




The Specificity of Comparison in National Linguistic Consciousness

 Gulnara Khasanzyanova¹,
 Elvira Islamova²,
 Ramziya Marsova
Bolgarova³,
 Ilsever Rami⁴

^{1,2,3}Kazan Federal University

⁴Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey

Corresponding Author: Ramziya
Marsova Bolgarova

e-mail: ramziya5@yandex.ru

Article citation: Khasanzyanova, G. & Islamova, E. & Bolgarova, R. M. & Rami, I. (2020). *The Specificity of Comparison in National Linguistic Consciousness*, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 4(9): 43–46.

Received Date: September 11, 2020

Accepted Date: September 21, 2020

Online Date: December 5, 2020

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2020 Applied Linguistics Research Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons, Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

ABSTRACT

All human knowledge about the world exists in their consciousness in the form of a picture of the world, and the world's image that has been gleaned by people of different nationalities in the process of their comprehending the diversity of the world, leaves stamp on a language. Language is considered not as a static language system, but as a means of communication, reflection of the world, an integral component and a bearer of ethnos culture. Language and culture are closely interconnected and interdependent, reflect the man's worldview. The way of life, culture, individualities of world cognition affect the formation of an ethnolinguistic view of the world, which gives a new turn to objects and phenomena of the reality. Ethnolinguistic world images are distinguished by their originality; they are composed of universal and unique national concepts. Comparative constructions are valuable material for identifying some features of linguistic world images of different ethnic groups, since they have semantic and grammatical planes of expression, being not only a linguistic, but also cognitive category.

The article discusses the comparative constructions of the Tatar and Russian languages as a means of language categorization of the Tatar and Russian views of the world. These constructions are of real interest, since they give us an opportunity to reconstruct the most important stereotypes of national consciousness. The elements of comparative analysis and the method of purposive associative experiment were used as the main research methods.

Keywords: comparative constructions, the Russian language, the Tatar language, national view of the world, purposive associative experiment.

Introduction

The linguistic view of the world is a systemic, holistic reflection of reality using various linguistic means. There is a universal core of the view of the world, serving as a basis for communication and mutual understanding of people of different nationalities and cultures. The universality of the core common to humanity is explained by the unity of the physical world, the proximity or commonality of the territory, the similarity of the stages of historical development, etc. But at the same time, it is necessary to take into account the characteristics of the material and spiritual culture of each ethnic group, place of residence, natural and climatic conditions, etc. [1, 2]. The main distinguishing features are religion and beliefs, customs and traditions. All this is mirrored in the language [3, 4]. Thus, universal and unique linguistic means form a linguistic world image. In addition, the worldview of each person is also made up of their own, subjective ideas about the world, which are formed throughout their lives.

Social and natural factors, differences in religion and beliefs are those features that distinguish the linguistic view of the world of representatives of different nationalities.

Therefore, when comparing linguistic means, we can determine the universal and unique features of the world images of different ethnic groups [5,6].

Comparative constructions of different languages are different, as they capture secondary sensations, and they reflect ideas about the world, especially thinking, characteristic of one or another ethnocultural community. V.A. Maslova writes that "the world, reflected through the prism of the mechanism of secondary sensations embodied in metaphors, comparisons, symbols, is the main factor that determines the universality and specificity of any particular national linguistic view of the world" [7: 70]. Consequently, a contrastive analysis of comparative constructions makes it possible to discover the universal and the unique in the culture of different peoples, to explore the phenomenon of ethnic mentality. Using these constructions, it is possible to expose those factors that have influence on the originality of the linguistic view of the world.

Language expression of value preferences, which is realized in the semantics of comparative constructions of the Tatar language, has a figurative character: human thinking is associative, which is manifested in figurative nominations of objects that are compared with well-known, axiologically significant objects and phenomena. Imagery is a component of connotation, expressing a holistic, visual representation of native speakers of some real phenomenon, object or property, assigned to language units via an internal form.

The imagery of comparative constructions is based on their internal form which motivates the general integrity of their semantics. Moreover, motivation embodies comparison as a starting point of the cognitive process, so the basis of imagery is the comparison of the realities of extra-linguistic reality which become a model of ideal quality or condition, etc.

Conception foundation of comparative constructions is based on various cultural codes that reflect the way people think and determine the content and forms of linguistic representations.

Methods

The following methods of linguistic analysis have been used in the work: generalization and systematization, analytical method, descriptive, comparative, and the method of association experiment, etc.

We have applied a comparative method to establish the general and specific features of the Russian and Tatar languages. The method of purposive association experiment has been used to determine the national specificity of the choice of comparison for the characteristics of a person [8]. We considered associative reactions of the same type as typical of the language community on the whole.

Results and Discussion

We have selected the examples from literary works of the Russian and Tatar languages that contain comparisons of anthropocentric orientation. It can be said that the largest group in the languages studied is made up of comparisons, where the figurative basis is the words of the thematic group of *nature*.

Отец Сисой был стар, тощ, сгорблен, всегда недоволен чем-нибудь, и глаза у него были сердитые, выпуклые как у рака [9];

Настя только что окончила учиться в гимназии; радуясь свободе, она весело и ясно улыбалась всему миру большими, темными как вишни глазами [9];

Аларның иң истәкалганнары кара бөрлегән төсле кап-кара күзле, бик яшь, бик беркатлы Лена [10];

Кара чәне бурега астыннан тузгып чыккан, күзләре тычканныкы кебек, йөгәрешеп торалар [10].

The next group of comparisons includes the names of everyday objects. These items are most often a way of comparison also when describing appearance and character of a person. The basis of comparison can be formed by the qualitatively characterizing features of the standard, such as shape, size, color, etc.

Его прогнал вежливый, коротконогий и кругленький человечек, с маленькой головкой, блестящей как бильярдный шар [9];

Лена заметила: губы у мамы как ниточки, - значит, сердится [9];

Әмма балаларныкы кебек почмакланып торган кабарынкы иреннәре, уң битендәге инә очы хәтле генә миңе, нәфис бие-сыны бер дәүзгәрмәгән [10];

Чырае мич йөзе кебек ап-ак [10].

In the languages studied, comparative constructions can be distinguished into a separate group, where the names of food serve as an image of comparing.

Молчаливый Степанов закивал как-то очень уж поспешно круглым как блин, задумчиво-добрым лицом [9];

И больше всего боялась Люба, что пухлые как сосиски пальцы коснутся ее [9];

Иске генә кәжән кигән бу карт чып-чын Хозыр Ильяс иде: сәт кебек ап-ак сакал-мыегы аңа илаһилык, серлелек, изгелек төсмере ягып тора [10];

Янчуринның бөтен йөзе каз мае белән майлангандай елтырый иде. [10].

With reference to the examples from literary works, it has been concluded that the figurative basis of comparisons in Russian and Tatar is the lexemes of different semantic classes: natural phenomena, flora, fauna, everyday objects, and much more. These lexemes are the objects of comparisons that convey the sum of different sense perceptions (hearing, visual), evaluate a person, actualize an evaluative component in their semantic structure.

The most widely used objects of comparison are the names of plants and animals. A person's characteristic, expressed by comparison, is in a certain way predetermined by the nature of that core component which correlates with a specific characteristic of a particular plant or animal. The use of these images can be explained by the fact that for comparisons a person chooses what is familiar, often found in everyday life.

The ethnocultural specificity of comparative constructions is manifested in the choice of objects and phenomena for creating images of comparison, as well as the objects and phenomena subjected to comparison, and even the ways of expressing comparison. The semantics of each national language encapsulates a system of images in which cultural information has been accumulated.

The peculiarity of comparative constructions in the Tatar and Russian languages is influenced by the peculiarities of thinking, spiritual structure, world outlook, historical development of an ethnos, its national culture and environment.

To check the reproducibility of the prototype images by Russian and Tatar speakers and to identify the number of matches with the examples from literary works, a purposive association experiment has been carried out. The technique of this experiment and the questionnaires were developed by Maslova V. A. The experiment and its results are described in the textbook *Cultural Linguistics* [7]. We were also interested in the national specificity of the choice of a comparison to characterize a person by Russian and Tatar speakers.

The informants were asked to fill in the comparative construction by sequentially selecting words that could serve as a basis for comparison according to the feature proposed in the experiment. To characterize the eyes, native speakers of the Russian language use the following comparisons:

1) with natural objects: голубые – как небо, море (blue – like the sky, the sea); карие – как земля, песок (brown – like earth, sand); красивые – как небо (beautiful – like the sky); блестящие – как звезды, солнце, капля воды (shining – like the stars, the sun, a drop of water); ясные – как небо, солнце, звезды, вода (clear – like the sky, the sun, the stars, water), etc.

2) with animals and plants: умные – как у собаки, у лошади (clever – of a dog, a horse); большие – как у коровы (large – of a cow); выразительные – как у коровы, у собаки, у лошади, у кошки (expressive – of a cow, a dog, a horse, a cat); блестящие – как у кошки (shining – of a cat); голубые – как васильки, незабудки (blue – like cornflowers, forget-me-nots); красивые – как цветок (beautiful – like a flower), etc. ;

3) with other people, personages from literary works, etc: выразительные – как у Мадонны, у артиста, у мамы, у ребенка (expressive – like the Madonna's, the artist's, the mother's, child's); умные – как ученого, у старика, у бабушки, у мудреца, у профессора (intelligent – like a scientist's, an old man's, the grandmother's, a sage's, a professor's); карие – как у цыганки (brown – like a gypsy's); блестящие – как у пьяного, у больного (lustrous – like a drunk's, an ill man's); красивые – как у меня, у мамы (beautiful – like mine, my mother's), etc. ;

4) with a certain season and time of day: карие – как ночь (brown – like night); красивые – как ночь (beautiful – like a night); ясные – как день (bright – like a day), etc.

The speakers of Tatar use the following associates:

1) with natural objects: голубые – как небо, море (blue – like the sky, the sea); красивые – как небо, солнце, луна (beautiful – like the sky, the sun, the moon); блестящие – как звезды, солнце (shining – like the stars, the sun); ясные – как небо, солнце, звезды (bright – like the sky, the sun, the stars), etc.;

2) with animals and plants: умные – как у собаки, у кошки, у льва (clever – of a dog, a cat, a lion); большие – как у коровы (large – of a cow); выразительные – как у коровы, у теленка, у собаки, у лошади, у кошки (expressive – of a cow, a calf, a dog, a horse, a cat); блестящие – как у кошки (glittering – of a cat); голубые – как колокольчики (blue – like bellflowers), etc.;

3) with other people, personages of literary works, etc.: выразительные – как у мамы, у ребенка (expressive – like the mother's, a child's); умные – как у преподавателя, учителя, дедушки (intelligent – like a teacher's, your grandfather's); карие – как у восточной девушки, у меня (brown – like an orient girl's, mine); умные – как у старика; аксакала, ботаника, папы (intelligent – like an old man's; senior a clansman's, a botanist's, the father's); блестящие – как у влюбленного (glistening – as with love); красивые – как у меня, у мамы, на портрете (beautiful – like mine, your mother's, in the portrait), etc.;

4) with a certain season and time of day: глаза черные – как ночь (dark – like a night); красивые – как ночь, лето (beautiful – like a night, summer); ясные – как день, утро, рассвет (bright – like a day, morning, dawn), etc.

Analyzing the data obtained as a result of a survey of informants – the native speakers of the Russian and Tatar languages – it has been found that they mainly use the same images. They have chosen the names of objects of nature and the names of animals as the main images for comparisons. Also, a large group encompasses the comparisons with other people: acquaintances, famous people, etc.

When comparing the data obtained as a result of a survey of informants with the similes from literary works, it turned out that in many cases the informants showed less diversity in the use of images of comparisons. This tendency is observed among speakers of both Russian and Tatar.

Summary

Thus, the emergence of close connotations in the Tatar and Russian languages is according to the universality of human reasoning, a common history and territory of residence, and attributing different qualities and connotations to the same images is determined by the specificity of the vision of reality by representatives of different peoples, differences in way of life, culture and religion. The study of comparisons and comparative constructions in relation to a comparative aspect is of interest not only for linguistics and cultural linguistics, but also psychology, psycholinguistics, as these constructions mirror not only the features of everyday life, customs and traditions of the people, but also capture certain stereotypes of thinking that are characteristic of a particular ethnocultural community.

Conclusions

The results of the purposive association experiment have shown that there is some destruction of fixedness and stereotype in the field of comparative constructions. New time gives rise to new images and standards of comparisons, often losing old ones. In our opinion, these processes are caused by the influence of other cultures, the media, television, advertising, etc.

Acknowledgements

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

References

- [1] Zamaletdinov R.R., Zamaletdinova G.F., Nurmukhametova R.S., Sattarova M.R. "The lexicon and its reflection in the inner world of the individual (on the basis of the Tatar language)" *Лексика и ее отражение во внутреннем мире индивида (на основе татарского языка)*, *Journal of Language and Literature* Volume 5, Issue 4, pp. 333-335, 2014.
- [2] Zamaletdinov R. R. *Tatar Culture in Language Reflection*. M.: The VLADOS Humanities Publishing Center; Kazan: Magarif, 2004, 239 p. P. 13.
- [3] Yuisufuva Z., Yusupova A.S., Mugtasimova G.R., Denmukhametova E.N. "Paroemiological units of the tatar language with culture-specific" *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, Special Issue December, pp.161-165, 2016.
- [4] Gabdrakhmanova, Fanuza H.; Zamaletdinov, Radif R.; Nurmukhametova, Raushaniya S.; Tatkenova, Almira T.; Smagulova, Guldarkhan N. "Idioms as expressive means of linguistic identity of a speaker (on the material Tatar and Kazakh languages)" *MODERN JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS* vol. 7, № 12 pp.15-20, 2017.
- [5] Nadezda Y. Murzina, Svetlana S. Safonova, Olga A. Chupryakova "The syntactic phraseologization in the mass media language" (*Синтаксическая фразеологизация в языковом пространстве СМИ*), *Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 7, № 3, pp. 310-313, 2016
- [6] Sadanyan Anaitpar, Safonova Svetlana, Chupryakova Olga "The parenthetic constructions in the space of fiction text (on V.V. Nabokov's novels "Lolita" and "King, Queen, Knave")", *AD ALTA-Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, Vol. 7, Is. 2, pp. 254-256, 2017.
- [7] Maslova B. A. *Cultural Linguistics: Manual for Graduate Students*. M.: The "Academiya" Publishing Center, 2001. – 208p.
- [8] Islamova E. A., Bolgarova R. M. "Man in the Mirror of Associative Experiment", *Philology and Culture*. – Issue 1 (55), pp. 13-17, 2019.
- [9] Lebedeva L. A. *Set Similes of the Russian Language: Short Idioglossary* [Electronic Resource] 3rd enlarged ed.M.: FLINTA, 2017. – 283 p.
- [10] The Corpus of the Tatar Language URL: <http://www.corpus.tatar>.