

CORRESPONDENCES AND NON-CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN LANGUAGES IN THE STUDY PROCESS

M.I.Rasulova

Uzbekistan State World Languages University



<http://dx.doi.org/10.37057/2433-202x>
Issue DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.37057/2433-202x-209-2021-1>
Article DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.37057/2433-202x-2021-1-1>

Abstract. In this article the urgent problems of teaching foreign languages in the education system of Republic of Uzbekistan are raised. On the basis of taking into account the principles of correspondence and non-correspondence of language facts in the process of teaching the main tasks for improving the system of teaching foreign languages are defined.

Keywords. Continuous education system, national education system modal, modern communication and information technologies, world picture, idiographic group, notional categories, grammatical categories, animateness, inanimateness.

Material. The material of investigation is based on the examples selected from the explanatory dictionaries of compared languages.

Method. A comparative analysis is used to reveal similarities and differences of languages belonging to different language family groups. The types of interference were analyzed and determined in the use of target languages.

Introduction. The issue of linguistic correspondences and non-correspondences is an urgent, at the same time one of the disputable problems and moreover hasn't been studied enough in Contrastive Linguistics yet. In this article we focused on the formulating the problem and showing the importance of this phenomenon in the second language acquisition.

Main part. The process of studying this or that language, as it is known, is backed up on the mother tongue. The role of such kind of support increases as the general language level and the skillfulness of the learners rise. So, why does not the direct method, the creation of the pure immersion atmosphere, “the absolute banishment of the native language from the study process” give the necessary effect in these conditions? Here it is worth remembering the reasonable statement by the famous Russian linguist L.V.Scherba that “to banish the mother tongue from the heads of the learners in school environment is impossible, as the learners can understand the meaning of this or that word, when are able to find its equivalent in their native language” [Scherba, 1947, p. 56].

Indeed, the pupils perceive information about a new language “through the prism” of their mother tongue: they already have some kind of understanding of the language science – the grammar, the orthoepy, the orthography. That is why it is

difficult or almost impossible to create the pure bilingualism without the conscious juxtaposition of the facts of the two compared languages and to express in the foreign language the things that are easily verbalized in the native one. In the process of understanding of the new language expression of thoughts and feelings, a mother tongue serves a subsequent criterion of these new language phenomena and facts. That is why it is so important to apply the already formed in the native language knowledge about this same language.

Thus, the given article is devoted to the study of the main difficulty in the process of the foreign language acquisition that is the revelation of the structural non-correspondence between the learned and the native languages.

The same meanings that exist in the speech production (speaking and writing) somehow similarly are used for the fixation of the human experience in the mind of the communication participants not only in the mother tongue, but in the various languages of the world [Shmelyov, 2009]. Consequently, as it is known, there appears a possibility for meaning interpretation in the native language and its translation from one language to another.

The knowledge sphere, where the human experience is being fixed, is called a *world picture*, and the notions, on which it is built, are the *semantic fields* [Safarov, 2015].

Each semantic field in a definite language without any gaps is filled with words. The list of words, which fill this field, is an *ideographic group*. In other words, an ideographic group is the description of an idea (a field) by the lexicographic means. The main difficulty, which appears in the process of translation from a foreign language into a native and vice versa, is that one and the same field in different languages is filled with a different ideographic group. In this case, in one language, where more words are included in the field, the notion of a world picture fixes the experience of the language bearers more exactly and in details, and in another – where there are fewer words included into the field – the fixation is less detailed and more abstract. Particularly, in the field “*kinship terms*” for the expression of the relatives in the descending line (children from the same parents) the words can be used, which point at gender and age distinction. For example, in the Uzbek language there are special words for this (overall, 4 terms): *ака – ука, она – сингил*; in the Russian and the English languages the differences are expressed in gender, but not age: Rus.: *брат – сестра*, Eng.: *brother – sister*; in the Indonesian language there is only one term for a descending line: *sudara*. In this case, while studying foreign languages, it is important to consider the relativity of the mutual translation that proceeds from these differences.

Within the world picture there exist the relations of irreversible predictability. Thus, the field “*living – nonliving*” presupposes the field “*kinship terms*”, but not vice versa. And the field “*kinship terms*” presupposes the properties of the field “*kinship in the descending line*”. The relations of irreversible predictability are the consequences of the inclusion of a predicted notion into a predicting notion. Such

relations are usually called **hierarchy**. The main pedagogue's delusion is that a learner can be easier explained an overlying notion (the one that predicts) than an underlying (the one that is being predicted). In reality, here the notion that is being predicted should be started from. Unfortunately, the ideographic dictionaries at least of one of the foreign languages are almost never used in this case.

For the structural reorganization, in the language teaching practice the differences not only in the notional, but in the grammatical categories should be considered. It is believed that a language has only a grammatical category (for example, a gender or a case), if there exists a morpheme that defines this category. Usually this morpheme is expressed by a suffix. Other means of grammatical category expression, for example, combination with a pre-position or a post-position, are sometimes not taken into consideration. For instance, many linguists consider that there is no grammatical category of case in the English language, as here there is no case suffix. The fact being usually neglected is that in the English language a subject is placed first before the verb and the second is a noun equivalent to a direct object (accusative or ablative), and the third in succession is a noun combined with prepositions – the combinations that can be equivalent to dative and instrumental cases in other languages. Still there exists translation possibility from the Uzbek language into English, although in Uzbek there are case suffixes and postpositions. To understand this, we suggest using the results of comparison of a non-native language with a native one.

In various languages (including English, Uzbek and Russian) notional categories presuppose lexical and grammatical meanings [Langacker, 1999]. This means that for a successful structural reorganization in a language study process it is necessary to consider notional categories (the world picture fields) and to search for the means of their designation in lexical meanings and categories, expressed by morphemes including not only suffixes, but word order, pre-positions and post-positions as well. In our viewpoint, the investigation of the dependence between notional and grammatical categories (including both lexical and grammatical meanings) allows for the formulation of the following principle: if in the process of the notional categories' reflection, a language lacks their morphological designation, there exists compensation in the lexical meanings. Thus, it can be concluded that notional categories always differ in lexical meanings, but still there may not be subsequent grammatical meanings.

Let us examine the representation of the notional category “living – nonliving” (in the English language “animateness – inanimateness”) in the process of learners' study of the English language.

Animateness is a category that defines objects having the possibility of free movement, notably living beings, which differ from inanimate and abstract objects.

Despite proper names, animateness in the observed languages is expressed by the word-forming suffixes and the word-combinations with personal pronouns. Here

categories that are subduing to animateness are functioning. First of all, these are the categories of nouns' gender and natural sex.

The category of animateness corresponds to the category of animality and subduing to it categories of gender and person. This category exists in the Slavonic (e.g., Russian) and some Scandinavian languages. In the English and the Uzbek languages the morphological means of this category expression are absent.

The category of inanimateness is a category that defines objects or things, which do not have the ability of free movement, notably nonliving beings. The grammatical category of inanimateness corresponds to the category of inanimacy or the unmarked counterterm of the animality category. This means that the category of inanimacy is present in the given language, only when the category of animality exists. Still, these categories in the spectrum of the included notional categories are different in all the languages. For instance, the category of animality in the Uzbek language, embracing the category of gender and sex, includes only people, though in Russian – all living beings.

Not all nominations, included into the analyzed ideographic group, contain a semantic sex indication. The absence of sex differentiation is more characteristic of the Uzbek than the English language, as here many nominations do not have adequate expression of the natural sex. For example, to the English “*nephew – niece*” and “*grandson – granddaughter*” in the Uzbek language such equivalents as “*жиян*” and “*набира*” correspond. However, the characteristic feature of the analyzed English group is the obligation for the existence of the natural sex, as these nominations define the persons of subsequent male and female sexes that are related by definite kinship. In the Uzbek language this lacuna is filled in by the lexical markers of the natural sex on the syntactic level, notably “*қиз набира*” – “*ўғил набира*”; “*қиз жиян*” – “*ўғил жиян*”.

In contrast to the English and the Uzbek languages, where the designation of the natural sex fully relates to the lexical meanings and the word-formation patterns, the Russian language has as the word-formation patterns expressed in the personal suffixes and the subjective evaluation, e.g.: *старик – старичок*, so the forms of inflection, gender and animality as coordinating classes, e.g.: *пожилая женщина* [for details: Rasulova, 2005].

In the word semantics the world vision peculiar to the given language or, precise, to the language bearers is expressed. That is why in each language a word lives its own life, tightly connected to the singularity of the language lexical-semantic system.

Taking into account the structural correspondences between the studied language and the native one and defining their specific features of considerable difficulty are necessary in language teaching and texts translation.

As learners need to understand difference between notional, lexical and grammatical categories, in teaching it is better to proceed from meaning to form, from speech to language. Consequently, in translation it is reasonable to move from

speaker to listener, thus, from language to speech, from paradigmatics to syntagmatics, notably to the revelation of the ways the messages (texts) are produced, for the sake of the language originality and the produced speech acts peculiarities' exposure.

References

1. Rasulova M.I. The basics of Lexical Categorization in Linguistics. – Tashkent, “Science” printing house, 2005.
2. Safarov Sh.S. Theory of Linguistics and Lingua-methodology. – Tashkent, “BAYOZ” printing house, 2015.
3. Shmelev D.N. The Problem of Semantic Analysis of Lexicon. The second edition, KomKniga printing house, 2006.
4. Shcherba L.V. Teaching foreign languages at school: general problems of methodology of teaching. – M.-L., 1947.
5. Langacker R.W. Grammar and conceptualization. – Berlin / New- York, 1999.
6. Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases. www.thesauru.com
7. Annotated dictionary of the Uzbek language. V dvux tomax. Pod red. Magrfova Z.M. M. : Russkiy yazyk, 1981.