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Abstract
The relevance of the investigated problem is caused by the modern tendencies in cultural linguistics when different linguistic phenomena are studied on the ground of both Linguistics and Cultural Studies. The main aim of this paper is to investigate the detailed study of Russian, English and Tatar set similes within the framework of History. This comprehensive study of set units in the languages of different systems has allowed us to determine the condition of the given study. The historical method used in this paper has helped examine different resources and research works concerning study of set similes of Russian, Tatar and English languages and emphasize three main periods of set similes research. The study of Russian, English and Tatar set similes within the third period gives perspectives for further study of their semantic and ideographic classification, defining their cultural codes, establishing a paradigm of universal and unique similes.
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Introduction

As it is known, there are three main scientific paradigms: comparative-historical, systemic-structural and anthropocentric. Comparative-historical paradigm was the first scientific paradigm in linguistics as comparative-historical method was the first specific method of the study of languages. All the XIX century was held under the name of this paradigm. Under the system-structural paradigm all attention was focused on the object, a thing, a name, so the focus was on the word itself. Even in the third millennium, it's possible to explore the language within the system-structural paradigm as it continues to exist in linguistics, and the number of its followers is quite large (Maslova, 2004). According to anthropocentric paradigm researcher's interest is focused on the subject, on the person, so the language is analyzed in a person and person in a language, as, according to the I.A. Bo Duan de Courtin, "Language exists not only in individual minds, but in the souls of those who make up a given linguistic society".

Comparisons or similes have a special place in the language and thinking. They have been used for a long time. People have always cognized the world and everything around them using comparisons. In our daily life, when we lack the exact word to describe someone or something, we often use comparisons. It is difficult to overestimate the didactic role of comparisons. In the methods of teaching the language they are effective interpreters of the meaning because of their imagery and expressiveness. Comparison is not just a way to name the surrounding reality, but rather the way of evaluation. It can clearly and vividly characterize a person, natural phenomena or everyday situations.

According to the ancient philosophers "the comparison is the mother of learning". Belyaev K.I. study comparison along with such concepts as knowledge, feeling and thinking. He regards the comparison as one of the basic kinds of mental processes (Belyaev, 1959). A great Russian thinker and educator K.D. Ushinskiy wrote: "Everything in the world is known through the comparison, and if we introduced some new items that you might not equate to anything to distinguish ... then we would not be able to say anything about it" (Ushinskiy, 1939).

In the linguistic dictionaries of the Russian language the following definition of comparison and comparative constructions may be found. Comparative phrase is a component complicating simple sentence and expresses the comparison with the fact, outlined in the main part of the sentence, (Academic Dictionary of linguistic terms, 2005). Comparative phrase expresses the comparison which is a part of a simple sentence (Rosenthal D.E, M.A Telenkova, 1976). The dictionary of linguistic terms by O.S. Akhmanova defines it as "a figure of speech which consists in the assimilation of one object to another, which assumes a characteristic in common with the first" (Akhmanova, 1966). According to O.V. Ogoltsov there are 1. individual creative similes or author’s similes that are created by the authors in their masterpieces and 2. social similes or set similes that are created by the people and widely used and handed down from one generation to another (Ogoltsov, 2001). The object of our research is set similes that play a special role in the organization of linguistic reality, and they are special language units capable of giving a clue to the national awareness (Maslova, 2004).

We can distinguish national and cultural sub-components reflecting the specific world view of a native speaker in the linguistic picture of the world. The national-cultural semantics is reflected in the different language units, especially in the phraseological fund of language, in set similes which reflect the customs and traditions of the people and their way of life.

Methodological Framework

To attain our aim we used the comparative-historical approach and made a review of different English, Russian and Tatar resources gave us an opportunity to make a detailed analysis of the works of noble scholars who made a great contribution to set similes study within the
framework of Philosophy, Linguistics and Linguoculturology. A complex approach to the study of set similes allowed us not only to analyze precisely the materials but to reach specific conclusion that there have been three main periods in the set similes study. The first period may be described as the discussion of similarity and similes in Philosophy. The second period is devoted to the detailed study of the structural analysis of comparative constructions within the frameworks of comparative-historical and systemic-structural paradigms. The third period is a linguocultural analysis of set similes on the ground of one or several languages on the basis of anthropocentric paradigm.

It should be noted that within the framework of this paper it is impossible to name all the researchers who made contribution to the development of set similes study but we try to draw the attention to those who greatly affected the elaboration on the overall theory.

Results

The first period of set similes study starts with the notion of similarity and similes in Philosophy. The origins of the similes study linked with famous philosopher and scholar Aristotle who studied comparison as the method of cognition. Later Lomonosov made a great contribution to the notion of degrees of comparisons.

The second period is characterized by detailed study of the structural analysis of comparative constructions within the frameworks of comparative-historical and systemic-structural paradigms. Such scholars as Buslaev F.I. and Potebnya A.A. figured out the cause of the comparison and the different images in the language. In the 60 years of the XX century N.A.Shirokova summarized the many results obtained in the previous area and made a significant contribution to the scientific study of this phenomenon. She defined different types of syntactic structures with comparative union as a part of a simple sentence. Moreover, she studied the types of compound sentences expressing comparison relations in the modern Russian literary language and introduced comparative unions, as part of the simple and complex sentence. One of the first who drew an attention to the theoretical plan of steady comparisons was V.V. Vinogradov. He identified them as a special type of idiomatic constructions, in which the internal convention of phrase determined the characteristic of traditional national image, its proven accuracy, everyday realism and expressive impressiveness. Grammatical comparison expression and various forms of comparative constructions have been studied in detail by such scholars as Chuich L.A., Cheremisina M.I., Polishchuk G.G., Skvoretskaya E.V. and etc. Rudnev A.G., Dmitrieva N.S., Voinova E.S., Mal'shakova N.T., Priyatkina A.F., Sazonov A.P. were among linguists who studied the classification of the comparatives. At the end of the XX century steady comparisons were studied in the structural and semantic level by Ogoltsev V.M., Lebedeva L.A., Mokienko V.M., Cheremisina M.I. and others.

Credit for the development of the scientific description of the comparative units is given to Ogoltsev V.M. who first represents set similes as a means of linguistic expression. Set similes were the object of study of linguists, not only on Russian material, but also on the material in other languages. The experience of studying the comparisons in the English language is associated with such names as Berlizon S.B., Birenbaum J.G., Kunin A.V. and etc. Tatar comparative constructions are studied by Sagdi G., Validi Z., Ibragimov S.M., Povarisov S.S.

According to our observations, the study of set similes in structural-typological and semantic and functional aspects of the example of one of several languages continues to the end of XX century. For example, Pavlov V.V. considered the comparative structure of the Russian language in simple sentence structure, revealed their structural and semantic features. Lebedeva L.A. offered the ideographic description of set similes. The author developed the topical dictionary of the Russian language in the following thematic fields: A person's appearance,
physical quality and human abilities, character traits, "world of things" around the person, nature, events, time, etc. Doughty F.V. explored the structural and semantic characteristics of comparative constructions with the index of comparison in aspects of the transition theory. Zlivko S.D. believed that comparative constructions are significant components of the linguistic texts pattern formation. Khlebnikov M.V. studied synonyms of comparative constructions in Russian and English languages.

The third period is the beginning of the XXI century when set similes were studied on the basis of linguaculturology and psycholinguistics, as everyone knows that language is studied not by itself but in close relation with the culture, the psychology of the people speaking this language. It may be explained by the fact that after the formation of linguaculturology or cultural linguistics as a science, different linguistic phenomena are beginning to be studied in connection with the culture of the people speaking this language. Collocations, phraseological units, including set similes, being the subject of cultural linguistics, "contains national-cultural component in its semantics. A "system of images, embodied in phraseological structure of language as a kind of" niche "for cumulation worldview, social and spiritual culture of the language community, and can therefore testify its cultural and national experience and traditions" (Telia, 1996).

We should stop on the imagery of set similes while studying them as idioms occur mainly on the basis of imagery; imagery also plays a significant role in the development and functioning of the phraseological units; imagery is an important factor in the formation of the semantic structure of the phraseology (Nazarian, 1987). Ogoltsov V.M. considering sustainability as a comparison unit of the language called it imagery comparison. (Ogoltsov, 1982). According to him, “comparative phraseological units is not only creates imagery due to the "imposition" of one object to another, as in a conventional comparison - assimilation, not only highlights the feature to compare objects, put in a comparison base, but also exaggerates this feature and amplifies emotionally expressive tension turnover "(Ogoltsov, 1971).

Ideographical study of phraseology as a science is connected with Emirova A.M. According to her, areas of the language that are already covered both with vocabulary and phraseology are of the interest from the ideographic point of view. (Emirova, 1988) Following Emirova A.M. phraseology as an independent ideographic research is also seen in the works of Mokienko V.M., Iwashko L.A, Kashina I.V. and etc.

In the third period there is a special tendency to ideographic classification of phraseological units. Mokienko V.M. considers that this classification should be objective with the identification of thematic and ideographic groups characterizing social relationships of all kinds. During the ideographic classification of such units variant, synonymous and antonymous relations, i.e. relations system disclosed in the phraseological fund is revealed. "(Nikolaeva, Seliverstov, 1991) Phraseological units are the idioms combined semantically and are part of a particular semantic field. This semantic field "is the result of individual groups of features in higher category. (Petrenko, 1988) Kovshova M.L, for example, believes that the creation of semantic fields is one of the possible approaches to solve the problem of describing the national cultural setting of phraseological units. Their semantics show the national language picture of the world in some fragments. (Kovshova, 1990)

There is the difference in the classification of phraseological units. Emirova A.M. distinguishes two semantic fields: characterizing the scope of human emotions and characterizing the cognitive activity of man. (Emirova, 1988). Nailer Y.A. also developed a semantic classification of phraseological units of the Russian language. At the first stage it allocates 5 most common classes, then distributes each individual class semantic group "on the
basis of similarity of values. Fedorov A.I. studying Siberian dialect phraseology offers "functional-semantic" principle in classification. He divides all idioms into groups depending on their role in the sentence. (Fedorov,1980). Solodub Y.P. in the article "Phraseological imagery and ways of its parameterization" also interprets these units at the level of imagery perception. In his work, he stops at the semantic microsystems, expressing the assessment of human appearance in the phraseosemantic field "man." As for ideographic description of set similes, scientists have different approaches to solving this issue. Some of them study the imagery on the basis of one language (Ogoltsov V.M., Sidyakova N.M, Royzenzon S.I), others on the basis of two languages in comparative terms (Kadyrov A.I, Gatiatullin Z.Z and Gizatova G.K, Ogoltsov V.M). There is diversity in ideographic classification of set similes too as there is a possibility of different semantic interpretations of the same unit, due to the fact that the basis of comparison is the word that may pass from one functional area to another. Sidyakova N.M. identifies 5 thematic groups on the material of English adjective comparative phraseological units. Royzenzon S.I. firstly divides nouns into animated and inanimated. Then he identifies subgroups within these groups. In Russian linguistics Ogoltsov V.M. distinguishes 12 thematic categories, Lebedev - 22 thematic fields. One of the first attempts of comparative semantic analysis of set similes in English and Tatar languages is the study of Gatiatullin Z.Z and Gizatovoy G.K. (1976). The paper identifies set similes, matching both the substantive value, and in the form of reproduction; identical in meaning but not identical in shape playing; available in one language but not in another. They are also divided into different groups: positive, negative and neutral assessment of the value. They define 11 groups on the semantic ground. So, as it can be seen, the semantic classification of set similes is rather diverse and needs the clarification.

Discussions
Recently, a comparative study of different systems of languages is popular among scholars (Sakaeva, Spirina, 2015). This can be explained by the fact that, on the one hand, the focus of public consciousness is directed to the areas that allow you to develop an idea of cultural values of the nation, the importance of language in the framework of the general development of civilization, and on the other hand, its discoveries are closely related to teaching foreign languages, theory and practice of translation, compilation of bilingual dictionaries. So the method of contrastive linguistics and comparative study of languages will be among the leading ones in the nearest future. After reviewing a number of studies concerning linguoculturology, we came to the conclusion that a large number of studies have already devoted to phraseological units. (Sakaeva, Bagautdinova, 2013). But the comparative study of Russian, English and Tatar set similes were not the subject of special study. Thus we can conclude that such an analysis is a promising area for further research, as set similes, because of their vivid imagery, are the object that gives opportunities for semantic analysis, reflect the vision of the world and experience of people, embody the people's mentality and spiritual culture.

Conclusions
The analysis of the works devoted to the set similes research suggests that a comparative study of these units in Russian, English and Tatar languages was not a subject of a special study. Comprehensive analysis of Russian, English and Tatar set similes in the aspect of linguocultural paradigm, their thematic and ideographic classification, identification of their cultural codes, the establishment of a paradigm of universal and unique set similes of the given languages may constitute a good basis for bilingual dictionaries creation and helps overcome international and intercultural interference in teaching foreign languages.
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