

THE LANGUAGE PICTURE OF THE WORLD OF THE TATARS AND THE NATIONAL IMAGE OF THE WORLD

Radif R. Zamaletdinov

Kazan Federal University

Fanuza H. Gabdrakhmanova

Kazan Federal University

fanuza_mayak@list.ru

Gulnara F. Zamaletdinova

Kazan Federal University

Abstract. The language is closely connected with the picture of the world, which predetermines linguistic cognition. Cognition underlies the conceptualization of knowledge about the extralinguistic reality and the language vision of the world. The language picture of the world includes a special worldview and the ethnos of the world, fixed in the semantics of linguistic units and the conceptual-categorial composition of the language. Categorization allows us to reduce an infinite variety of a phenomena to a concrete classification, concluding in the division of the world into certain discrete entities and classes of such entities. Thus, the language picture of the world is formed not only by the nomenclature of nominative units, but largely by the rules of their formation and functioning. The analysis of fragments of the language picture of the world of the Tatars allowed us to come to the following conclusions: in the Tatar language model of the world, first of all, the visual-spatial experience of a person is reflected. When modeling in the language of the inner world, the fundamental characteristics of objective reality, such as space and, to a lesser extent, time, are interned by a person. So, for example, in terms of space, the concept of *kunel* as specific for the Turkic-Tatar linguoculture is described as an internal topos where the soul, heart, conscience are placed, where the source of various feelings and experiences is.

Keywords: linguoculturology, a world model, the language picture of the world, Tatar linguoculture, ethnos, a cultural code, key concepts.

1.Introduction. Modern linguistics continues the process of rethinking the role of the language in the generation and functioning of the basic mechanisms of a human cognition and culturally creative activity. The language in this case is understood as the cultural code of the nation, not simply as a means of communication.

The language picture of the world is one way of structuring knowledge about objective reality. The knowledge of the world of all the person, received by him during his life, exists in his mind in the form of a picture of the world that determines the attitude of the person to reality, influences the norms of behavior, the formation of a system of values, socially determined imperatives and prohibitions, the strategy of a life activity, ways of awareness of a human subjectivity.

In recent years, a significant number of works devoted to the study of the conceptual world view have appeared in Russian linguistics and served as a scientific and methodological basis for this research (N.D. Arutyunova, T. Bulygin, V.I. Karasik, O.A. Kornilov, D.S. Likhachev, S.Kh. Lyapin, O.N.Selivestrova, Yu.S. Stepanov, A.D.Shmelev, V.A. Maslova, V.V. Krasnykh and others).

In modern science, there are a number of approaches to the study of the specifics of national world view, which are based on the material of one (Yu.D. Apresyan, Z.Kh. Bidzeva, M.V. Zainullin, Yu.N. Karaulov, etc.) or several languages (S.G. Vorkachev, G.D. Gachev and etc.).

In modern science, comprehension of the world view occurs through reflection on the results of scientific achievements and in the course of semiotic, cultural, linguistic, linguocultural analysis, on the material of studying the folklore, the mythology and the language.

Some theoretical aspects of the problem considered in the article are covered in the works of the scientists of the Department of General Linguistics and Turkology of the Kazan Federal University engaged in research in the field of Tatar linguoculturology under the guidance of the Professor RR. Zamaletdinov [Vildanova R.R. et.al, 2017]; F.R. Sibgaeva [Sibgaeva F.R. et.al, 2017], E.A Islamova [Zagidulina A.F. et.al, 2016], R.M. Bolgarova [Khusnullina G.N. et.al, 2017], R.R.Salakhova [Salakhova R.R., Sibgaeva F.S., 2017], G.R. Mugtasimova [Yuisufuva Z. et.al, 2016 , Singh, P., Teoh, S. H., Cheong, T. H., Rasid, N. S. M., Kor, L. K., & Nasir, N. A. M. (2018)] .

2.Methods. Proceeding from this, that the main task of the study is a comprehensive study of the language in connection with the culture, we studied the practical material by the method of the linguocultural field, by which we mean a certain thematic set of lexico-phraseological units, whose lexical background reflects the most significant cultural and social characteristics of the nation. The semantic and structural-semantic links of phraseology reflects the connections between the objects and phenomena of reality relevant to man and society, and its real and ideal objects, and thereby transmit peculiarities of the national world model, giving the individual a model of the world view.

3.Results And Discussion. The language world view is formed by linguistic means, reflecting linguistic universals, and also by language means that fix the features of the worldview of this or that people. There is no universal world model, but there are a lot of national paintings of the world, originality, uniqueness of which can be seen only in the course of comparing the world view of different peoples speaking different languages.

O.A. Kornilov identifies two main approaches to the concept of "worldview of the nation." The first approach is the cognitive, instrumental, in which the language is viewed from the point of the view of its functioning as a tool for communication, thinking or cognition, as a semiotic code. The second approach can be called cultural and philosophical [Kornilov O.A., 2003, Molina, Reynier Israel Ramirez, et al. 2018].

From these positions, each ethnic language appears as an integral part of the culture of the people, as the most important organ of self-reflection, self-knowledge and self-expression of national culture. Starting with romantics, the European thought of language tries to comprehend how the human language in general unfolds into the diversity of various national languages, accessible to experience and description, with their different structure. V. fon Gumboldt, who viewed every language as a special worldview, explored the inner form in which the process of the language formation is differentiated each time. He discovered the significance of languages as mirrors of the spiritual identity of peoples. Sound is connected with the object not only directly, but also through semantically processed units. In different languages, the level of categorization is different. The social nature of a language collective is not just a background for communication, but the necessary prerequisites for including the individual in a single process of linguistic comprehension of the world.

The metaphor "linguistic picture of the world" indicates that it is a question of a simplified replacement of the real world by the invented scheme of the world or the model of the world. The language picture of the world reflects a spontaneous, yet unreflects holistic perception of the world by man. And linguistic consciousness generates a huge number of mythical objects, verbal constructions, subjective characteristics that do not exist in the real world, but are represented in the language picture of the world. Being born as a beautiful metaphor, the language picture of the world in the future received a lot of interpretations, each of which emphasized the individual sides of the notion.

4.Summary. Each culture has its own, characteristic for it a system of values. At the same time, words that express the value dominants and peculiarities of mentality, connected with customs, traditions, behavior stereotypes are most significant for us. So, in the opinion of the researchers, the words *pravda* (a truth), *spravedlivost'* (a justice), *dobro* (a good), *volya* (a will), *udal* (a skill) are significant for the Russian consciousness [Stepanov Yu.S., 2007], for the American – freedom, independence, private property, money, etc. [Ter-Minasova S.G., 2000]. For the Tatar language carrier, according to our material, there is an increased emphasis on national specifics, key concepts can be called *kunel* (a soul), *don'ya* (the world), *ipi* (a bread), *sy* (a water), *yt* (a fire), *dzan* (a spirit), *sabyrlyk* (an endurance). But an attempt to reveal the final list of the values of a particular people, unfortunately, cannot be free of subjectivity.

According to the statement of V.A. Zvegintsev, "in some languages a value is denoted by one word, in others it can have a detailed nomenclature containing dozens of titles. Words that are identical in meaning occupy an unequal position even in systems of closely related languages, perform unequal functions in them and, therefore, are not absolutely unambiguous" [Zvegintsev V.A., 1957].

Often, connotations are perceived as an estimated halo surrounding the meaning of the word, while the national specificity of the language is clearly manifested. In the connotation, the potential resources of the nominative language system are realized, for "the connotative word has the ability not only to create but also to retain a deep meaning, which is in complex relations with the semantics of the word, to fix it in the language, thereby creating a cultural-national language picture" [Maslova V.A., 2001].

A special place in the semantic space of the language is taken up by the level of connotation, which is associated with the stable associations fixed in the language, called in the collective linguistic consciousness by the objects of the surrounding reality. Connotations as additional semantic and stylistic nuances, superimposed on the main meaning of the word, reflect cultural concepts and traditions. Thus, representatives of other nationalities can hardly imagine with great difficulty that it is quite natural for the Tatar language consciousness to see in the leech (*sulek*) the standard of slimness: "*Chistiy yuler iken bu Galiyabanu, shundi yulek kebek egetne yaratmiycha, ber bukenge gashik bulgan, tile!*" – *diye bashliylar* (E.Eniki) (lit. begin to say: "Well, this stupid Galiyabanu, did not fall in love with a fellow who was as slender as a leech, and fell in love with such a blockhead!"). *Kaichandir, bik kyptennen inde, yl yze eget chaginda kamchat burek, ak chikmen kiep, biln kizil bay belen byip, kamit kyrmegen sulektey yash' aigirga atlanip dalaga chigip kite ide* (E.Eniki) (lit. very long ago, when he was a young man, dressed in a beaver hat and a white armyak dressed in a red sash, he sat down on a slender, like a leech, a young stallion who did not know what a yoke was, and galloped into the steppe).

When translating such fragments, has to give lengthy comments or change the figurative structure of the text. The translator must take into account that the lexical meanings of the words of each language implicitly include information of this kind.

A.D.Shmelev notes that "non-trivial semantic configurations are sufficiently frequent in everyday discourse" [Shmelev A.D., 2002]. For example, from the Tatar proverb *at yegerek tugel, kunel yegerek* (lit., not the horse is swift, but the soul) it follows that earlier the horse was the main means of transportation.

What is stated directly can always be challenged, it is necessary to pay attention to those components of the meaning of the statement, which the speakers consider self-evident and do not consider it necessary to dwell on this specifically. The Tatar proverb *kunelde yukni kyz kyirmi* (lit. eyes do not see what is not in the soul) testifies that in the Tatar language world view *kunel* can act as a means of irrational, intuitive cognition, opposed to both rational and sensory cognition.

It is noteworthy that in the above examples, proverbs are built on the category of negation (compare also in Russian: one does not see with eyes, and will not hear with ears, and the heart will not understand), i.e. through the

prism of dialogue with the reaction of objection. At the same time, it can be noted that if the heart is an organ of cognition and the sense organ in the language picture of the world of the Russians, then in Tatar this role is performed by *kunel*.

There is one more example. The Tatar word *ume* is translated into Russian as a help, a collective assistance; Subbotnik. This word is associated with the tradition of sharing unselfish performance of heavy labor-intensive work for a single family. They were arranged for fast carrying out of such works as threshing of bread, timber harvesting, setting up a house, etc.; now, *ume* can be organized to help widows, orphans, people who lost their homes as a result of a fire. On the one hand, the organization of such events is connected with the traditions of the rural patriarchal community; on the other hand, it can be interpreted as a refraction of the norms of Islam in the Tatar culture, where for every Muslim the sacred duty is the feasible assistance to the disadvantaged. Finally, this is an important socially tested and culturally fixed mechanism for regulating social life within the rural community, contributing to its prosperity and well-being. However, *ume* is not only hard work, but also cheerful teamwork, a way of rallying collective of the people, *ume* assumes a festive joint feast after work; Tatars were able to turn hard work into a holiday, after the end of the work fun games were arranged.

In the system of rituals of the Tatar people an important place is occupied by *kaz umese* – an assistance in the processing of stabbed geese, an activity most loved by Tatar youth. The very process of labor made it possible to demonstrate dexterity, skill, turning from a heavy duty into a fun contest, where work was mixed with a sharp word, songs.

In the national culture, the same word can have an extensive network of associations. Take for example the word *dog*. In Russian lingvoculture, along with negative phenomena, the dog is associated with fidelity, devotion, unpretentiousness. In Tatar lingvoculture, this dog can be associated with difficulties: *et gazabi*, *et kone* (lit. a dog life); with insolence: *et erseze* (literal, insolent to the limit); with fatigue: *et bulganchi yury*, *et bulu* (lit. dog); with curses, abuse: *et itep sygy* (lit., to scold). According to V.N.Teliya, it is the cultural connotation that allows us to relate language and culture. The fastening in the language of associative attributes and meanings is a cultural-national process that may not obey the logic of common sense (why is it associated with a dog, not, for example, a horse or ox-animals witch performing heavy agricultural work).

The most valuable source of information about the culture and mentality of the people, in which the ideas about customs, rituals and morals of the people are concentrated is the foundation of phraseological units of the language. For example, such Tatar phraseologicalisms as *ebi patsha zamaninda* (lit. in the time of the grandmother-queen, i.e. Catherine II), *khan zamaninda* (lit. in the times of the khans), with the meaning "very long ago, in the times of the king of the Peas" are monuments of the historical past of the people. The phraseology *Nukh zamaninda* (in Noah's time) refers us to the Old Testament and Koranic history.

Signs and standards characterizing the peculiarities of the naive world view are also of great importance for linguoculturology. V.A. Maslova notes that the standards are "what the world is figuratively measured", "the standard is an entity that measures the properties and qualities of objects, phenomena, objects" [Maslova V.A., 2001]. Symbols and standards reflect not only the national worldview, but also the national world model and attitude. For example, the Tatars say: *tash bugyr* (lit. stone soul), *tash yerek* (lit. stone heart), in this case the stone is the standard of indifference, lack of compassion, ruthlessness, meanwhile the French have a stable comparison *sad as stones* (i.e., in the perception of the French, stones are associated with a feeling of sadness, sadness).

5. Conclusion. Considering the relationship between the semantics of the word and the background knowledge, we come to the conclusion that some word-realities that denote key concepts and phenomena for a given culture acquire an extremely important place in this culture. They, as a rule, have a rich palette of national cultural connotations (for example, *birch*, *oak*, *winter* in Russian, *at* (a horse), *kunel* (a heart, a soul) in Tatar). Such words form extensive word-forming and phraseological nests, participate in the creation of proverbs and aphorisms. They begin to play the role of peculiar images-symbols of the national culture, important elements of the national world view on the lexical, phraseological, aphoristic levels of the language. Even more important is their participation in creating images of folklore and fiction. At this level, words further enrich their semantics with new stable associations.

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

References

1. R.R. Vildanova, R.R. Zamaletdinov, M.R. Sattarova, G.F. Zamaletdinova "Tatars names as a phenomenon of traditional culture," *Astra Salvensis*, vol. 5, Issue 10, pp. 169–176, 2017.
2. Sibgaeva, Firuza R.; Nurmukhametova, Raushaniya S.; Sattarova, Madina R.; Smagulova, Guldarkhan N. "Man as an object of evaluation in the phraseological picture of the world (on the material of Tatar language)," *AD ALTA – Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, V. 7, Special Issue 2. pp. 267–269, 2017.
3. Zagidulina A.F., Gilazetdinova G.Kh., Islamova E.A. "Associative fields of lexemes "Homeland" and "Vatan" in Russian and Tatar linguistic consciousness," *Journal of Language and Literature*, v. 7, Is.2, pp. 289–292, 2016.
4. Khusnullina, Gulgena N.; Bolgarova, Ramziya M.; Islamova, Elvira A.; Zholshayeva, Maira S. "Comparisons of dishware names in Tatar and Russian languages," *AD ALTA – Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, v. 7, Special Issue 2, pp. 112–115, 2017.

5. Salakhova R.R., Sibgaeva F.S. "Problems of studying the verbal semantics of differential languages in the conditions of bilingualism," *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 138, number 4 (2) (Whole Number 552), pp. 1022–1033, 2017.
6. Yuisufuva Z.; Yusupova A.S.; Mugtasimova G.R.; Denmukhametova E.N. "Paroemiological units of the Tatar language with culture-specific lexicon," *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, Special Issue, pp. 161–164, 2016.
7. Singh, P., Teoh, S. H., Cheong, T. H., Rasid, N. S. M., Kor, L. K., & Nasir, N. A. M. (2018). The Use of Problem-Solving Heuristics Approach in Enhancing STEM Students Development of Mathematical Thinking. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(3), 289-303.
8. Kornilov O.A. *Yazykovyye kartiny mira kak proizvodnyye natsional'nykh mentalitetov*. – M.: CheRo, 2003. – 349 s.
9. Molina, Reynier Israel Ramírez, et al. "Liderazgo consiliente como competencia potenciadora del talento neuronal." *Opción* 34.86 (2018): 826-854.
10. Stepanov Yu.S. *Kontsepty. Tonkaya plenka tsivilizatsii*. – M.: YAzyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, 2007. – 248 s.
11. Ter-Minasova S.G. *Yazyk i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya: ucheb. posobiye*. – M.: Slovo, 2000. – 624 s.
12. Zvegintsev V.A. *Semasiologiya*. – M.: Izd-vo Mosk. un-ta, 1957. – 321 s.
13. Maslova V.A. *Lingvokul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye dlya studentov vyssh. ucheb. zavedeniy*. – M.: Asademia, 2001. – 208 s.
14. Shmelev A.D. *Russkaya yazykovaya model' mira: Materialy k slovaryu*. – M.: YAzyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2002. – 224 s.