New and Traditional Values in Contemporary Russian.
Natural Semantic Metalanguage in Cross-cultural Semantics

ANNA GLADKOVA

Australian National University

Anna.Gladkova@anu.edu.au

1. Introduction

Almost a century ago a prominent Russian philosopher Nikolaj Berdjaev reflecting on the future of Russia wrote about the need of transformation of the Russian character. Suggesting a way of doing it, he said the following: "We should adopt some Western virtues and remain Russian at the same time" (Berdjaev 2000, 270). These words of Berdjaev proved to be prophetic. In the contemporary Russian language the process of borrowing of new words and use of previously borrowed words has significantly intensified since the 1980-90s (Krysin 2002, Ryazanova-Clarke and Wade 1999). The majority of the recently acquired words denote new artifacts and realia which are becoming attributes of the changing life style influenced by Western standards (e.g. *press-reliz* 'press-release'*, butik* 'boutique'*, brifing* 'briefing', etc.). Among the new words there is also a small number of value terms which have entered the Russian lexicon. The adaptation of these words can be regarded as a sign of change in the value system and the ways of thinking.

One of the most indicative current examples of borrowings into Russian in the domain of virtues are the words *tolerantnost'*(n.), *tolerantnyj*(adj.) and *tolerirovat'*(v.). They originate from Latin *tolerare*, but now they are regarded as counterparts of the English *tolerance, tolerant, to tolerate* (Tolerantnost' 1998, Pogodina 2002). These words were first introduced into Russian as value terms in the middle of the XIX century (Lara 2001). After the Revolution of 1917 they were discredited and put out of use as they were associated with the dangerous influence of the capitalist West. During the reforms of the 1980-90s they were 'rehabilitated' and now their integration into political discourse is supposed to be a sign of Russia becoming an open society sharing democratic values of the West.

The attitude of *tolerantnost'* is a necessity for the contemporary Russia with its multinational population. The development of this attitude requires an adequate understanding of the concept. The meaning of the word *tolerantnost'* is interpreted in two ways by contemporary Russian scholars. Some sociologists and politicians suggest that the meaning of *tolerantnost'* is identical with the meaning of the Russian value word *terpimost'* (Zinov'ev 1998a, b). Other researchers argue that there are differences in meanings between these words because they are products of different languages and cultures and thus reflect different cultural attitudes, ways of thinking and behavior (Temičeva 2001, Pogodina 2002, Tolerantnost' 1998, Fen'ko 2001).

A relatively short history of the word *tolerantnost'* in Russian does not yet make it possible to describe its meaning extensively and give a definite answer whether it is different from that of *tolerance*. However, some examples of its use already indicate that the meaning of the concept

tolerantnost' in Russian is not fully identical with that of *tolerance* in English. To prove this point the following examples from newspapers quoted in the National Corpus of the Russian language can be cited:

(1)   *Davit modnaja **tolerantnost'**, mnogotrudnyj socium ljubit terpet'.*
        The fashionable tolerance [*tolerantnost'*] puts pressure on us; the rough society likes to suffer [*terpet'*].

(2)   *Ne men'šee udivlenie vyzyvaet passivnaja reakcija naselenija ... na povsemestnuju **tolerantnost'** po otnošeniju k kriminalizacii obščestva.*
        The passive reaction of people towards the prevalent tolerance [*tolerantnost'*] to the criminalization of the society causes astonishment.

(3)   *... problema **tolerantnosti** segodnja javljaetsja važnešej dlja Rossii.*
        … the problem of tolerance [*tolerantnost'*] is the most acute one for Russia today.

(4)   *Pokolenčeskaja **tolerantnost'** vozrastaet, a tolerantnost' po otnošeniju k vlasti, naoborot, umen'šaetsja.*
        Tolerance [*tolerantnost'*] between generations is growing, but tolerance [*tolerantnost'*] towards the authorities, on the contrary, is decreasing.

(5)   *Treningi budut ustraivat'sja i dlja sotrudnokov milicii: kak **tolerantno** proverit' u čeloveka dokumenty?*
        Training sessions will be organized for policemen: how to check a person's documents in a tolerant way [*tolerantno*ADV]?

These examples show that the meaning of the word *tolerantnost'* in Russian has acquired some culture- and language-specific features and differs from the meaning of the word *tolerance* in English. For example, can *tolerance* be called a problem in English? Do people speak about *tolerance* towards the authorities? Why should a policeman be *tolerant* when checking people's documents? Why does *tolerance* put pressure on Russian people? Are people *tolerant* or simply indifferent towards the criminalization of the society? On the basis of these examples it is possible to suppose that the new concepts have become influenced by the Russian reality and mentality as well as by similar (but nonetheless different) traditional concepts of the Russian language, as discussed below.

It would be too premature to analyze the meaning of *tolerantnost'* in Russian since it requires some time to settle. However, it might be interesting to compare the meanings of the English words *tolerate, tolerant, tolerance,* which are the sources of borrowings of *tolerantnost', tolerantnyj, tolerirovat',* with those of the interrelated traditional Russian concepts *terpet', terpimyj, terpimost,'* which are considered their traditional counterparts. Thus, the goal of this paper is to conduct cross-linguistic semantic analysis of the words *terpet'*, *terpimyj*, *terpimost'* in Russian and *to tolerate*, *tolerant*, *tolerance* in English.

2. Methodology of semantic study of value-words

The importance of conducting vigorous cross-cultural semantic research has been emphasized by Anna Wierzbicka and Cliff Goddard in their recent studies, and several successful attempts have already been made to reveal differences between some cultural value words (Wierzbicka 1992; 1997; Goddard 2001). For example, Anna Wierzbicka showed that the concept of

freedom in English differs from *libertas* in Latin, *svoboda* in Russian and *wolność* in Polish (Wierzbicka 1997). Cliff Goddard described differences between Malay *sabar, ikhlas* and *setia* and English *patient, sincere* and *loyal*, which are traditionally treated as their translations (Goddard 2001). This kind of investigation can reveal minor differences in cultural understanding of similar concepts which result from differences in historical and cultural development. A most suitable and effective tool for conducting such research can be found in the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM), a method developed by Anna Wierzbicka and her colleagues (Wierzbicka 1996, Goddard 1998, Goddard and Wierzbicka (eds) 1994; 2002). This method has significant advantages over other ways of describing culture- and language-specific words (A. Šmelev, A. A. Zaliznjak, I. Levontina) when no universal concepts are used because semantic universals can be regarded as the most neutral medium for semantic comparison.

The main claim of the NSM theory is that there exists a set of about 60 semantic primes (Table 1) common to all languages. These are simple words that are found in all languages and can be understood by speakers regardless of their background and age. This list of words is the following:

Table 1. The list of the NSM semantic primes (in Goddard and Wierzbicka (eds) 2002)

Substantives: I, YOU, SOMEONE, PEOPLE, SOMETHING/THING, BODY
Determiners: THIS, THE SAME, OTHER
Quantifiers: ONE, TWO, SOME, ALL, MUCH/MANY
Evaluators: GOOD, BAD
Descriptors: BIG, SMALL
Mental predicates: THINK, KNOW, WANT, FEEL, SEE, HEAR
Speech: SAY, WORDS, TRUE
Actions, events and movement: DO, HAPPEN, MOVE
Existence and possession: THERE IS, HAVE
Life and death: LIVE, DIE
Time: WHEN/TIME, NOW, BEFORE, AFTER, A LONG TIME, A SHORT TIME, FOR SOME TIME
Space: WHERE/PLACE, HERE, ABOVE, BELOW, FAR, NEAR, SIDE, INSIDE
Logical concepts: NOT, MAYBE, CAN, BECAUSE, IF
Intensifiers, augmentor: VERY, MORE
Taxonomy, partonomy: KIND OF, PART OF
Similarity: LIKE

Each of the universal semantic primitives possesses some "inherent syntactic properties" (Goddard and Wierzbicka 2002, 41), which allow them to combine with other semantic primitives and be used in certain "canonical contexts". These canonical contexts have been tested in a variety of languages and have been proved to be universal as well. For example, phrases like -

> I feel something good (in Russian: *ja čuvstvuju čto-to xorošee*)
> somebody wants to do something (in Russian: *kto-to xočet sdelat' čto-to*)
> many people think something bad about it (in Russian: *mnogie ljudi dumajut čto-to ploxoe ob ètom*)

can be said in any language and understood by speakers, as shown by in-depth previous research (Goddard and Wierzbicka 1994, 2002). These semantic primitives within the boundaries of their universal combinability create a miniature metalanguage which can be used to explicate the meaning of more complex linguistic phenomena. If the right combination of simple words is found to explain meaning of complex words, it then becomes possible to show the differences between similar concepts. These explications will have some common components and at the same time they will differ in some primes and their combinations.

3. *Terpet'* and *terpimyj* in Russian

3.1. The cultural significance of *terpet*' in Russian language and culture

The semantics of the words *terpimost'* and *terpimyj,* which are regarded as the nearest Russian counterparts of *tolerantnost'* and *tolerantnyj,* can be better understood if the meaning and significance of the verb *terpet'* (the word they derive from) is uncovered. The verb *terpet'* is a very common Russian verb of attitude which reflects, roughly speaking, a culturally valued patient acceptance of hardships and sufferings. *Terpet'* does not have exact equivalents in English and can be linked with the following near-equivalents: *suffer, endure, stand, bear, put up with, tolerate*. Importantly, all these English words differ in meaning from the Russian *terpet'*.

The significant role of this concept in the Russian language and culture can be illustrated by its common use in Russian proverbs, a common source and repository of folk wisdom, which emphasize the importance of *terpet'* (Dal' 1957):

(6)　　*Bog **terpel** i nam velel.*
　　　　God endured/suffered [*terpet'*PAST.SG.MASC.] and so told us.
(7)　　***Terpi**, kazak, ataman budeš'.*
　　　　Suffer/endure [*terpet'*IMP], Cossack, you will become an ataman (a gang leader).
(8)　　 *S bedoju ne perekorjajsja, **terpi**!*
　　　　Don't argue with the misfortune, suffer/endure [*terpet'*IMP]!
(9)　　 *Čas **terpet'**, a vek žit'.*
　　　　An hour to endure/suffer *[terpet'*INF], a century to live.
(10)　　 ***Terpja**, v ljudi vyxodjat.*
　　　　By suffering/bearing [*terpet'*GER], one becomes a person.

I should stress again that *suffer* or *endure* are not exact equivalents of *terpet'*, but it is impossible to find better ones for these contexts. *Terpet'* differs semantically from *stradat'* 'suffer' in Russian as well as from *suffer* in English in so far as it implies a conscious attitude towards suffering, which is engendered by a certain way of thinking.

The ability to *terpet'* is certainly a positive characteristic in folk understanding (Uryson 2003, Rancour-Lafferriere 1995). This attitude diminishes conflicts and brings peace. However, it requires effort, both moral and physical, which allows one to live through hardships.

Sometimes a bad state is accepted in order to achieve some goal or in circumstances when not much can be done to change an unpleasant situation.

Terpet' as an important value word can be linked with two other Russian cultural key words. The value of *terpet'* and the importance of the acceptance of hardships is related to the value of *smirenie* (whose closest possible English equivalent is 'humility'). *Smirenie* is a corner stone attitude to life taught by the Russian Orthodox Church which has significantly influenced the development of the Russian character and way of life. According to Wierzbicka, "the word *smirenie* denotes a religious attitude of serene acceptance of one's fate, achieved through moral effort, through suffering, and through realisation of one's total dependence on God, an acceptance resulting not only in an attitude of non-resistance to evil but also in profound peace and a loving attitude toward one's fellow human beings" (Wierzbicka 1992, 189). According to Šmelev, "*smirenie* may emphasize the idea of denial of pride as well as the idea of humble acceptance of everything that is granted to a person" (Šmelev 2002, 104). This quality of the Russian people was especially valued by Leo Tolstoy. *Smirenie* is about developing a peaceful attitude towards misfortunes and hardships. Like *smirenie*, *terpet'* is about accepting the existing situation, not having bad feelings towards other people and not wanting to do bad things to other people.

Terpet' can also be linked with the Russian culture-specific particle *avos'*, as an example from classical literature shows:

(11) *Bol'šaja čast' ljudej, popavšix pod vlijanie samodura, predpočitaet prosto **terpet'** s tupoju nadeždoju, čto **avos'** kak-nibud' obstojatel'stva peremenjatsja* (Dobroljubov).
The majority of people, being under the influence of the despot, prefer simply to put up/suffer [*terpet'*], with a blind hope that maybe [*avos'*] somehow the circumstances would change.

This particular example which links *terpet'* with another Russian cultural word (*avos'*) is also revealing of the meaning of *terpet'*. *Avos'* is the particle "which the Russians themselves regard as a particularly good key to their culture and national character. … *Avos'* is something special, not just another word for 'perhaps'" (Wierzbicka 1992, 433). As Anna Wierzbicka argues, *avos'* reveals "an attitude which treats life as unpredictable: 'it is not worth making plans and trying to carry them out; one cannot organise one's life rationally because one cannot control life; the best one can do is to count on luck'" (ibid., 435). Alexej Šmelev extends it further by saying that *avos'* expresses "a hope that nothing bad will happen which contradicts common sense". It is an attitude characteristic of "a person who doesn't mend a roof which can tumble down soon or the one who builds a nuclear station without an appropriate system of defense" (Šmelev 2002, 134).

Like *avos'*, *terpet'* includes this component of not taking measures which can be regarded as rational and reasonable in bad situations. From the common sense point of view there is nothing rational in putting up with and experiencing suffering, hardships, sorrows, misfortunes and pain, but this is what *terpet'* is about. Like *avos',* *terpet'* also has the component of waiting which can be with or without hope for the better (but waiting with some hope makes this condition easier to bear). As in the example from Dobroljubov (11), people had some blind hope (*tupaja nadežda*, something like 'blind/dull/blunt hope') that circumstances would change somehow. It is related to the "theme which runs through the entire Russian language

and Russian culture: the theme …. of not being in control, of living in a world which is unknowable and which cannot be rationally controlled" (Wierzbicka 1992, 435), which is embedded in *terpet'*.

This discussion shows the cultural importance of the attitude incorporated in the word *terpet'* and makes it possible to distinguish some basic semantic elements of this word. I will now explore the semantics of *terpet'* in more detail.

3.2. The semantics of *terpet'*

Terpet' functions as a transitive word which can be used with or without an object. It has three main syntactic frames which are linked with differences in meaning. In the first frame *terpet'* (*terpet'$_1$*) functions as a transitive verb with an object expressed by an abstract inanimate noun or without an object; in the second (*terpet'$_2$*) – with a human object, and in the third (*terpet'$_3$*) – with abstract nouns which have the meaning of some kind of a loss. The differences in syntactic frames determine semantic differences between the variants. This paper will investigate only the first two meanings: *terpet'$_1$* as most culturally unique and *terpet'$_2$* as the closest one to the meaning of *tolerate*.

3.2.1. *Terpet'$_1$* as a culturally significant attitude towards suffering

Terpet'$_1$ functions as a transitive verb (as already mentioned), which can be used with or without an object. (Several cases of *terpet'$_1$* used without an object were already quoted in examples 6-10). In this frame *terpet'* can also combine with abstract inanimate nouns *bol'* (pain), *xolod* (cold), *muki* (sufferings), *nužda* (need), *uniženie* (humiliation)*, *niščeta* (poverty). These words represent a variety of uncomfortable and painful conditions lasting for some period of time and causing negative feelings. The following examples can illustrate this point:

(12) *I esli vernost' otečestvu potrebuet ot menja **terpet'** nuždu do konca moix dnej – budu **terpet'**, no mat'-rodunu ne predam!* (Radzinskij)
And if faithfulness to the fatherland will require me to endure [*terpet'*] need till the end of my days – I will endure [*terpet'*] (it), but I will not betray my Motherland!

(13) *I nikakie durnye obstojatel'stva, kazalos', ne mogli pridavit' ego. On mog kvartirovat' xot' na kryše, **terpet'** adskij golod i neobyknovennyj xolod.* (Dostoevskij)
It seemed that no bad circumstances could influence him. He was able to lodge even on a roof, endure [*terpet'*] intolerable hunger and unbearable cold.

(14) *Na fone rosta pretenzij značitel'no snizilas' gotovnost' molodeži **terpet'** lišenija i preodolevat' trudnosti.* (internet)
While pretensions are growing, the ability of the youth to endure [*terpet'*] destitution and overcome difficulties has significantly decreased.

Terpet' presents an attitude a person can develop when being in a difficult situation that produces negative feelings. This attitude builds up due to a certain cognitive scenario which allows a person to prolong this negative state. A certain way of thinking rejects a possible (more logical and natural) scenario of interrupting this state by performing some action. The essence of this way of thinking is that a person realizes his/her capacity to remain in this state longer and decides to do so.

To show that *terpet'* is linked with the concept of 'ability' several colloquial expressions can be cited which have the meaning 'I can't bear more':

(15) *Netu   našej   **močen'ki***   *bol'še   **terpet'**.* (Rasputin)
No   our   capacityDIM   more   *terpet'*.
There is no more of our 'capacity' to *terpet'*.

(16) *Vot   my   **terpeli,**   **terpeli,**   da   už*
Here   we   terpet'PAST.2PL   terpet'PAST.2PL   and   so
nevmoč'   *stalo.* (Aleškovskij)
unbearable   it became.
We have waited long, but it has become unbearable.

The colloquial words *močen'ka* (diminutive noun derived from the verb *moč'* (be able to)) as well as the adverb *nevmoč'* 'unbearable' do not collocate with words other than *terpet'*, which means that they have become 'joined' to *terpet'* due to their common combination. *Terpet'* as a verb also gave rise to the adverb *nevterpež* within the impersonal adverbial construction *emu stalo nevterpež* (heDAT became *nevterpež*) (he couldn't stand/bear it any longer). This is another piece of evidence for *terpet'* being perceived as an ability.

Taking all these ideas together, the explication of *terpet'*₁ can be as follows:

[A]   *čelovek X terpit₁* (person X *terpit₁*) / *čelovek X terpit₁ čto-to (N_{Abstr}) (bol,' muki, stradanija)* (person X *terpit₁* something (N_{Abstr}) (pain, sorrows, sufferings))
(a) something very bad has been happening to person X for some time
(b) X feels something very bad because of this
(c) X can think about it like this:
(d)   I don't want it to be happening
(e)   maybe if I do something, this bad thing will not be happening to me any more
(f)   because of this, I will not feel like this any more
(g) X doesn't think like this, X thinks like this:
(h)   it will be good if I don't do anything
(i)   I can feel like this some more time
(j)   I will not do anything because of this
(k) because X thinks like this, X doesn't do anything
(l) people think: it is good if a person can think like this
(m)   it is good if a person can live like this

This explication shows that *terpet'*₁ is an attitude of a person towards unpleasant conditions which happen regardless of a person's wishes and which lead to this person's negative emotional state (components a and b). This person decides not to act in this situation because s/he thinks that it is good not to try to change it and that it is still possible to continue to bear it (components c-k). This kind of attitude has a positive social evaluation (components l and m). Literary and ethnographic evidence suggests that this meaning of *terpet'*, which has a positive value of accepting suffering and hardship, is very significant in the Russian language and culture.

3.2.2. *Terpet'₂* as an attitude towards people

The situation of *terpet'₂* requires at least two people who have to interact due to some circumstances. The possible objects of such an attitude can be noisy neighbours or annoying relatives. One of them (the one who *terpit*) for some reason does not like the other person because of his/her behavior, but decides not to end the relationship because it could hurt the other person. I presume that prototypically this decision not to harm other people is influenced by the Christian Orthodox belief and is modeled after Jesus' attitude to people. However, this link is not incorporated into the meaning of the word today and this kind of attitude can be adopted by religious and non-religious people. Here are some examples of use of this word in this meaning:

(17) *No oni byli vynuždeny **terpet'** drug druga, kak sokamerniki, i ėta vynuždennost' sosuščestvovanija, verojatno, unižala ix bol'še, čem kakie-to melkie uslugi so storony zrjačix.*
But they had to tolerate [*terpet'*] each other like cellmates; and this forced necessity of coexistence humiliated them more than any small services from the sighted.

(18) *Ne tak li mnogie ... s umom ljudej bojatsja i **terpjat** pri sebe oxotnej durakov?* (Krylov)
Isn't it that the majority of people … are afraid of clever people, and put up with [*terpet'*] fools around them?

Unlike *terpet'₁, terpet'₂* doesn't include the component of positive social evaluation because this kind of attitude is perceived as some kind of humiliation from the point of view of the object of the attitude, as the following example illustrates:

(19) *Vasilise kazalos', čto nikto ee bol'še ne zamečaet, nikto s nej ne sčitaetsja, a tol'ko **terpjat.*** (Rasputin)
It seemed to Vasilisa that no one was noticing her anymore, no one took her into consideration, but only put up with her [*terpet'*].

The use of *terpet'₂* with the adverb *tol'ko* 'only' denies the possibility of the component of a positive social evaluation.

I propose the following definition of *terpet'₂*:
[B] *čelovek X terpit₂ čeloveka Y* (person X *terpit₂* person Y)
(a) person X has to be with person Y for some time
(b) person Y has been doing something for some time
(c) something bad is happening to person X because of this
(d) person X feels something bad because of this
(e) person X thinks something bad about person Y
(f) X can think about it like this:
(g)   I don't want this
(h)   I want to do something because of this
(i) X doesn't think like this, X thinks like this:

(j)　　　it will be good if I don't do anything
(k)　　　I can feel like this some more time
(l)　　　I will not do anything because of this
(m) because X thinks like this, X doesn't do anything

3.3. The semantics of *terpimyj*

Terpimyj is an adjective which derives from the verb *terpet'₂* and expresses a characteristic of a person who is "capable of being patient and not hostile towards views, opinions and behaviour of other people" (Ožegov 1978, 731). It can characterize a person in general (*terpimyj čelovek* 'terpimyj person') or an attitude towards a particular feature of another person or people. It is then used with an object in dative case governed by the preposition *k*. So among objects compatible with *terpimyj* the following combinations are possible:

> *terpimyj k　neznakomym licam, javlenijam, čužim vkusam* (unknown persons, phenomena, other people's tastes)
> *predstaviteljam drugoj rasy, drugogo pola, drugoj seksual'noj orientacii* (representatives of another race, another gender, another sexual orientation)
> *drugim religioznym ubeždenijam* (other religious beliefs)
> *ljudskim slabostjam i nedostatkam* (people's weaknesses and demerits).

On the one hand, a person can be characterized as *terpimyj* if s/he can accept and allow beliefs, behavior and tastes of other people which differ from his/hers. On the other hand this attitude is also directed at other people's shortcomings and weaknesses.

Examples illustrating the importance of this value to the Russian people can be found on the Russian web-site of single people looking for partners. Many women providing information about themselves write that they are *terpimy* (along with qualities like optimistic, outgoing, joyful) presenting it as one of their positive qualities. Why do they think it will be attractive to men? Perhaps it conveys the ability of these women to create a relationship and accept weaknesses or faults of men (like excessive drinking or rough treatment). It means that many women consider this quality to be a foundation for a relationship. So the essence of *terpimyj* is not about attitude to something or somebody who is merely different. It is an attitude to people whose behavior is considered bad by the *terpimyj* person and has direct negative impact on that person.

I suggest the following explication of the word *terpimyj*:
[C] *terpimyj čelovek (k drugim ljudjam)* (*terpimyj* person (towards other people))
(a) sometimes when a person has to be with some other people
　　this person thinks about these people like this:
(b)　　these people are doing bad things
(c) this person feels something bad because of this
(d) this person can think about it like this:
(e)　　maybe if I do something
　　these people will not do these bad things any more
(f)　　because of this, I will not feel like this any more
(g) this person doesn't think like this, this person thinks like this:
(h)　　it will be good if I don't do anything
(i)　　I can feel like this some more time

(j)   I will not do anything because of this
(k) because this person thinks like this, this person doesn't do anything
(l) people think: it is good if someone can be like this

This explication shows that *terpimyj* is a quality of a person which is expressed in a situation of dealing with other people who act in a bad way from the point of view of that person (components a and b) and cause negative emotional feelings in that person (component c). The possible reaction of that person can be to think of doing something to stop that bad action (components d-f). Instead of this, the person has a different mental scenario, according to which s/he thinks it would be better not to do anything in this situation and that it is possible to remain for longer in this negative emotional state (components g-j). This way of thinking results in the person's not doing anything (component k). This quality has a positive social evaluation (component l).

Terpimost' as a noun differs from *terpimyj*, which is an adjective, only in the frame of use, i.e. this difference is of syntactic character rather than semantic. Thus, the explication of *terpimost'* would be identical to that of *terpimyj* and therefore will not be discussed here.

4. *To tolerate* and *tolerant* in English

4.1. The semantics of *tolerate*

To uncover the semantics of the words *tolerant* and *tolerance* it is important to comment on the meaning of the verb *tolerate* from which they derive. In analysing the meaning of the verb *tolerate* it is worth distinguishing three frames: 1) *to tolerate* someone's behaviour, 2) *to tolerate* pain/frustration/ambiguity, 3) *to tolerate* spicy food/salt. I will comment on the first meaning (*tolerate$_1$*) because it is most culturally-significant and because the adjective *tolerant* and the noun *tolerance* derive from it.

The verb *to tolerate$_1$* expresses an attitude towards the behaviour of other people that somehow interferes with normal and balanced condition of that person. The English *tolerate$_1$* can be experienced towards people affecting someone personally:

(20)   *Perhaps, I thought, I am solid enough to **tolerate** his extraordinary and naive arrogance…*
(21)   *My mother tried to talk me out of getting a divorce, using the argument that women have to **tolerate** the immaturity of men.*
(22)   *Steven says he could only **tolerate** his brother's serpent handling up to a point.*
(23)   *Family members can **tolerate** sacrificing their own needs for the sake of a relationship goal of successfully finishing professional training.*

However, unlike *terpet'*, *tolerate$_1$* can express an attitude towards behaviour of a group of people which is divergent from the norm:

(24)   *The French Government has little or no record of barring US citizens whose papers are in order and who have a clean record on their soil. The country itself is known to **tolerate** a wide variety of views across the political spectrum.*

(25)   *India could get control of it because for centuries India has been a society that has been able to **tolerate** diversity, particularly religious diversity.*

As these examples illustrate, a person who *tolerates* other people's behaviour allows these people to behave in the way they want. This person realizes that there is a possibility of terminating these people's behavior by saying or doing something to them, yet the person chooses not to do so. The mechanism that prevents the person from interfering with another person's behaviour is the idea of personal autonomy which allows each person to behave and live in the way she/he wants. This idea is specific to the Anglo culture.

It is interesting to note that among the occurrences of *tolerate* in the COBUILD corpus one can observe a significant prevalence of $tolerate_1$ used in negation over its use without a negation. The following examples can illustrate such cases:

(26)   *They're **not** going to **tolerate** the indifference…*

(27)   *Stroh **doesn't tolerate** discrimination*

(28)   *anti-abortion activists **won't tolerate** tyranny or oppression*

(29)   *I have **never** been able to **tolerate** hypocrisy*

(30)   *… he could **not tolerate** violence*

In these cases the attitude of *tolerate* is directed towards other people's socially unacceptable behavior (like discrimination, blackmail, tyranny, hypocrisy, etc.). This suggests that the verb *tolerate* in this meaning is not a value word in contemporary English and that the ability to *tolerate* other people's bad behaviour is not a very respected and valued quality now.

I will suggest the following explication for $tolerate_1$:

[E] *person X tolerates$_1$ person's Y behaviour:*

(a) sometimes person X has to be with person Y

(b) Y has been doing something bad for some time

(c) something bad is happening to X because of this

(d) X feels something bad because of this

(e) X doesn't want Y to do this bad thing

(f) X knows that if X does/says something to Y
    Y will not be able to do this bad thing any more

(g) X thinks about it like this:

(h)   if Y wants to do something, Y can do it

(i)   I don't want to say to Y:

(j)   "you can't do this because I don't want you to do it"

(k)   because of this, I will not do anything to Y

(l) because X thinks like this, X doesn't do anything

This analysis shows that the meaning of the verb to *tolerate$_1$* is different from that of *terpet'$_1$* and *terpet'$_2$*. *Terpet'$_1$* is an attitude of accepting hardships and sufferings and not developing a

negative reaction to them, whereas *terpet'$_2$* and *tolerate$_1$* are attitudes towards other people. *Terpet'$_2$* develops towards another person, who the subject of the attitude has to be with for some time and whose actions cause the subject's negative feeling (components a-c). *Tolerate$_1$* is an attitude towards an action of another person which has a negative emotional impact on the subject of the attitude (components a-d). In the case of *tolerate$_1$*, unlike *terpet'$_2$*, this attitude can be directed at someone distant. The decision not to take action against another person in *terpet'$_2$* is caused by a person's realization that s/he can experience a negative emotional state for some more time and by the general negative evaluation of doing bad things to other people (components i-k). The attitude of *tolerate* is based on the recognition of the autonomy of behaviour and thought of another person (components h-j).

4.2 The semantics of *tolerant*

Being *tolerant* is certainly a virtue in English. It is a quality of a person who is capable of accepting other people doing something in a different way. This attitude can be directed at shortcomings of people one knows well (examples from **Cobuild**):

(31)   *Martha is not **tolerant** of my negligence or my foolishness or my eccentricities…*
(32)   *At 38 years of age, Mr Welsh says it will take a very **tolerant** woman to put up with his work commitments and fanaticism about sports, especially golf.*

The attitude of a *tolerant* person can also be directed at distant people, whom the person does not know. Usually behaviour or ideas of such people are considered different from socially accepted norms:

(33)   *... older people are becoming more **tolerant** of homosexuals, premarital sex, and other sexual alternatives.*
(34)   *We've become more **tolerant** of minority groups such as homosexuals, Aborigines and the ethnic population: and that's reflected in our films.*
(35)   *Other changes include more **tolerant** attitudes to one-parent families and to unmarried couples having children.*
(36)   *Older people are more **tolerant** to the idea of Charles and Camilla conducting their relationship in private.*

These examples show that a tolerant attitude can be directed at people whom one does not know personally, but whose behaviour is divergent from what is considered in a given society or milieu as normal and acceptable. The point of view of a *tolerant* person is to a certain degree determined by him/her being a representative of a society and respecting certain societal norms. A *tolerant* person recognizes differences in other people, and his/her possible reaction to them can result in wanting to do something to stop those people from doing those things in a different way. However, a *tolerant* person chooses not to do anything out of respect for the personal autonomy of all people, which allows people to think and behave in the way they find appropriate. Unlike *tolerate*, *tolerant* does have a component of positive social evaluation. I would suggest the following explication:

[F] *person X is tolerant of people Y*
(a) person X thinks about people Y like this:
(b)   these people are not like me
(c)   because they do some things in other ways
(d)   people can think that it is bad to do things like this in these other ways
(e)   people can want to do something because of this
(f)   I don't want to do this
(g)   if a person wants to do something it is good if this person can do it
(h)   a person can't say to people:
(i)   "you can't do something because I don't want you to do it"
(j)   it will be good if I don't do anything
(k)   because of this, I will not do anything
(l) because X thinks like this, X doesn't do anything
(m) people think: it is good if someone can be like this

The attitude of a *tolerant* person develops towards someone whose behaviour differs from his/her behaviour and can be divergent from societal norms (components b-d). It is different from the quality *terpimyj,* which as in the case of *terpet'₂*, is an attitude that a person develops towards someone whose behaviour s/he considers bad and that causes that person's negative emotional feeling (components b and c). Therefore *terpimyj* is more 'personal' in its attitude. It refers to other people influencing us directly. Thus the bad actions of other people have personal effect on us and cause our negative emotional reaction. The attitude of a *tolerant* person is aimed mostly at people deviating from social norms and not necessarily affecting him/her personally. The not acting of a *terpimyj* person is caused by understanding of the possibility of experiencing that negative emotional state for some more time (component j). A *tolerant* person is significantly influenced by the idea of personal autonomy and the right of each person to behave and think in the way s/he wants (components g-j). This kind of comparison leads to understanding that some virtues which might seem similar in different languages and cultures are governed by different social rules and understanding and thus are different.

The meaning of *tolerance* will not be discussed here, as like in the case of relationship between *terpimyj* and *terpimost'*, it is identical to the meaning of *tolerant.*

5. Conclusions

The work in contrastive semantics can tell us a great deal about differences between cultures in which the particular words are used. Linguists can contribute to social sciences and to the investigation of values prevailing in different cultures and different societies by a detailed semantic analysis, which in turn can be successful if the appropriate methodology is used. NSM is able to reveal subtle differences in the meaning of value words and proves to be an adequate tool for this kind of task.

A detailed semantic analysis allowed us to show differences between concepts *terpimyj* and *tolerant*. *Tolerant* has a more "social" character since it is an attitude towards something seen as different from social norms. *Terpimyj* is more "personal" in its attitude as it is a reaction towards personal offence. *Tolerant* is related to the recognition of personal autonomy of

thinking and behavior as well as the idea of social harmony as an opportunity for people to behave and think in the way they want. *Terpimyj* is linked to the value of *smirenie*; it is about not developing bad feelings and negative reaction to those seen as doing bad things and about maintaining the social harmony of positive feeling among people. Thus, *tolerant* is more "rational" and "liberal" and *terpimyj* is more "emotional" and "moral".

The proposed definition of the English *tolerant* formulated in simple universal concepts allows us to make first estimate about the possible difference between the Russian new word *tolerantnyj* and the English *tolerant*. In some cases the Russian *tolerantnyj* is used in the way similar to English and refers to an attitude towards people who are different from the majority:

(37)   *Naibolee **toletantny** rossijane k migrantam iz Belorussii, s Ukrainy i voobšče k slavjanam.*
         Russians are most tolerant towards migrants from Byelorussia, Ukraine and Slavs in general.

However, there are some cases of use of *tolerantnyj* in Russian which are different from the use of *tolerant* in English. *Tolerantnyj* can be used to refer to an attitude towards other people who do not deviate social norms or do not decline from a social standard, but rather they are simply disliked by a *tolerantnyj* person for some reason:

(38)   *Vpročem, budem **tolerantny** k našim činovnikam – popytaemsja ponjat', čto oni zatejali.*
         However, let's be tolerant towards our officials and try to understand what they have in mind.
(39)   *… Javlinskij and Ivanenko otpravili lideram SPS pis'mo, v kotorom izlagajut principy **tolerantnogo** povedenija dvux partij v xode vyborov…*
         Javlinskij and Ivanenko sent a letter to the leaders of SPS with an explanation of the principles of a tolerant behaviour of two parties during the elections.

As these two examples illustrate, as well as examples (4) and (5) quoted in the beginning of the paper, according to a Russian way of thinking a person can be *tolerantnyj* towards officials, members of another political party; policemen can be *tolerantnyj* towards drivers when checking their documents. These examples show that there is some variance in meaning between *tolerant* and *tolerantnyj* in the way that a *tolerantnyj* person develops this attitude towards someone she/he doesn't like personally even though this person is not violating any social standards. Thus, the semantic component (d-e) in the explication of tolerant (F) cannot be justified for the Russian *tolerantnyj*. This fact suggests that the Russian word *tolerantnyj* reflects a world view encoded in the Russian language, which has some differences from the world view encoded in the English language. According to this view, one's likes and dislikes in developing an attitude towards other people are more important than societal norms and order. In this way *tolerantnyj* becomes similar to *terpimyj*, whose attitude is aimed at people someone dislikes personally.

Acknowledgement

References

Berdjaev N 2000 *Sud'ba Rossii* [The Fate of Russia] EKSMO-Press Moskva/Xar'kov

COBUILD. The Collins COBUILD Bank of English. http://titania.cobuild.collins.co.uk/ (accessed June 2004).

Dal' V 1957 *Poslovicy russkogo naroda. Sbornik.* [Proverbs of the Russian people. Collection.] Izdatel'stvo hudožestvennoj literatury Moskva.

Goddard C 1998 *Semantic Analysis: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press Oxford.

Goddard C 2001 'Sabar, ikhlas, setia – patient, sincere, loyal? Contrastive semantics of some 'virtues' in Malay and English' *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 653-681.

Goddard C and Wierzbicka A (eds) 1994 *Semantic and Lexical Universals: Theory and empirical findings.* John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Goddard C and Wierzbicka A (eds) 2002 *Meaning and Universal Grammar: Theory and empirical findings*. John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Fen'ko A 2001 'Osobyj tip myšlenija' [Special way of thinking] *Maloe predprijatie* 6 (http://www.dtpress.ru/mp/2001/06/03.htp accessed October 2002).

Krysin LP 2002 'Leksičeskoe zaimstvovanie i kal'kirovanie v russkom jazyke poslednix desjatiletij' [Lexical borrowings and replication in the Russian language in the previous decades] *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 6: 27-40.

Lara U 2001 Zloklučenija slov-izgoev [Misadventures of 'outcast' words] *Ličnost' i mir* 10 (http://www.ifgo.ru/?n=339 accessed October 2002).

Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo jazyka [The National Corpus of the Russian Language] http://www.ruscorpora.ru/ (accessed June 2004).

Ožegov S 1978 *Slovar' russkogo jazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian language] Russkij jazyk Moskva.

Pogodina A 2002 Tolerantnost': termin, pozicija, smysl, programma [Tolerantnost': term, position, meaning, programme] *1 Sentjabrja/ Istorija* 11 (http://www.1september.ru/ru/his/2002/11/2.htm accessed October 2002).

Rancour-Laferriere D 1995 *The Slave Soul of Russia: Moral masochism and the cult of suffering* New York University Press New York/London.

Ryazanova-Clarke L and Wade T 1999 *The Russian Language Today* Rotledge London/New York.

Šmelev A 2002 *Russkaja jazykovaja model' mira* [The Russian language model of the world] Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury Moscow.

Služba A&B. Buro znakomstv [A&B Service. On-line dating Service] http://www.abservice.ru/ (accessed June 2004).

Slovar' russkogo jazyka 1981-1984 [Dictionary of the Russian language]. 4 V. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.

Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka 1960-1965 [Dictionary of the Contemporary Russian language] 17 V. Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR Moskva/Leningrad.

Temičeva E 2001 Tolerantnost' kak uslovie suščestvovanija [Tolerantnost' as a condition of existence] *ASI bulletin* (http://www.hro.org/actions/nazi/toler/1.htm accessed October 2002).

Tolerantnost' 1998 In *Encyclopedia 'Krugosvet'* (http://www.krugosvet.ru/articles/10/1001072/1001072a1.htm accessed October 2002).

Uryson E 2003 *Problemy issledovanija jazykovoj kartiny mira* [Issues in studying the language world view] Jazyki slavjanskoj kultury Moskva.

Wierzbicka A 1992 *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal human concepts in culture-specific configurations* Oxford University Press New York/Oxford.

Wierzbicka A 1996 *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford University Press New York/Oxford.

Wierzbicka A 1997 *Understanding Cultures Through their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford University Press New York/Oxford.

Zinov'ev D 1998a 'Sociokul'turnaja tolerantnost' – ee suščnostnye xarakteristiki' [Socio-cultural tolerance: its essential characteristics] *Paradigma* 1 (http://res.krasu.ru/paradigma/1/11.htm accessed October 2002).

Zinov'ev D 1998b Social'no-psixologičeskij portret studenta v kontekste tolerantnosti. [A socio-psychological portrait of a student in the context of tolerance] *Paradigma* 2 (http://res.krasu.ru/paradigma/2/6.htm accessed October 2002).