

FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF VOCABULARY RELATED TO THE CHARACTERISTICS OF A PERSON IN THE TATAR LANGUAGE

Luiza Mikhailovna Galyautdinova¹, Asiya Rizvanovna Rakhimova²

¹Kazan Federal University, Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies e-mail: gluiza@mail.ru

²Kazan Federal University, Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies

ABSTRACT

The relevance of the problem under study is stemmed from the need for systematic analysis of the topic-based vocabulary of the Tatar language. The purpose of the article is to analyze the sources of formation and semantic development of the topic-based vocabulary of the Tatar language. Theoretically methodological base for this particular research consists of conceptual strategies of scientific researches in the field of system study of Turkic languages lexis. System study of lexis rests on complex approach of using not only literary vocabulary but also dialects. Classificatory thematic and lexical aspect is the trusting base for further comparative historical research. Comparative research of lexis and semantics, in turn, helps deepening the study of vocabulary with focus on etymological explorations. Turkic vocabulary related to the characterization of a person in the Tatar language is dominated by native Tatar words, which indicates the development of this language parallel to the development of society. Words borrowed mainly from Arabic and Persian indicate the significant role of Islamic culture in the formation of the studied vocabulary. The research data and article findings can be used in teaching the Historical Lexicology of the Tatar language, as well as in compiling Etymology dictionaries.

Keywords: language, thematic vocabulary, Tatar, Turkic languages, semantics, word origin, Arabic and Persian lexical units.

INTRODUCTION

The lexis of the Tatar language, which reflects the history of the ethnic group, age-old culture of the people, social economic conditions and the understanding of the social realm, etc. has stayed without a deep, systematic study for a long time. The reason for this is, above all, the lack of systematization of lexical resource, as well as cumbersomeness of the material and constant changes that take place in the lexical structure of the language. Research scientists, who are familiar with the history of the Tatar linguistic science, know that the study of the vocabulary of the Tatar language began in the XVIII century with the lexicography and making of the first Russian-Tatar and Tatar-Russian dictionary [1]. As it is seen from the report of L.T. Makhmutova, containing a brief overview of the Tatar linguists for fifty years (1926-1976), lexicological study of the Tatar language in this period was only at the stage of appearance. Starting from the 50s, the main theme of the study of vocabulary was lexical meaning, reflected in the synonymous and antonymous relationship of the lexical units, as well as polysemy and homonymy [2]. The famous Russian linguist Karaulov Y.N. writes: "... as the object of study is selected some isolated item of the word stock (words that express the concept of "end", "permanent" or "remember", "think", "shake" or verbs of motion, speaking, knowledge, visual perception, perception of temperature adjectives and many similar words) following the principles of "completeness" and "natural (easy) identity"; and the relationship of its constituent units is studied. The results of the analysis cannot have precise formulation. As a rule they can hardly be used by other researchers..." [3]. It is for this reason, in the following years, linguists, including Turkologists, frequently suggest that the systematic approach to learning vocabulary could be the starting point of finding the solution to this problem. This approach is based on the method of lexical-thematic and lexical-semantic classifications [4]. Ideographic description (i.e. description of semantic distance) of the vocabulary is one of the ways of the words [5, 23].

Vocabulary related to the characteristic of man is of great interest, especially in view of the fact that the object and the subject of perception is a human. Verbal description of the characteristic features of a person operates a huge number of lexical units that have been developed parallel to the development of society.

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretically methodological base for this particular research consists of conceptual strategies of scientific researches in the field of system study of Turkic languages lexis.

System study of lexis rests on complex approach of using not only literary vocabulary but also dialects. System study of lexis needs grouping the lexis into the subject groups. Classificatory thematic and lexical aspect is the trusting base for further comparative historical research.

Comparative research of lexis and semantics, in turn, helps deepening the study of vocabulary with focus on etymological explorations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

From different Tatar dictionaries, we collected about 1500 lexical units (not including phonetic variants of these items) relating to the characteristics of person. The classification includes 25 thematic groups.

It should be emphasized that at the present time primarily nominative words are subjected to ideographic (thesaurus) systematization and subsequent semantic analysis. However, in the language, there are other classes of vocabulary, which in the future should also be analyzed on the lexical-semantic principle. According to K. Buhler, "... the most significant in relation to sematology border runs between the demonstrative and denominative words" [6, 273]. In addition, there is another part, which is outside of both mentioned areas, - "interjections and phonemically structured appellative items" [6, 274]. The landmark book, written by group of authors on the topic of "Historical and comparative grammar of Turkic languages. Vocabulary", demonstrates the principle of lexical-semantic classification for purposes of linguistic research, namely the reconstruction of Turkic lexical units [7].

Among Tatar linguists, the first to draw attention to thesaurus interpretation of lexical system was A.G. Shayhulov, whose works consider historical aspects of system characteristics of historic and dialect vocabulary of the Turkic languages of the Volga-Kama-Ural region [8], [9]. Considering the works of our native linguists (Stepanov Y.S., F.P. Filin, Ufimtseva A.A., Tsintsius V.I., et al.), who note the desirability of the thematic development of the vocabulary material, he draws attention to the fact that: "... authors, mentioning in detail the feasibility of thematic grouping in the study of language, could not reconcile the idea of a thematic approach around some central theme..." [9, 53-54].

The systematic study of vocabulary requires integrated approach to the research, i.e., analysis of the vocabulary of literary language, along with dialect and colloquial variants. For it is only by examining the individual items in the bulk of lexical thematic material one can come to know the causal relationship of semantic and historical change. It should be noted that modern Tatar lexicography systematized lexical richness of the language in the form of defining, dialectological and etymological dictionaries [10].

The proposed systematic approach is associated with the traditional structural and semantic linguistics, but at the same time tends to cognitive linguistics, widely developing in the West [11] and gradually attracting interest of the native linguists [12].

The choice of a particular lexical-thematic group and organization of the study material, as evident from published works, is made by the author of the study. If we take four large thematic vocabulary categories: 1. Nature; 2. Man; 3. Society; 4. Knowledge; and compare the themes explored by Tatar lexicologists, we see that the first and third topics are studied more than the second and fourth ones. Regarding the second thematic category, we can specify a monograph appeared recently, in which there is the first attempt of

system description of Tatar language associated with "man" [13]. This monograph provides a comparative analysis of many lexical items, but in a greater extent, it is descriptive. In the future, a deeper historical and comparative study of this thematic vocabulary with the determination of its sources of formation and genetic capital is required. The vocabulary characterizing the person as the subject of this study is also researched incompletely.

CONCLUSION

Semantic, etymological and comparative historical analysis of vocabulary of these groups allows us to make the following conclusions:

1. The vocabulary of the Tatar language on the studied subject is not uniform and is divided into Turkic and borrowed words. The basis of the Turkic formation constitute: a) Ancient lexical units: tat.lit.: *apy* 'clean, tidy; healthy' < o. turk.: *ari-* 'to clear' < *arig* 'clean; figur. morally impeccable, decent' (DOT, 51-52) etc.; b) Turkic-Mongolian lexical parallels: tat.lit. *иркӧ* "pampered, spoiled", mong. *эрх* "spoiled, resty", *эрхлэх* "to caress" and many others.

Common Turkic lexical items under study are identified in very small quantities. Kipchak layer consisting of lexical units common to the Kipchak (Tatar, Bashkir, Nogai, Kumyk, Karachay-Balkar, Kazakh, and close to the Kipchak languages - Kyrgyz, Altaic) languages is also small in number. For example tat.lit. *яман* "evil, bad", *кысыр* "barren", *карт* "old", *ялкау* "lazy", tat.dial. *купык* "haughty", etc. Most lexical units are proprietary non-borrowed Tatar words. Borrowed formation is presented mostly by Arabic, Persian and Russian words. Foreign words very often act as motivational bases in derived lexemes formed with the help of the Turkic-Tatar affixes. For example: *пәрвайсыз*, *фәрвайсыз*, *пәруайсыс* "inattentive, neglectful, carefree" < ir. *парво* "care, attention".

2. Simultaneous parallel analysis of literary, colloquial and dialectic variants of lexical units reveals predominance in number of the latter two almost in every thematic subgroup. For example tat.lit. *кабалаңучан*, tat.dial. *кабалаңчык*, *аташлы*, *сӓрсӓңнӓгӓн*, *писелтӓк* "fussy, hurried, dumbfounded" and many others.

3. In semantic terms, all the words that characterize a person express the attitudinal meaning of the general nature - positive or negative: *тырыш* "studious, diligent, hard-working" - a positive value; *астыртын* "secretive, feigned" or *азгын*, *бозык*, *ахлаксыз* "depraved, profligate; immoral"- negative value. In the studied thematic vocabulary, there are more words of negative evaluation. In our opinion, this is because the person, who sees the positive aspects of another person, does not always note them, since everything positive is considered ethical norm. If there are no positive qualities, it is considered a deviation from the norm, which is criticized, and therefore the name to express this negative quality or disadvantage appears.

4. In addition to word-borrowings, penetrated into the language, together with a new concept or the new realia, facts of life, in the Tatar language there is a huge number of words of foreign origin, and concepts they stand for, simply could not exist in the Tatar society. The process of transition of Arabic or Persian lexical items in place of the Turkic (Turkic-Tatar), as shown in our study, took place in two stages. Initially, lexical units were used in parallel for some time, and then the "strong" lexical unit gradually took the place of the "weak" lexical item and became permanent. Equally attractive is the conclusion that the Turkic-Tatar lexical items, which «gave up their places» to another language, did not disappear, but were forced to "retreat" from the literary (normalized, commonly understood) language into dialects. For example, in dialect meaning 'physically weak' *майрык/майырык* is a widely used word, which gave place to the Arabic word *зӓгыйфь*.

Sometimes native Turkic lexical items "stay" to exist in the standard language, changing, sometimes beyond recognition, their semantics. For example, the word *сый*, as used in modern language meaning

'treat' originally meant 'respect, honour', eventually its basic meaning gave way to Arabic borrowing *хөрмәт*. In Karaim language *сый* is still used to mean 'honor, respect and courtesy'.

5. Comparison of the Tatar language with other Turkic languages makes it possible to explain the origin of many lexical units of the subject under study, etymology of which (based on the material of the Tatar language) previously was not possible. For example, in words *көнче/көнчел* "jealous, envious", *көнләй*- "be jealous" derivational affixes Turkic *-че, -чел, -ләй* are allocated, however root *көн* in the Tatar language is not used independently. These lexical units are found in most of the Turkic languages: tuv. *хүннээчел* «ревнивый»; khak. *күннөг*, kum. *гюнчю* "envious"; kar. *кюнючю* "envier", *кюнюлюк* "jealousy; envy", *кюнюля-* "be jealous; to envy"; nog. *куьниши / куьнишил* "envious"; kaz. *кьнишил*, kkalp. *кьнлеуши, кьнишил* "envious; jealous", uzb. *кунчи* "envious; jealous", *кунлашмок* "to be envious, to be jealous" and others. This lexical item is found in the texts of ancient Turkic writing: o.turk. *küni* "envy; envious", *künilä-* "to be envious". We assume that the word in ancient Turkic languages appeared because of the word metaphor *küni* «position and status of one concubine in relation to the other (DOT, 327). The word *күни* and its phonetic variations are preserved in many Turkic languages: kyrg. *күни*, turkm. *гүни* (obsolete), kum. *гюндеш* "position of one wife of the husband in relation to another".

6. Some of the words characterizing man in the Turkic languages are used in relation to animals, primarily horses. Their meanings when associated with the person are allegorical: tat.dial. *асау / азау* 'unbroken, unhandled – about a horse; stubborn, wicked (about a man)' comp.: uig. *асав* 'unbacked, wild'. In the appearance of some of them, we anticipate the impact of the so-called "female language" of Turkic peoples. This phenomenon is due to the traditional beliefs of the Turks. Allegory, replacement of some words in the speech to another by women existed "not to draw attention of" the evil spirits. Word *буяз* (common Turkic meaning 'calf') in Karachai-Balkar language, for example, means 'calf; pregnant'. In the Tatar language, in the sense of 'pregnant' a large number of words based on the allegory is used: tat.lit. *кәмәнле, авырлы*; tat.dial. *авырайак, айлы / айлу, ауырайаклы, буйгат, буйлы, ике кат*. Among studies on the question of the existence of the "female language" and its difference from "male language" in modern society the work «The historical background (I) – Folklinguistics and the early grammarians» draws attention. It examines many aspects of the features of "female language" and the influence of gender on the language used. So for example, the English language proved minimal exposure of "female language" to vulgarity inherent to 'male' [14].

7. Comparative analysis reveals the semantic development of lexical units in Turkic in general. For example, lexeme *карусыз* 'meek, submissive', as shown by a comparison with other Turkic languages, originally meant 'powerless, weak', from the word *кару* 'strength; resistance'.

Thus, the study of the Tatar language vocabulary related to the characteristics of the person reveals the historical and genetic layers, sources of formation, as well as ways of semantic and historical development of this thematic vocabulary. Vocabulary, describing a man is a part of the conceptual class "Person", which is one of the four classes of lexical reference system of any language. Complex systematic research of the vocabulary by thematic groups is of great importance for the comparative study of daughter languages. In our example we compare the Tatar language with other Turkic languages. In addition, it has the same value for the comparative study of different systems of languages. The ultimate goal of conceptual classification and semantic analysis of the vocabulary is to make ideographic language dictionary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The content of the article represents value to the specialists who teaches Turkic languages lexicology in High School; does research about historical lexicology of Tatar language; compose etymological dictionary of Turkic languages.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

REFERENCES

- Two-volume handwritten dictionary of S. Khalfin "Tatar Dictionary in favor of the student of the Kazan youth gymnasium learning the Tatar language, composed in the same gymnasium" (1785). More about this dictionary see: Hanbikova Sh.S. S.Hälfinnen linguistics eshchänlege // Research on Tatar linguistics. Kazan, 1984. - pp. 84-91; Giganov I. Russian-Tatar Dictionary. SPb., 1804; Trojansky A. Dictionary of the Tatar language and some commonly used in it Arabic and Persian sayings. Kazan, 1833-1835; Nasyri K. Full Russian-Tatar dictionary. Kazan, 1892; Budagov L. Comparative Dictionary of Turkish-Tatar adverbs. SPb., 1869; Ostroumov N.P. Tatar-Russian dictionary. Kazan, 1892; Voskresensky A.A. Russian-Tatar dictionary. Kazan, 1894, etc.
- Makhmutova L.T. Knowledge of Turkology and the Tatar language (All-Union Turkic conference. Alma-Ata, September 1976) // Tatar language and literature: In Six volumes. Kazan, 1977. - pp. 5-12 (158 pages).
- Karaulov Y.N. Linguistic engineering and thesaurus of literary language. M.: Nauka, 1981. – 366 p.
- On the classification of vocabulary by thematic groups, see details: Karaulov Y.N. General and Russian ideography. M.: Nauka, 1976; Karaulov Y.N. Linguistic engineering and thesaurus of literary language. M.: Nauka, 1981; The lexical basis of the Russian language. M., 1984; Lexical minimum of modern Russian language. M., 1985; Musayev K.M. Lexicology of Turkic languages. M., 1984, and others.
- Morkovkin V.V. Experience of ideographic description of language (analysis of words with the meaning of time in Russian). M.: Publishing House of the Moscow University, 1977. – 166 p.
- Byuler K. Language Theory. Translation from German, general editorship and comments of T.V. Boulygina. Second edition. M.: Progress, 2000. – 528 p.
- Historical and comparative grammar of Turkic languages. Lexis. Executive editor Tenishev A.R. Moscow: Nauka, 1997. – 800 p.
- Shayhulov A.G. On the principles of thematic and semantic classification of appellative vocabulary // Research on semantics. Interuniversity scientific collection. Ufa, 1983. - pp. 119-122.
- Shayhulov A.G. Lexical relationship of Kipchak languages of the Ural-Volga region in the light of their historical and cultural community. Ufa, 1999. – 228 p.
- Tatar dictionary: In 3 volumes. Kazan, 1977, 1979, 1981; Full Tatar dialectological dictionary. Kazan, 2009; Akhmatzhanov R.G. Tatar etymologic dictionary. Four volumes. v. 1. (A-J). Birk, 2005.
- Cognitive Linguistics: Foundations, Scope, and Methodology. Ed. by T. Janssen and G. Redeker. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999. - 270 p.; Cognitive linguistics. Cambridge: University Press, 2004. - 357 p.
- Kubryakova E.S. About cognitive linguistics and semantics of the term "cognitive" // Herald of the Voronezh State University. Series: linguistics and intercultural communication. Voronezh, 2001. - pp. 4-10.
- Ramazanov D.B. Tatar телендә кешегә байләнешле лексика. Kazan, 2013. - 364 p. (Vocabulary associated with a person in the Tatar language).
- Jennifer Coates. The historical background (I) – Folklinguistics and the early grammarians // Women, Men and Language. 3rd Edition. Pearson Education Limited, 2004. - pp. 9-28.