

## Comparative Constructions in Tatar and Their Translation Methods

**Gulnara I. Khasanzyanova**

Kazan Federal University, Kremliovskaya str, 18, 420008, Kazan, Russia

**Ramziya M. Bolgarova\***

Kazan Federal University, Kremliovskaya str, 18, 420008, Kazan, Russia

**Elvira A. Islamova**

Kazan Federal University, Kremliovskaya str, 18, 420008, Kazan, Russia

**Ilsever Rami**

Okan University, Istanbul, Tepeören Mahallesi Tuzla Kampüsü, İstanbul Okan Üniversitesi, 34959 Tuzla/İstanbul, Turkey

### Abstract

This article discussed the specifics of the translation of comparative constructions in literature from Tatar into Russian. It also suggested methods for the full-fledged translation of such constructions according to semantics and functional features of conjunctions. Postpositions were the main method to represent comparative constructions in simple and complex sentences in Tatar. Conjunctions, the instrumental case of the noun and other means, could further express the meanings of such postpositions when translated into Russian. The analysis of translation of comparative constructions helped to identify the integral and the differential in the semantics and functioning of the conjunctions, which not only connected the components of the comparative constructions, but also created imagery. Using comparative constructions, writers and translators could refer both to the general concepts inherent in their native culture, and to their personal worldview. This seemed possible only with a preliminary comparative analysis of the semantics and the structure of lexical units. Analyzing the translations of literary texts, some functional and semantic correspondences were revealed: comparative postpositions such as *kebek*, *syman*, *kuk*, etc. and Russian comparative conjunctions such as *As if for sure*, etc. (Eng. like, as if, kind of); relative pair words in Tatar and correlative pairs in Russian; affixes of adverbs such as *-cha/-che*, *-day/- dey* in Tatar and the instrumental case of the noun in Russian.

**Keywords:** Comparative constructions; Translation; Tatar language; Russian language, Semantics; Postpositions; Conjunctions.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

### 1. Introduction

Translation is a complex and multifaceted human activity. The process of translation is not only the substitution of a language with another one, but it is also the clash of different cultures, traditions, and mindsets. The following Russian and Tatar scholars have also made great contributions to the development of translation theory: L.S. Barkhudarov, V.S. Vinogradov, G.R. Gachechiladze, V.N. Komissarov, Yu.D. Levin, Ya.I. Retsker, A.V. Fedorov, L.A. Chernyakhovskaya, P.D. Schweitzer, V. Shor, E.G. Etkind, R.A. Yusupov, R.S. Nurmukhametova, etc. (Komissarov, 2002; Yusupov, 2009). Among foreign scholars, the works by J. Catford, L. Kelly, A. Neubert, P. Newmark, M. Snell-Hornby, T.R. Steiner, J. Holmes, S. Bassnett, etc. can be emphasized (Bassnett, 2002; Newmark, 1988). Applied aspects of the translation from Tatar language and into Tatar language were also reflected in the works by Yerbulatova *et al.* (2017a).

Translated texts are a valuable source of information about languages involved in the translation process. Translation starts a linguistic experiment in the communicative equating of utterances and texts in two languages. It further helps to reveal similarities and differences in the use of units and structures of each of these languages to express identical functions and to describe identical situations (Bakhyt *et al.*, 2018).

It is important to take the specifics and peculiarities of these languages into account to ensure that the translation into Russian is maximally equivalent to its original in Tatar language. This is only possible with a preliminary comparative analysis of the semantics and the structure of lexical units (Gabbrakhmanova *et al.*, 2016). Analogies and differences in the forms and functioning of languages and linguistic universals should be also revealed, which is of great importance for translation studies (Villalobos, 2015).

There are no two different languages in which such semantic units as morphemes, words, and set word combinations would coincide completely in their direct and idiomatic meanings. Although the concepts themselves mostly coincide, the methods of expressing them may diverge in different languages (Romanova *et al.*, 2017).

The problems faced by translators in terms of the transfer of comparative constructions from the source text are a mismatch of the range of meanings inherent in the units of the source and the target languages; divergence of the perception of the same images by representatives of different nations, etc. Therefore, when translating comparative constructions, a translator does not replace one worldview with another, but combines them. At the same time, it is

important to take both the semantics and functional features of such constructions into account to ensure their full-fledged translation.

## 2. Methodology

To conduct this research, previous experience of studying the semantic and the functional features of lexical units was used (Gabbrakmanova *et al.*, 2017; Yerbulatova *et al.*, 2017b). The main method employed in the work was comparative analysis, involving the comparison of two or more languages. The authors also resorted to the methods of analytical processing of theoretical materials on a problem, classification, systematization of linguistic materials, and elements of structural and component analysis.

Methods of generalization and systematization were also used to study linguistic materials and views of different researchers. To analyze scientific and methodological literature on the topic as well as scientific concepts in modern Russian and foreign studies, the analytical method was recruited. Descriptive method is a system of research techniques used to characterize linguistic phenomena at a particular stage of language development; however, the comparative method could establish general and specific features of Russian and Tatar languages. Materials for the study were extracted from (The Corpus of Written Tatar, 2018).

## 3. Results and Discussion

One of the most interesting aspects of translation theory is the problem of transferring stylistic devices of a language. The adequate transfer of imagery of a literature is the main aspect for studying the translation of figurative means recreating the stylistic effect of the original in the target text.

To this end, the authors considered the system of comparative constructions in Tatar and the methods of translating them into Russian based on the translation of literature, since texts could perform the function of storing and transmitting cultural information and reflect the material and spiritual world of the human.

The main method of comparison in Tatar was to use postpositions such as *kebek*, *syman*, *khetle*, *cadres*, etc. The functions of these conjunctions were also differentiated, and the semantics of these postpositions had much in common. Russian also possessed different methods to express comparison, i.e. various conjunctions. When these lexical and syntactic means were used, a parallel between objects and properties, and their similarity could be observed. As translated into Russian, postpositions with comparative semantics were transmitted by such conjunctions as *as though* etc. For example:

*Anyn eylesendege aksyl yakty kuk, altyn tuzanynda aunagan ute kurenmele yuka yefekne kemnerder yogere-yogera zheygen shikelle, haman achyla bara, hem yeraklashkan boyltlarnyn kukreve anyn osten syypap, tigezlep utkende toyela ide... / Nebo vokrug nego vse bolshe i bolshe svetleyet i ozaryayetsya zolotym svetom, kak budto kto-to stelet tonkiy zolotisty shelk, grozovyye tuchi ukhodyat vse dalshe i dalshe;*

*Bu yash kyzny chishme suy kebek saf, zheyge tan kebek guzel toygylary aldynda nindi suzler belen aklanyrga / Kak opravdatsya pered chistymi, slovno klyuchevaya voda, i prekrasnymi, kak letniy voskhod, chuvstvami lyubyashchey devushki?*

*Anyn miyen kyzgan ene shikelle ber uy chenechkeli: elle chynnan da berersen enetleme / Tochno raskalennaya igla, mozg sverlila neotvyaznaya mysl: "Sluchaynaya eto bolezn ili chy-to podloye delo?..";*

*Ber terezele, syerchik oyasy khetle kechkene gene bup-bush bulme. Khetta karavat ta yuk / Malenkaya, slovno skvorechnik, komnatushka s odnim okoshkom, sovershenno pustaya, dazhe krovati net.*

The next group of comparatives in Tatar consisted of verbs with semantics of comparison such as *okhshagan*, *kheterletken*, *bulyp*, etc. Such means had their own lexical, semantic, and stylistic properties, which must be taken into account when translating. For example, the verb *okhshagan* in combination with nouns and pronouns in the dative case could express similarity in the comparative construction. The correspondent word in Russian was the adjective *pokhozhi*. Also, its meaning could be transmitted by similar verbs. For example:

*Ene uram yak bakchalary echennen uyenchik tartmalar shikelle gene kurengen ap-ak oylar, ene uram buylap tezelep kitken koyelarnyn biyek sirtmelere, uyga chumganday, typ-tyr toralar, ene avyl bashynda kazarmaga okhshagan ozyr-ozyr ferma binalary tagyn da zurrak, mehabetrek bulyp kitkennar / Belenyye domiki, vyglyadyayushchiye iz zeleni sadov, pokhozhi na atlasnyye korobochki, vysokiye zhuravli kolodtsev, nedvizhno vystroivshiyesya vdol ulitsy, sdayetsya, pogruzheny v kakiye-to svoi dumy, dazhe dlinnyye, pokhozhiye na kazarmy stroyeniya kolkhoznykh ferm, siyaya beliznoy svoikh sten, vyglyadyat prazdnichno.*

Different grammatical forms of the Tatar verb *kheterletken* could express distant similarity. Such forms appeared in combination with nouns and pronouns in the accusative case. The Russian verb *napominayet* was also used in translations. For example:

*Agach yortlarnyn kybese yellar uzudan kyyshayep betken, tash yortlarnyn shtukaturlary kubyp toshken, pochmaklary kitelgen. Kinolarda kyrsetele torgan nindider iske oyaz kalasyn kheterlete / Bolshinstvo derevyannykh domov pokosilis ot vremeni, u kirpichnykh domov osypalas shtukaturka, otkololis ugly. Napominayet staryy uyezdnyy gorod iz filma.*

In Tatar, comparative constructions could also use meaningful words with different lexical and semantic meanings. For example, meaningful adjectives denoting size, magnitude, length, and physical state could form a comparison with affixes *-lyk/-lek*. Such constructions were translated in several ways: more often with the noun+preposition combination *velichinoy s*, less often - with such conjunctions as *kak*, *slovno*, etc. For example:

*Chirkeyde patshany keshe biyeklege zur resemen kurgenem bar ide / Ya kak-to videl v tserkvi portret tsarya velichinoy s chelovecheskiy rost;*

*Ayagy ikenche konne uk burene kalynlyk bulyp sheshken / Na vtoroy zhe den yego noga opukhla, kak brevno.*

Comparatives in the system of the parataxis/hypotaxis of the languages studied could be represented in complex types of sentences in Tatar, in complex sentences of divided and undivided structures, and in conjunctionless complex sentences in Russian.

Complex sentences expressing comparison in the languages also differed significantly from each other. The sentences the parts of which had comparative relations could represent similarity of two situations. Russian linguistics distinguished two types of comparative sentences: sentences with a deterministic relations and sentences with correlational relations. However, in Tatar, they were considered as complex sentences with a subordinate clause of manner.

In Tatar; in comparative complex sentences, the subordinate clause of manner, expressing comparative attitudes, could join the main sentence with the conjunctions *guya*, *guya ki* and the connective words *eitersen*, *diyarsen*. Complex sentences with conjunctions *guya*, *guya ki* were mostly found in written literary language. They were translated by such Russian conjunctions as *kak*, *budto*, *kak budto* etc. For example:

*Alarnyn yozlere tynych, guya eshten son bik nyk aryp donyalaryn onytyp yoklyylar / Litsa u nikh spokoynyye, budto oni spokoyno spyat posle trudovogo dnya.*

Complex sentences with conjunctions *eytersen*, *diyarsen* could establish concretizing relations. The subordinate clause could use these conjunctions to express a process or a phenomenon to which another process or phenomenon, indicated by some member of the principal sentence, was likened. These conjunctions were also translated into Russian as *slovno*, *kak*, *budto*, *kak budto*, etc. For example:

*Kuzlegen boryn ochyna gyna elgen Karp Vasilyevich kartlarcha ashykmyycha, ekren gene atlyy, e Gazinurnyn kukregende, eytersen, kazan kaynyy, ul kolyn shikelle yurgalarga gyna tora / Karp Vasilyevich shagayet postarikovski, medlenno, ochki u nego sdvinuty na samyy konchik nosa, a v grudi u Gazinura slovno kipit kotel, on vse norovit pustitsya vskach, kak zherebenok.*

Complex sentences, in which pronouns could act as conjunctions, occupied a special place in the subordination system. In Russian syntactic science, they were also qualified as correlative words, correlative pairs or correlates, and in Tatar, they were identified as paired relative words since 1958.

In Tatar language, analytical constructions with relative pairs of words (*nichek* - *shulay*, *nu chalky* - *shul chakly*, etc.) expressed the relations of comparison, which could be translated into Russian by correlative pairs *kak* - *tak*, *skolko* - *stolko*, etc.

For example: *Kigen kiyem nichek tuza, Yash gomer shulay uza (Zhyr) / Kak iznashivayetsya odezhdya, Tak prokhodit molodost; Agachta yafraq ni chalky, Bezde shatlyk shul chalky / Skolko listyev na dereve, Stolko radosti u nas; Kupme bulsa sezde koch hem yalkyn, Shul kaderle zhirde khakygyz / Skolko dano vam ognya i svobody, Stolko dano vam prozhit pa zemle!; Bal korty chechekten chechekke kunyp nichek bal zhyysa, Gazinur da khalyktan ishetken suzlerne shulay kheter sandygyna zhyrgan / Kak pchely sobirayut pyltsu, pereletaya s tsvetka na tsvetok, tak i Gazinur sobiral i zapominal vse uslyshannoye.*

These examples showed that two elements of comparison - the object and the image - could appear in two sentences: the images of the comparison were in the subordinate clause, and the objects of the comparison were in the principle clause. However, not all correlative words were a means of expressing subordination, but only those in which in principle clause could replace the subordinate one in general and establish a connection between them. If demonstrative and pronominal words had replaced only a sentence part, but not the entire sentence, they were not then correlative words.

Unlike Russian language, Tatar distinguished complex structures of a synthetic type - complex- soldered sentences, which was a specific feature of all Turkic languages. In such sentences, the form of the predicate in the subordinate clause expressed the subordination between the sentence parts. Thus, the subordinate clause was called soldered, and the dominant one was called principle. The affixes *-myni/-meni* and the affixes of adverbs *-cha/-che,-day/-dey* could also act as conjunctions in the soldered sentence. They were translated into Russian as *slovno*, *budto*, *kak budto*, etc. For example:

*Professor da, Makhire khanym da, inneren avyr yok baskanday, sygyla toshap, uyga kalyp utyralar / I professor, i Magira khanum sidyat prignuvshis, slovno tyazhelaya nosha davit im na plechi.*

In Tatar, postpositions *kebek*, *syman*, *shikelle*, *tosle* combined with the verb form with suffix *-gan* also acted as conjunctions in complex-soldered sentences. Such complex sentences could express the meaning of comparing the action or phenomenon indicated by the relative clause with the action or phenomenon described in the principle clause. Conjunctions in such sentences were also translated into Russian as *kak*, *kak budto*, etc., and by such correlational pairs as *kak...tak*, *stolko...skolko*, etc. For example:

*Konbagysh koyashka gashyyk bulyp, anyn artynman konnen-kon buye bashyn bora birep karap torgan kebek, Gazinur da hervakyt Gali abzyga taba borylyp karyy-karyy, ber-ber eshke totynsa, bu turyda Gali abzyy ni eyter iken, dip kunelennen uylap ala / Kak vlyublennyy v solntse podsolnukh tselymi dnyami provozhayet yego vzglyadom, tak i Gazinur vse vremya oglyadyvayetsya na Gali abzyya; nachinaya novoye delo, vseгда dumayet o tom, chto by skazal na eto Gali abzyy.*

## 4. Summary

Thus, it can be noted that in the analysis of translations of literary texts, functional and semantic correspondences were revealed: postpositions of comparison *kebek*, *syman*, *kyk*, etc. and comparative conjunctions *kak*, *slovno*, *tochno*, *kak budto*, etc.; relative pair words in Tatar and correlative pairs in Russian; affixes of adverbs *-cha/ -che, -day/ -dey* in Tatar and instrumental case of the noun in Russian.

However, it was impossible to establish strictly defined correspondences among individual conjunctions in comparative constructions, since these postpositions and conjunctions did not differ significantly from each other in terms of semantic nuances.

## 5. Conclusion

Comparison, being a means of cognition of the surrounding reality, can reflect mentality, a certain mindset of each nation. Using comparative constructions in literary texts, both universal concepts inherent in their native culture, and their own convictions, individual experience, and worldview were addressed.

Comparative units of multi-structural languages differed, because they expressed secondary sensations and also reflected ideas about the world, the features of thinking characteristic of one or another ethno-cultural community.

A further matter of concern was to analyze comparative units in texts of different functional styles and different genres, as well as to identify the national and cultural specifics of set and individual (author) comparisons in Russian and Tatar.

## Acknowledgements

This article was fulfilled according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

## References

- Bakhyt, S., Kalimbetov, B. and Khabibullayev, Z. (2018). Possibilities of mathematical problems in logical thinking development of secondary education pupils. 34(2): 441-57.
- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies (New accents series)*. Psychology Press: Sussex.
- Gabdrakhmanova, Zamaletdinov, R. R. and Zamaletdinova, G. F. (2016). Comparative associative analysis of the meanings of the Tatar and English linguistic cultures (on the example of the Lexemes Gaila and Family). *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(3): 277-81.
- Gabdrakhmanova, Fanuza, H., Zamaletdinov, R. S., Nurmukhametova, A. T. and Tatkenova, G. N. (2017). Idioms as expressive means of linguistic identity of a speaker (on the material Tatar and Kazakh languages). *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(12): 13-18.
- Komissarov, V. N. (2002). *Sovremennoye perevodovedeniye, Uchebnoye posobiye (Contemporary translation studies. Manual)*. ETS Publishing: Moscow.
- Newmark, P. A. (1988). *Textbook of translation*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press: Shanghai.
- Romanova, N. V., Shafigullin, L. N., Gabdrakhmanov, A. T., Sarimov, D. R. and Sotnikov, A. M. (2017). Thermal properties of polypropylene/Low density polyethylene (PP/LDPE) Blends. *Astra Salvensis*, (2): 387-96.
- The Corpus of Written Tatar (2018). Available: <http://corpus.tatar/ru/>
- Villalobos, J. (2015). Ética, gobernabilidad y estado de derecho en América Latina, en tiempos de globalización, *Cuestiones Políticas*. 18(29): 10.
- Yerbulatova, I. K., Gilazetdinova, G. K. H., Zamaletdinova, G. F. and Azhgaliev, M. K. (2017a). Pragmatic aspects of artistic pros reality translation from Kazakh language to Russian. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 7(2): 84-86.
- Yerbulatova, I. K., Mugtasimova, G. R., Kirillova, Z. N. and Sahin, L. (2017b). Culture-specific terms as verbal expressive peculiar features of national cultures. *Astra Salvensis*, 10: 123-30.
- Yusupov, R. A. (2009). *General and specific in multi-structural languages: lexical and phraseological means of Russian and Tatar languages*. TGGPU: Kazan.