedings of the 24th International Florida Artificial Intelligence Research Society, FLAIRS – 24, 335-340.

Zalewska, A.A. (1999). Введение в психолингвистику: Учеб. для студ. вузов, обуч. филол. спец. М.: Рос. гос. гуманитар. ун-т, 381.