



Comparative analysis of Russian, Turkish and Kabardino-Circassian set expressions with zoocomponents

L.H. Kharaeva, Z.Kh. Dzhanhotova, L.M. Abazova, K.V. Abazova*, M.K. Unezheva

Federal State Budget Educational Institution of Higher Education "Kabardino-Balkar State University named after H.M. Berbekov», Nalchik, Chernyshevskogo str., 173.

Abazova Karina Vladimirovna - address: Russian Federation, 360017, North-Caucasian Federal District, Kabardino-Balkaria Republic, Nalchik, Vatutina str. 31, apt. 29.

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Original Research Paper

Received May. 2018

Accepted July. 2018

Keywords:

set expressions

zoocomponent

interlanguage correspondences

intercultural communication

bilingualism

Russian as a foreign language

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the issues of national and cultural content in the structure of phraseological meaning from the point of view of people worldview expression means on the basis of set expressions with zoocomponents in Russian, Turkish and Kabardino-Circassian languages. The goal of the comparative analysis is to determine the ratio of interlanguage correspondences between phraseological units in the languages being compared at the lessons of Russian taught as a foreign language (RLF).

1. Introduction

The wide use of set expressions in modern Russian is a fruitful platform to solve the most important linguodidactic problems. The phraseological found of Russian language, like any other language, has a clearly expressed national and cultural specificity and is an extensive source of linguistic and cultural knowledge, therefore there is no doubt that the study of phraseological units in Russian language as a foreign one contains a huge educational, developmental and upbringing potential. The acquaintance with phraseological phrases contributes not only to an effective expansion of the lexical vocabulary of students, the study of RLF grammar and syntax, but also to the development of linguacultural competence. Phraseological units, reflecting the national worldview of a particular people, demonstrate how it perceives and assesses the realities of life. The images that form the linguistic picture of the world can have similarities and differences among different peoples. There are also the cases of complete absence of certain images in one of the compared languages. In order to identify a universal and an idioethnic component in different linguocultures at RLF classes, this study proposes a comparative analysis of certain classes of phrases and paremias in three languages of different structure (Russian, Turkish, Kabardian-Circassian).

2. Methods

In the article, they use such scientific methods as comparative, conceptual, linguocultural one within the communicative approach. Comparative analysis helps to identify similarities and differences in the formal and content structure of set expressions and to identify culturally-labeled connotations. The relevance of phraseological unit comparative study during Russian classes taught as a foreign language is conditioned by the fact that "even if one speaks the same language, people can not always correctly understand each other, and the

reason is precisely the divergence of cultures often" [1]. Conceptual and linguocultural analysis allows us to understand deeply the specificity of figurative thinking and language speaker' worldview of conjugated linguocultures. The use of these linguistic methods stimulates the cognitive interest of students and shapes the skills and techniques of intercultural communication. The obtained data can serve as a basis to solve linguodidactic problems during RLF lessons.

A language reflects the phenomena of the objective world and brings the knowledge about them into a certain system, metaphorically called the linguistic picture of the world, and is characterized by the fact that "the way of reality conceptualization includes both universal and nationally specific components for each language" [2]. In this regard it is legitimate to speak of the dual nature of language in the sense that it presents two aspects: universally objective and subjectively national. The second, idioethnic aspect is manifested in the semantic features of lexical and phraseological units expressing the relation of native language speakers to the surrounding world, because a language interprets reality, and does not reflect it. One of the most imaginative, "conservative" and culture bearing language subsystems, reflecting the lifestyle, the culture, the national scale of a particular nation values, is phraseology, which includes paremiology in its broadest sense [3]. Set expressions contain a huge layer of old words and archaic forms, a significant part of which is related to various realities of people's life, historical facts, beliefs, customs and rituals. Phraseologisms and paremias are the richest lexical layer of the language, representing a valuable factual source of knowledge about a specific national culture.

An important role in the teaching of the Russian language as a foreign one is assigned to the integration of a foreign student personality into the system of Russian national culture, which makes it necessary to develop intercultural communication skills among inophones, i.e. the communication in the format of foreign culture. The transition from one language to another is the change of one linguistic worldview into another: "Each language describes a circle around the people to whom it belongs, from which a person can go out only in so far as he immediately enters into the circle of another language. The mastery of a foreign language could be likened to the conquest of a new position in the previous vision of the world [4]. The picture of the world, i.e. the representation of a person of a particular culture about the world and about his place in it, is coded by language means and expressed through a system of concepts that are the basic units of the national mentality. The nature of the world vision among different people is different, since the consciousness reflecting the world is determined by different categorical systems of languages. The possession of cultural concepts is one of the conditions for a language learning, because their totality, characteristic for each culture, conveys a world picture of the language personality, allows you to learn the value system and the worldview of another language bearer. The depth of interlingual and intercultural communication problem becomes more obvious when a foreign language is compared with a native one and foreign culture is compared with its own habitual [5]. A student who starts to learn a foreign language, has a fully mono-cultural and monolingual consciousness at first, the whole mechanism of generation and perception of speech is tuned to a native language. All that he speaks in the language being studied, is subconsciously formulated by the inner speech into the utterances of his native language with all culturally conditioned specifics. This problem becomes especially important during the study and the use of phraseological units in speech: rarely set expressions can be literally translated into a student's native language. Most often in such cases, a teacher has to look for the ways of interlingual transcoding, which become a vivid example of a real dialogue of cultures. The process of recoding stimulates students to search for similar images in different languages and cultures, to the comparison of linguocultural features of the native and studied languages, and forms the skills for an adequate use of language units in appropriate situations. In the process of culture dialogue not only juxtaposition but also the interaction of linguocultural spaces takes place,

which leads to an active exchange of cultural values, the familiarity with the specifics of studied language speaker's figurative thinking, the borrowing of linguocultural concepts and the expansion of the conceptual framework. For our research, the following fact is relevant: the main contingent of foreign students studying at the Kabardino-Balkar State University is represented by repatriates (Circassians), which provides a broad platform for experiments related to the comparative analysis of linguocultural concepts among the languages of different structures. The work at Russian language classes with foreign bilinguals showed that the fluency in two languages and the ability to communicate with them successfully have a positive effect on the development of memory, the ability to understand, analyze and discuss the phenomena of a language. The practice of working with foreign students, who know a mother tongue since the childhood along with the state language of their country, convinces us that natural bilingualism contributes to the speed of reaction, better learning of speech skills and the development of logical thinking. Bilinguals, as a rule, learn foreign languages and cultures more successfully. Possessing a more extensive experience of language communication, they are more easily adapted to the figurative system of a language being studied, are interested in the etymology and the stylistic coloring of words, realize that the same concept can be expressed by different means in different languages. The specificity of similar and distinctive features of image building perception by bilinguals in different languages provides an exceptional opportunity for RLF teacher to use more complex types of tasks during lessons aimed at the development of not only grammatically correct, but also emotionally colored, figurative speech that also contributes to an adequate understanding and the use of the most frequent phraseological units used by native speakers in various spheres of communication. The point of view expressed by us is also confirmed by the works of other scientists devoted to the study of bilingual pupil brain functional characteristics. In their opinion, bilinguals studying the third, the fourth, the fifth language, are characterized by a high speed of information processing, which distinguishes them from originally monolingual monocultural people or the people who have mastered foreign languages in adulthood. Researchers are convinced that such bilinguals "have a certain resource that is invaluable for society, and first of all in terms of intercultural communication: bilingual children play a unique role of a "bridge" in society since childhood because otherwise they develop their own picture of the world, in which the "incompatible" is united [6]. The work with bilinguals should be a teacher's incentive for more creatively organized work, for the choice of original, non-standard methods of class conduct. The linguistic material offered below is addressed to the work with foreign students-bilinguals of the humanitarian profile with a highly advanced level of Russian language proficiency.

We chose set expressions with zoocomponents as a linguistic material. This choice is conditioned to the fact that the zoonyms make the part of many phraseological units, proverbs and sayings as metaphorical indicators of speech. The structural similarity of the world of animals and the world of people contributed to the emergence of specific associative characteristics of animals in the linguistic and paremiological mentality of different peoples, which formed the basis of figurative evaluative definitions of a man through zoomorphisms. Zoonyms have a high phrase-production in all languages of the world and create an extensive field for imaginary worldview exploration of different peoples, which provides unique opportunities for effective comparative work on phraseological units simultaneously using the material of several languages in the work with bilinguals (in our case - Russian, Turkish and Kabardian-Circassian language). Set expressions with two zoocomponents are chosen for the study - a dog and a wolf - which is explained by the fact that the names of these animals are widespread cultural symbols in considered languages. It is known that in the languages and the cultures of peoples representing different cultural and linguistic societies, the names of the same animals equivalent in nominative meaning may have dissimilar additional semantic or stylistic features that are stably associated with the main meaning in the minds of native speakers. For example, there are few proverbs in Turkish language with

a positive connotation of a dog, while in Russian set expressions this animal often symbolizes devotion, hard work and kindness. At the same time, the interpretation of a dog image in the phraseology of the Russian language is notable for its duality. On the one hand, a dog is an animal suitable for protection and hunting. "A watchman sleeps With a faithful dog"; "You can not catch a hare without a dog"; "You can not find even with dogs"); this zoonym personifies such virtues of a person as loyalty, vigilance, affection, sincerity, obedience, a sharp flair ("dog fidelity", "faithful like a dog", "doggy nose", "A dog is a friend of a man", "A good dog will not remain without a master," "An old dog does not bark on an empty tree", "A good dog wakes up three times a night to look after its owner", etc.). Wishing to say that someone is an expert on a case, has a lot of experience, the Russians say: "I ate a dog," "I am a proficient in this" (gained experience). But on the other hand, a dog in Russian phraseology also acts as a zoometaphore of rudeness, stiffness, vindictiveness and anger, - i.e. as the bearer of wild, bestial qualities of his ancestor - wolf [7]:

evil as a dog;

live like a dog;

a dog's soul (about a brutal, cruel person);

a dog on hay (about a person who does not use it himself and does not give it to others);

to hang all dogs on someone (to accuse someone unreasonably).

Allure a dog, and keep a stick!

A dog's death to a dog (about the one who lived wrong and therefore did not deserve a worthy death);

If you lie down with a dog - you'll get up with fleas;

At such a time, a good owner will not drive a dog out;

A dog bites not out of greed, but out of anger;

A dog friendship to the first bone;

A dog takes, but it is never enough for it;

A dog's honor to a dog;

The dog barks, the wind wears (about an evil, a rough man, a gossip), etc.

A national, distinctive Russian understanding of a dog's image is that, in general, the Russian phraseological fund has the positive connotations of the analyzed zoonym, which is especially evident in comparison with the Turkish and Kabardino-Circassian languages.

In Turkish culture, the likening of a person to a dog is perceived as a gross insult, because traditionally a dog is regarded as an unclean creature in Islam. Recently there has been propaganda of a good attitude towards this animal. However, phraseological units reflect the centuries-old ideas about a dog, which continue to live in the minds of many Turks today. A negative connotation, firmly associated with the previous ideas about this animal, is present in almost all stable phrases of Turkish language: it azarlar gibi kovmak (to drive out like a dog); köpek gibi ölmek / die like a dog; it oğlu it (son of a bitch), etc. As can be seen from the examples given, a dog occupies an extremely low position in the phraseological picture of the Turk world and is ranked among despised creatures. Besides, Turkish proverbs and sayings about this animal reflect the ideas of infidelity, insidiousness, jealousy, anger, and danger:

Köpek gibi kıskanç / jealous as a dog;

Köpeğini yisi leş başında, insanın iyisi iş başında [A good dog is by the fall, a good man is near work];

"İt ısırılmaz, at tepmez", deme [Do not say that a horse will not kick, and a dog will not bite];

İt izi at izine karıştı [Dog tracks mixed with horse traces] (about a situation in which something good is difficult to distinguish from something bad);

Ak köpeğe koyun diye sarılma [Do not hug a white dog, calling it a sheep];

It Üürür kervan yürür / A dog barks, a caravan moves;

Bir Köpeğin Dostluğu, Bir Dostun Köpekliğinden iyidir [Friendship of a dog is more expensive than a dog friend], etc.

Another constant element of Russian and Turkish phraseology and proverbial continuum is a wolf image. Russian phraseology and paremiology reflects an ambivalent attitude toward the wolf with a noticeable predominance of negative evaluation. In the linguistic consciousness of Russian people, the image of a wolf in the projection on a person is most often associated with dangerous, malicious, insidious, harmful concepts: a man is a wolf to man; to watch like a wolf, a wolf ticket; a wolf howl, etc. And although sometimes this zoonym carries a positive connotation (a sea wolf is an experienced sailor, an etched / shot wolf is a person who has experienced many deprivations in life and gained experience), the sign of hostility and aggression in the symbolism of a wolf is a main one for a Russian person; The image of an animal is most often associated with the image of a strong and a cruel enemy:

Dog, do not stop on the wolf's footstep: if it looks around, it will eat you;

The goat fought with the wolf tended, the horns and hooves remained;

Do not pretend to be a sheep, a wolf will eat you;

Take a stick if you go to the forest: you may meet a wolf;

Keep a stone if you have a wolf among friends;

People walk by road, and a wolf walks in forest;

If a wolf is employed as a shepherd do not wait for good;

A wolf is beaten not for gray skin, but for the fact that he ate the sheep;

Feed a wolf as much as you can, but he keeps looking into the forest.

Also in the representation of Russian people, a wolf personifies voracity, greed and hypocrisy:

The wolf regretted the mare, left her tail and mane;

A wolf's mouth and priests' eyes are an insatiable pit;

A wolf in a sheep clothing.

A wolf is one of the most widespread animal images in the ancient beliefs and genealogical legends of the Turkic peoples. His symbolism differs markedly from the interpretation of an image presented in the Russian phraseological and paremiological foundation. An image of a wolf in the representation of the Turks is as ambivalent as in the perception of the Russian people. However, the dominant traits in the image of this animal

are completely different symbols. A wolf personifies the image of a leader in the heroic Turkish epic who embodied the strength and the fearlessness of a single hero in the poetic language, as well as the combined military power of the Turkic tribes. Besides, according to the myth about the origin of the first Turkic peoples, a wolf is their totemic animal since ancient times. The ancient proverbs of the Turks reflect the cult of an aggressive predator, which impressed the ideals of military democracy era. The instructions of the Turkic commanders in the texts of the XIth and XIIth centuries list various animals whose properties must be possessed by an army leader; such set expressions as "the greed of a wolf", "like a wolf's strength", etc. are mentioned among them more often than others [8]. An ancient zoonym, personifying the features of a strong, a determined and an intelligent leader of the nation, has not lost its relevance for the Turkish society in our time. Admiring the activities of the outstanding reformer and military leader, the founder of the modern Turkish state Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, his compatriots call him the Gray Wolf. The image of the wolf in the perception of the Turks also embodies the idea of freedom: "The food of a wolf and the food of a young man are on the road", "A wolf will bear hunger, and will not tolerate slavery" [9]. So, in general, the Turkish phrases emphasize the following main characteristics of a wolf image: power, freedom, independence, responsibility, fearlessness, devotion to the family, experience, mind:

Kurtların arasında sonuncu olmak, çakalların arasında birinci olmaktan iyidir [It's better to be the last among the wolves than the first among the jackals];

Kurt doğan tilki olmaz [Who was born as a wolf, won't be a fox];

Kurdun oğlu kuzu olmaz [A son of a wolf will not become a lamb];

Kurda sormuşlar: Ensen niye kalın, diye. Kendi işimi kendim yaptığım için demiş. [The wolf was asked: "Why do you have a thick neck?" - "Because I take care of myself," he replied];

Kurt köyünü değiştirir, huyunu değiştirmez [A wolf can change a habitat, but it never changes a character];

İşin kurdu olmak (to be a wolf in this matter);

Yaşlı kurt (an old wolf);

Eski deniz kurtlarında (he is from old sea wolves), etc.

In the phraseological fund of the Kabardino-Circassian language, the word *khe* unites two concepts - the dog and the wolf. According to F.N. Guketlova, the ancient Adygs distinguished these animals only on the principle of "wild - domestic". Therefore, the cult of a dog was not separated from the cult of a wolf [10]. Despite the fact that a dog / a wolf was a cult animal, in the modern everyday consciousness this zoonym has a generally negative connotation. The representatives of the Adyghe linguistic culture relate to this image the idea of cruelty, anger, sycophancy, greed, the lack of principle, immorality, vulgarity, danger, disrespect for a person, but at the same time, in the artistic worldview of the Adygs the image of a wolf-dog has such positive features as experience, fidelity, as well as the ideas of abundance and fertility, kindness and suppleness:

Хьэ бын – dog's children;

Хьэ дзэкъэн – evil as a dog;

Хьэ зэрышх – bickering, pack;

Хьэзэрышхым хэк1уэдэн – to suffer from some scandal;

Хьэщэхурыпхьуэ – insidious, vile;

Хьэм дэльхуэ – too much prolific;
Хьэм егъэхьын – to insult, to humiliate;
Хьэм и нэмыс хуэмыщӀын – to treat someone with no respect;
Хьэми кхьуэми – all is absolute;
Хьэмрэ джэдумрэ хуэдэщ – like a cat with a dog;
Хьэр гъэбэнэн – to hang around;
Хьэр лъуэ ефэн – to get drunk hard;
Хьэр къахэжьэн – to be into a trouble;
Хьэр псафэхуэшэн – to be very obedient;
Хьэуэ мыльгъун – not to be considered at all;
ХьитӀым яку къыдэжӀа – a dog's offspring;
Хьэжжъ хэхьухьын – (literally, to become an experienced dog), gain experience;
Яку хьэкарэ дэжаш – a black dog ran between them;
Хьэжъ - an old dog, i.e. a grabber;
И хьэм сыкъишхщ – (lit.: his dog ate me), he humiliated me.

As can be seen from the analyzed examples, the connotations of zoonyms in each of the considered languages are closely related to the national zoomorphic culture code, i.e. with the combination of those stereotyped images of animals that are conditioned by a specific ethnic culture.

3. Conclusions

The linguocultural content of set expressions is based on the cognitive level and is modeled by culturally significant interpretations of phraseological units. Since the modeling of PU linguocultural is based on the collective worldview of linguistic cultural community and by the relation to the settings and the characters of national culture: symbols, stereotypes, standards, myths, etc., during the practical development of Russian as a foreign language it should be possible to focus on the study of national-marked culture signs. The semantification of PU should be also an interpretation of the linguistic cultural connotation verbalized in them. The study of concepts and associative fields of the animal wolf and dog in Russian, Turkish and Kabardian language demonstrates that there are similarities between the connotations inherent to these zoonyms, indicating a similar perception of reality by the representatives of different linguocultures, about the universal categories of human thought. Idioethnic representations characterize the peculiarities of the people - language bearer worldview, reflect the concrete historical and cultural experience that determines the unique linguistic picture of the world. The analysis carried out in the study allows us to assert that there are many similarities between the representatives of Russian and Turkish languages in the representations of a wolf and a dog, which indicates a certain correspondence in the perception of the world by these peoples. At the same time, the peculiarities of the mythological worldview (an ancient form of the world knowledge), a specific historical experience of national cultures, religious beliefs development have contributed to the emergence of disparate, unique features of these images symbolic content in these two linguistic cultures. The peculiarity of the Adygian understanding of wolf / dog image (along with the existence of perception similar to the representatives of Russian and Turkish

linguoculture) lies in its syncretism, in the imposing of wolf objective characteristics on a dog and vice versa. The comparison of these processes in the educational discourse promotes a deeper understanding of the studied language, and the work with bilinguals gives lessons a more creative character and is characterized by high productivity and emotional saturation, which is very important when you learn a foreign language. Bilingual students, comparing the names of animals in three languages of different structure can find equivalents and compliances in Russian language based on the Turkish-Circassian phraseological comparisons, which are a reference during RFL classes, thus expanding their linguistic and extralinguistic knowledge required for successful integration in Russian-speaking culture.

The linguistic material analyzed in this article can be the basis for the development of a variety of tasks to teach phraseological units of the Russian language for foreigners, the search for cross-cultural relations, intercultural communication skills, identification of the specifics of the national perception of the world, reflected in the zoomorphic codes of different languages by foreign students.

4. Summary

The comparative analysis method for phraseology, based on the simultaneous connection of several different language material, promotes an effective solution during the lessons of RFL for linguistic and important extra-linguistic tasks: the expansion of ideas about the world, the formation of a culture of tolerance among foreign students, the respect for the specificity of psychology and philosophy of different peoples, for their spiritual identity, for universal human aesthetic and moral values.

Conflict Of Interest

The authors confirm that the presented data do not contain a conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Vereshchagin E.M. Language and culture: Linguistic studies in teaching Russian as a foreign language / E.M. Vereshchagin, V.G. Kostomarov. - M.: Russian language, 1983, p.16.
- [2] Apresyan Yu.D. Integral description of the language and system lexicography / Yu.D. Apresyan // Selected Works in 2 vols. - V. 2. - Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 1995, pp. 350-351.
- [3] Telia V.N. Russian phraseology: Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects. M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1996, p. 58.
- [4] Humboldt W. Selected works on linguistics. - Moscow: Progress, 1984, p. 80.
- [5] Kryuchkova L.S., Moshchinskaya N.V. Practical methods of Russian teaching as a foreign language. M: Flint. Science, 2014, pp. 56-57.
- [6] Popova M.V. Psychological features of bilingual: Russian-speaking European. // Russian language abroad. 2014, No. 6. pp. 67-72.
- [7] Kolesov V.V., Kolesova, D.V., Kharitonov A.A. The dictionary of Russian mentality. V. 2. St. Petersburg: Zlatoust, 2014, p. 279.
- [8] Malov S.E. The monuments of ancient Turkic writing. Texts and research M., 1951.
- [9] F. Urmancheev. Following the White Wolf // "Soviet Turkology", 1978, no. 6, p. 12.
- [10] F.N. Gukettova. Zoomorphic code of culture in the language picture of the world. Moscow: Thesaurus, 2009, pp. 51-52.