

COMPARISON AS THE WAY OF TATAR AND RUSSIAN WORLD PICTURE SPECIFICITY REPRESENTATION

Dina Kh. Galiullina, Radif R. Zamaletdinov, Ramziya M. Bolgarova
Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Tatarstan, Russia

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the comparative structures of Tatar and Russian languages as the means of linguistic categorization of the Tatar and Russian world pictures. These designs are of great interest, as they allow to reconstruct the most important stereotypes of national consciousness. The elements of structural, component and comparative analysis were used as the main study methods. The study material is the comparative structures, selected from the "Dictionary of comparisons and comparative constructions" by K.S. Gorbachevich, "The dictionary of sustainable comparisons" by L.A. Lebedeva and the works of art written in Tatar and Russian languages.

The reproduction of belief system, which is reflected in the comparative structures of the Tatar and Russian languages, helps to identify a universal and a unique aspect in the outlook of two ethnic groups; reveal the hidden meanings of the national-cultural comparisons in the content in the compared languages. Thus, the use of certain names as the comparison images may give an idea of the place, which is occupied by various phenomena and objects in the Tatar and Russian world picture, as well as about the thinking features of these ethnic groups representatives. The uniqueness of comparative constructions in Tatar and Russian languages is influence by thinking features, a spiritual attitude, a world-view, the historical development of an ethnos, its national culture and its environment.

The performed study has a practical significance, because the obtained results represent a valuable material for the study of two ethnic group philosophy.

Keywords: language world picture, comparison, Tatar language, Russian language, national worldview

TATAR VE RUSYA DÜNYASI RESİM SPESİFİKASYONU TEMSİLİ YOLUYLA KARŞILAŞTIRMA

ÖZ

Makale, Tatar ve Rus dillerinin karşılaştırmalı yapılarıyla, Tatar ve Rus dünya resimlerinin dilsel kategorizasyonunun araçları olarak ele alındı. Bu tasarımlar, ulusal bilincin en önemli stereotiplerini yeniden yapılandırmaya izin verdikleri için büyük ilgi uyandırıyor. Yapısal, bileşen ve karşılaştırmalı analiz unsurları ana çalışma yöntemleri olarak kullanılmıştır. Çalışma materyali, K.S.'in "Karşılaştırma ve Karşılaştırmalı İncelemeler Sözlüğü" nden seçilen karşılaştırmalı yapılarıdır. Gorbachevich, L.A. Lebedeva'nın "sürdürülebilir karşılaştırmalar sözlüğü" ve Tatarca ve Rusça dillerde yazılmış eserler.

Tatarca ve Rusça dillerinin karşılaştırmalı yapılarında yansıtılan inanç sisteminin yeniden üretilmesi, iki etnik grubun bakış açısında evrensel ve eşsiz bir yön belirlemeye yardımcı olur; Karşılaştırılan dillerdeki içerikteki ulusal-kültürel karşılaştırmaların gizli anlamlarını ortaya koymaktadır. Bu nedenle, karşılaştırma görüntüleri olarak belirli isimleri kullanmak, Tatar ve Rus dünya resiminde çeşitli fenomen ve nesnelere tarafından işgal edilen yerin yanı sıra bu etnik grup temsilcilerinin düşünme özellikleri hakkında fikir verebilir. Tatarca ve Rusça dillerinde karşılaştırmalı yapıların benzersizliği, düşünce özellikleri, manevi bir tutum, bir dünya görüşü, bir etnosun tarihi gelişimi, ulusal kültürü ve çevresi tarafından etkilenmektedir.

Yapılan çalışma pratik anlamda bir önem taşıyor çünkü elde edilen sonuçlar iki etnik grup felsefesinin incelenmesi için değerli bir materyali temsil ediyor.

Anahtar kelimeler: dil dünyası resmi, karşılaştırma, Tatar dili, Rusça dili, ulusal dünya görüşü

INTRODUCTION

The comparative study of two or more languages involves the revealing of studied language universal and unique features. At the same time, we consider a language not only as a system of signs, but as the means of communication, the means of a man worldview reflection.

The comparative structures of any language is one of the most illustrative means of the world picture representation. The aim of our study is the identification of the Tatar and Russian language world picture specifics by the means of comparative constructions. The relevance of this study is explained by the fact that the reproduction of the representation system, which is reflected in the comparisons of Tatar and Russian languages, helps to identify a universal and a unique aspect in the outlook of the ethnic groups; to reveal the hidden national-cultural meanings in the content of compared language comparative constructions.

The theoretical and methodological basis of research are presented in the works written by W. Von Humboldt, E. Sepira, A.A. Potebnya, E.F. Arsentieva, N.D. Arutyunova, Y.D. Apresyan, G.A. Bagautdinova, L.K. Bayramova, E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov, R.R. Zamaletdinov, Y.N. Karaulov, S.A. Lebedev, V.A. Maslova, V.M. Mokienko, A.V. Petrovsky, E.M. Solodukho, V.N. Teliya, I.I. Chernysheva, N.M. Shansky, A.D. Shmelev, H.Burger, W.Fleischer, Th.Schippan and others.

The national worldview is fixed in the semantics of language units with different levels, but most clearly in its constituent elements, which include comparisons [Bolgarova + et al 2014], idioms [Tarasova + et al 2014, Sibgaeva 2015], metaphors [Nurullina + et al 2015] as these units reflect the figurative interpretation of reality.

A rich historical experience of people is pictured in comparisons, it reflects the representations associated with work activity, life and culture of people.

The national-cultural identity of comparative constructions is particularly evident during the comparison of languages. This comparison allows to bring out the similarities and differences in the images and the standards on which the comparisons are based. The isolation of universal features in the comparative structures of two or more languages facilitates the understanding of ethnic and cultural identity. Every nation has its own way of the world perception and, therefore, it creates a language picture of the world on his own. This peculiarity is shown clearly at the comparison of different people world pictures [Gilazetdinova G. + et al 2014].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The basic method of the work is the comparative one, involving the comparison of two or more languages. The work also used the methods of theoretical database analytical treatment on this issue; a solid sampling of comparative units from the works of Russian and Tatar literature; the classification and the systematization of linguistic material, the elements of structural and component analysis.

Main part:

A linguistic world picture is a systemic, holistic representation of reality through various linguistic means. Every language has a universal core of the world picture, which serves as the basis for the mutual understanding of people with different nationalities. This is due to the material world unity, and the similarity of individual people historical development stages, etc. Despite the apparent universality, every people lives in certain areas and in certain natural and climatic conditions, every nation has its own characteristics in material and spiritual culture [Zamaletdinov + et al 2014]. The main features are the religion and beliefs, customs and traditions. All this is reflected in a language [Kirillova 2014]. Consequently, the linguistic picture of the world is developed by universal and unique linguistic means. Besides, the world picture of each person is represented by their own subjective views about the world, which are developed throughout his life.

A linguistic picture of the world may differ for several reasons among the representatives of different ethnic groups. These are social and natural factors. Also a big role is played by the differences in religious views. Therefore, we can say that the language picture of the world is a universal and a unique one. And as it was mentioned earlier, we can determine the unique worldview of different ethnic groups only at the comparative study of the world pictures.

"On the one hand, a language world picture is developed by the language means which reflect the linguistic universals, and, on the other hand, by the language means, fixing people worldview features. There is no single universal picture of the world, and there are many national world pictures, the uniqueness of which can be seen only during the comparison of different nation worldviews, speaking different languages "[Zamaletdinov 2004: 13].

The differences of ethnic-linguistic pictures of the world are manifested in the lexical fund of a language, phraseology and, to a lesser extent, in grammar. Obviously, the "comparative structures are the valuable material to identify some of the features concerning a language world picture of different ethnic groups, as they have a semantic and a grammatical plans of expression, being not only a linguistic category, but also a cognitive category, reflect the peculiarities of thinking among the representatives of different ethnic groups" [Bolgarova 2015: 16].

The comparative structures of different languages differ, as they fix the secondary sensations, and they reflect the world views, the peculiarities of thinking characteristic of a particular ethnic cultural community. According to V.A. Maslova, "the world reflected through the prism of the secondary sensation mechanism embodied in metaphors, comparisons and symbols is the main factor that determines the versatility and specificity of any particular national language picture of the world" [Maslova 2001: 70]. Therefore, the comparative analysis of comparative units allows to detect general and specific aspects in the culture of ethnic groups, to explore the phenomenon of ethnic mentality, to identify the factors affecting the originality of comparative constructions, specific to different languages.

The comparative structures are specific to a particular ethnic group. The standards of these structures are taken from the mythological layer of national consciousness. A person acts as the object of comparison in these structures, and the images of mythological and folk heroes, as well as religious images act as the reference ones. The basis of comparison is the ideas about an appearance and a character. For example: *Аның йөзе кәфендәй агарган, күз карашлары битараф, күңелендә дөнья кайгысы калмаган иде.* (F. Sadriev); *Бәр көнне иртән иртүк ул, мотоцикльның сиртмәле биленә атланып, такыр юлдан пырылдап, тирбәлә-тирбәлә Сыртланга китеп бара, ә кич белән тагын шулай **жәң кебек** машинасында тумырылып кайтып **жүтә** иде* (Г.Әпсәләмов); *Кабер сырты кебек, кемнеңдер дәү аркасы калыкты* (Г.Әпсәләмов); *Daria went down in a cold quagmire, barely got out by crawling, dirty and wet, like a witch* (V. Rasputin). *The uncle and the nephew chased pigeons, swinging by the poles on the roof and whistling as Nightingale the Robber* (Yevgeny Yevtushenko); *Not boys, but the adults of dwarf growth stood under the bathhouse with the rods in their hands. One of them was even old; he had long gray hair like a priest, they streamed from the hat on the coat collar* (Yu. Nagibin); *- You, brother, Viktor Petrovich, have to get some haircut, you have the hair like a deacon, it is not interesting to look at you* (V. Zakrutkin).

These comparisons are unique ones as they act as the carriers of ethnic-cultural information.

The next group of comparative constructions is a universal one, because it is based on human knowledge. For example, the names of the heavenly bodies are often used in the description of eyes in both languages: *Тукайны күрүемә ярты гасыр үтте инде, ә мин аның күзләрен әле дә булса хәтерлим. Еллар тирәнлегеннән алар миңа **якты йолдызлар сыман** карыйлар*(Г.Әпсәләмов); *Аның кара күзләре нур белән тулы, **әйттерсең, ике тере йолдыз** карап тора*(Г.Әпсәләмов); *And when she raised her lashes to look at him, her eyes were shining like stars, and became wet* (A. Kuprin); *His eyes look directly in front of the window, in the sunset spring sky, and I know that now they are not squint, they are blue, deep and shiny like stars* (I. Odoevtseva).

But sometimes during the description one and the same image may characterize an object or a phenomenon from different angles. For example: *Фин, **мәче башлы ябалакның** караңгыда ялтыраган **сары күзләре төсле** зәһәрле күзләрен ялтыратып әкрен генә борыла башлады.*(Г.Әпсәләмов); *- Get out, I say! - Repeated Philip Philipovich and his eyes were round like an owl's* (Mikhail Bulgakov); *She looked at Alexey with a cheerful surprise, her eyes were round as an owl's, bright and impudent ones* (B. Polevoy).

These comparative structures are also universal ones for compared languages. Therefore, not all comparative structures are the carriers of cultural and national information. There is a large number of comparisons in the languages under study, where the objects or phenomena associated with universal knowledge become the benchmark of comparison.

The analysis of comparative structures showed that universality and the features of world perception and world understanding of Tatar and Russian language carriers are particularly apparent in comparisons, in which different specific phenomena of life and ethnic culture make act as references and comparison bases. In this respect the sphere, which combines the names of household items, is the largest one. These items

often act as the standards of comparison during the description of a person's appearance and character. The comparison may be based on qualitative signs of a reference, as the a shape or a size: *Әмма балаларныкы кебек почмакланып торган кабарынкы иреннәре, уң битендәге инә очы хәтле генә миңе, нәфис буюсыны бер дә үзгәрмәгән* (Г.Әпсәләмов); *Сакалы ак, аркасы дуга кебек бөкрәйгән* (Г.Әпсәләмов); The elder girl of about nine years old, high and thin as a match ..., stood in the corner beside her little brother ... (Dostoevsky). Stepa turned from the machine and saw a strange subject in a mirror placed in front, which was not wiped by lazy Grunya for a long time. He was like a long pole and had a pince-nez ... (Mikhail Bulgakov), color: *Чырае мич йөзе кебек ап-ак* (Г.Әпсәләмов), Spare your eys. They will be colorless and would be like pewter bowls (К. Раустовский); etc.: *Кулым балта кебек каты минем...* (Г.Гыйльманов), But I know that your shoulders - I kissed them in a dream - they are gentle, like wax candles (Gumilev).

The existential signs of everyday objects act as comparison basis: the way of existence, produced sounds or the lack thereof, etc. For example: *Көянтә шикелле урталай бөкрәйгән татар шәкерте узып ките* (Ф.Әмирхан), And Lelka comes here again ... she came up to me very close, and smiles by her damn smile, and I start to feel myself comfortable and I shine like a copper samovar (Frolov).

The names of clothes, shoes and various accessories are close to this area. The use of their distinctive features as the bases of comparison is applied to describe a person's appearance. For example: *Чәчләре, ефәк шәл булып, бөтен гәүдәсен урап ала...* (Г.Гыйльманов), *Сәлим аның түгәрәк йөзенең, кечкенә кара күзләненең эчке нурдан жәүһәр кебек балкып китүен бик ачык күрдө* (Г.Әпсәләмов); I met the Negro ... - his face was like a wet overshoe (Vladimir Nabokov). He looked at me with his bright eyes, which stuck on a small moustached face like beads (V. Kaverin).

The words of this group can act as a comparison standard for the description of objects or phenomena: *Әлегә хәтле колак алкасы кебек кечкенә кармак яки өч-биш сажинлы бредниктан башка кораллар белән балык тотканны күрмәгәнлектән, мондагы эшләр аңа шактый сәер тоела иде* (Sh. Kamal), *Яратам мин айлы-йолдызлы төннәренә, күк йөзе энҗе белән чиккән кара хәтфә кәләпүшкә охиый* (Г.Әпсәләмов). During the doctor's visiting hours, the salon is silent as a wadded cloak (Boris Pasternak). Heavy drops of dew were hanging on trembling aspen leaves as ruby earrings (G. Sholohov-Sinyavsky).

The following field of images is represented by product names and national cuisine dishes. Color becomes the basis of comparison during a man description: *Иске генә кәжән кигән бу карт чып-чын Хозыр Ильяс иде: сәт кебек ап-ак сакал-мыегы аңа илаһилык, серлелек, изгелек төсмере ягып тора* (G. Gyuylmanov), The frostbitten faces of passers-by, red, like a sausage appeared out of the fog (Boris Pasternak); Form: *Иреннәре уңган камырдан пешергән кабартма хәтле булып кабарган* (N. Gyuymatdinova), *Covering by fingers, thick as sausages, the arms of the chair, he tried to raise a naughty body* (M. Gorky); as well as the signs which reflect the loss of an original shape and the size after their technological processing: *Сафринә миннән чибәррәк, ул тутырган тавык төсле тулы гәүдәле, ә мин – ябык чебеш идем* (N. Gyuymatdinova); An old gypsy woman with the face like a baked apple stared at him (V. Maksimov).

The basis of these comparisons may be also represented by smell, hardness / softness, the method of preparation, etc.: *Янчуринның бөтен йөзе каз мае белән майлангандай елтырый иде.* (F. Sadriev), *Күңелең май кебек йомшак булсын, телең бал кебек татлы булсын* (Н.Дәүли), The white sweaty chest glistened in the sun like a greased one (M. Gorky), *Gargilian was lying ... flabby, soft as jelly* (D. Merezhkovsky). *She had a tanned smooth face as if drenched in icing* (Yu. Nagibin)

CONCLUSIONS

The ethnic cultural specificity of comparative constructions is shown in the choice of objects and phenomena to create the images of comparison, as well as objects and phenomena undergoing comparison, and even the methods of comparison expression. The semantics of each national language develops the system of images, in which the cultural information is accumulated.

The uniqueness of comparative constructions in Tatar and Russian languages is influenced by the peculiarities of thinking, the spiritual mind, the world-view, the historical development of an ethnos, its national culture and environment.

SUMMARY

Thus, the emergence of close connotations in Tatar and Russian languages is conditioned by the universality of human thinking, the common history and the territory of residence, and the provision of different qualities and connotations to the same images is determined by the specific vision of reality by the representatives of different nations, the difference in everyday life, culture and religion. The study of comparisons of comparative constructions in the comparative aspect is of interest not only for linguistics and linguistic culturology, but also for psychology, as these designs reflect not only the particular ways of life, customs and traditions of people, but also fix certain thinking patterns that are typical for a particular ethnic cultural community.

Acknowledgement

The research is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Bolgarova R.M., Safonova S.S., Zamalyutdinova E.R. Comparison in Russian and Tatar linguistic cultures: systemic functional and comparative analysis // *Journal of Language and Literature*. – 2014. Volume 5, Issue 3. – pp. 148-152.
- Tarasova F.H., Mukharlyamova L.R. The modelling of phraseosemantic groups in the system of the Tatar, Russian and the English // *Journal of Language and Literature*. – 2014. Volume 5, Issue 3. – pp. 196-202.
- Sibgaeva F.R. Phraseological units as the way of Tatar language person representation // *Journal of Language and Literature*. – 2015. Volume 6, Issue 2. – pp. 101-103.
- Nurullina G.M., Chupryakova O.A., Safonova S.S. Expressive substantives describing a person in Russian dialects of the Republic Of Tatarstan // *Journal of Language and Literature*, 6 (1), 2015, Pages 287-290
- Gilazetdinova G.Kh., Edikhanov I.Zh., Aminova A.A. Problems of ethnocultural identity and cross-language communication // *Journal of Language and Literature*, volume 5(3), 2014, pp. 29-42.
- Zamaletdinov R.R., Zamaletdinova G.F., Nurmukhametova R.S. The Lexicon and its Reflection in the Inner World of the Individual (on the basis of the Tatar Language) // *Journal of Language and Literature*, 2014, 5 (4), pp. 333-335.
- Kirillova. The Tatar language realization as the official (20s-30s of the XXth century) // *International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on SOCIAL Sciences and ARTS SGEM 2014. Psychology and Psychiatry, Sociology and Healthcare, Education. Conference proceedings. Volume III. 1-10 September, 2014, Albena, Bulgaria, pp.995-1001.*
- Zamaletdinov R.R. Tatar culture in linguistic reflection. - M.: Humanit. publishing center VLADOS; Kazan: Magarif, 2004. - 239 p., p. 13.
- Bolgarova R.M., S.S. Safonov. The comparisons in Russian and Tatar languages: semantic-functional and comparative aspects. - Kazan: Fatherland, 2015. - 136 p.
- Maslova V.A. Linguistic culturology: Textbook for university students. - M.: Publishing Center "Academy", 2001. - 208 p.