A Critical Look at of Russian Language and Culture in the XVI-XVII Centuries: A Comparative Linguistics Focusing on Russian and Korean Corpora[1]

Yuliya Yurisovna Karamova[2], Alfiya Rafisovna Alikberova[3], & Elmira Kamilevna Khabibullina[3]

Abstract

The comparative method aims to prove that two or more historically attested languages descend from a single proto-language by comparing lists of cognate terms from which regular sound correspondences between the languages are established. A sequence of regular sound changes can then be postulated, which allows the reconstruction of a proto-language. Relation is deemed certain only if at least a partial reconstruction of the common ancestor is feasible, and regular sound correspondences can be established, with chance similarities ruled out. This study aimed to critically look at language and culture in in the XVI-XVII Centuries. It actually tired to do a comparative linguistics with a focus on Russian and Korean Corpora. Both domestic and foreign historiography often describes the same historical events in different ways. The reasons for such disagreements and different descriptions of the same historical events are insufficient information, the influence of some states on others, and deliberate distortion in order to create a negative image of participants in historical events. This study used the following methods: analysis of the research literature on the topic under study; the method of specific situations (case method) in the analysis of examples; instrumental observation. Also, the study used such general scientific methods as analysis and synthesis in determining the goals, resources, and tools of the concept under consideration, as well as a structural approach.

Keywords: Russian Language; Comparative Linguistics; Korea; Russia; Corpora.

1. Introduction

In recent years, creation of different text corpora became one of the cutting-edge directions in the applied linguistics. In Western countries the corpus linguistics

---

[1] Please cite this paper as follows:

Karamova, Y. Y., Alikberova, A. R., & Khabibullina, E. K. (2019). A critical look at of Russian language and culture in the XVI-XVII centuries: A comparative linguistics focusing on Russian and Korean corpora. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics,10* (SP), 1262-1269.

[2] Kazan Federal University; *valieva.yul@yandex.ru*

[3] Kazan Federal University

shaped itself as a separate linguistic universe in early 90's, even though the concept of the corpus and the first physical corpora had been known long before. The earliest Russian corpus was built in 1980s at the University of Uppsala (Sweden). But another project influenced this direction in Russia so much that it should be mentioned. In 1960–70s the Frequency Dictionary of Russian was created by L.N. Zasorina (a printed version, 1977). Text database for the dictionary counted about 1 million tokens. During its compilation a huge number of notorious issues of corpus linguistics was discussed: representativeness, tokenization, normalization, lemmatization. So, it was the earliest computerized corpus of Russian that doesn't exist nowadays. In 1980s the Computer Fund of the Russian Language project started. The idea belonged to the academician Andrei Yershov (1979). It was formulated in his paper "On methodology of constructing dialogue systems: the phenomenon of business prose" (p.24). The idea was stated as follows: "Any progress in the field of constructing models and algorithms will remain a purely academic exercise, unless a most important problem of creating a Computer fund of the Russian language is solved. It is to be hoped that creation of such a Computer fund by linguists, qualified for the task, will precede construction of large systems for application purposes. This would minimize labor costs and simultaneously would protect the 'tissues' of the Russian language from arbitrary and incompetent intervention".

The most renowned Russian corpus for many years was the Uppsala Corpus of Russian Texts. By now its linguistic material is neither up to date in terms of the volume (one million-word occurrences), nor complies with modern conceptions of a national corpus at all. The Uppsala corpus has 600 texts, its volume is 1 million tokens, equally divided between specialized texts and fiction. The aim of the corpus was to represent literary language, and thus the collection doesn't cover spoken language. Full specialized texts from 1985 till 1989 were selected for the corpus and fiction from 1960 through 1988. Texts were presented in Latin alphabet. The Uppsala corpus belongs to so called Tubingen Russian corpora that were created during the project "Linguistische Datenstrukturen. Theoretische und empirische Grundlagen der Grammatikforschung" of the Tubingen University in 1990-2000s with online access [3]. Russian newspaper corpus was built at the Department of Philology of the Moscow State University in 2000-2002 at the Laboratory of General and Computational Lexicology and Lexicography (1 million tokens in total, online version is limited to 200 thousand tokens). Texts and text items are automatically or semi-automatically marked by various tags: the source, text volume, genre, date of the publication etc. (for texts); grammatical, lexical, morphemic or other categories (for words). (Namaziandost, Shatalebi, & Nasri, 2019).

Comparative linguistics is a fairly modern field that is quickly expanding. Contrastive lexicology studies (Koneva, 2014; Namaziandost, Neisi, Kheryadi, & Nasri, 2019) in Russian and other languages are becoming more common. The results of contrastive lexicology studies are important both for relevant science and practice,

especially for those who study foreign languages, most of all, translators. A concrete method of analysis is the extraction of integral (general) semes and differential semes, which allows us to determine the degree of proximity of the values of the studied vocabulary. According to Koneva (2014), “The more the words of the integral semes are compared, the closer they are to each other in meaning, and on the contrary- the more they have differential semes, the less close in meaning these words are” (p. 31). At present, synchronic-comparative studies in the field of lexicology are significantly increasing. Contrastive lexicology focuses on similarities and differences in two or more languages (Sternin, 2007). The results of these studies are important both for relevant science and practice, especially for those who study foreign languages, most of all, translators. In comparative terms, the study of the vocabulary of the Russian and Korean languages is gradually gaining momentum (Yoo, 2016; Namaziandost, Sabzevari, & Hashemifardnia, 2018; Yoo & Kulkova, 2016). Furthermore, studies have also examined vocabulary of various languages from a comparative standpoint (e.g. Cheng, 2018; Koneva, 2014; Namaziandost, Neisi, Mahdavirad, & Nasri, 2019). The focus of our attention - the vocabulary of the Russian language against the specific background of the Korean language - is the lexicosemantic group (hereinafter “LSG”) of classifying vocabulary, which in Russian is very extensive (tip (type), vid (species), rod (genus), sort (variety), poroda (breed), raznovidnost' (variety), forma (form), kategorija (category), klass (class), marka (brand), model' (model), modifikacija (modification), versija (version), variant (variant), etc.). We will focus on the meaning and use of the words “tip (type)” and “vid (kind).”

The history of Russian-Korean relations has long roots. Since then, in the early 60s of the XIX century, Russia and Korea found a common border along the lower reaches of the Tumangan River, the Russian government implemented a policy aimed at maintaining friendly, good-neighborly relations with Korea. This was in the interests of the national security of Russia and, at the same time, contributed to peace and stability in the region. Due to a number of objective reasons (military, financial and economic weakness in the Far East, huge costs for the economic development of Far Eastern possessions, distraction for other foreign policy goals, etc.), the leitmotif of Russia's policy toward Korea was the struggle to maintain the status quo on the Korean Peninsula, the desire to prevent the capture of Korea by hostile Russian powers. At the same time, the northern regions, which could be used by others for purposes hostile to Russia, were the subject of special concern for Russian politics right up to the annexation of Korea by Japan.

Revising the history of Russian-Korean relations in the last years of the XIX century allows us to trace the main stages of the process of a gradual increase in the role and place of Korea in Russia's foreign policy in the Far East, the activities of Russian diplomats in neutralizing the policies of aggressive powers in Korea and maintaining the independence of the Korean state.

2. Methods

This study used the following methods:

1) analysis of research literature on the topic;
2) the method of specific situations (case method) in the analysis of examples;
3) instrumental observation;

In addition, the study used such general scientific methods as analysis and synthesis in determining the goals, resources, and tools of the concept under consideration, as well as a structural approach.

3. Results and Discussion

In linguistics, the comparative method is a technique for studying the development of languages by performing a feature-by-feature comparison of two or more languages with common descent from a shared ancestor and then extrapolating backwards to infer the properties of that ancestor. The comparative method may be contrasted with the method of internal reconstruction in which the internal development of a single language is inferred by the analysis of features within that language. Ordinarily, both methods are used together to reconstruct prehistoric phases of languages; to fill in gaps in the historical record of a language; to discover the development of phonological, morphological and other linguistic systems and to confirm or to refute hypothesised relationships between languages. (Tahmasbi, Hashemifardnia, & Namaziandost, 2019)

Tatiana Mikhailovna also writes that many of the works by South Korean researchers working on this issue have one thing in common - these works include a thesis about the so-called “paper tiger”. The essence of this thesis is that in comparison with Western countries, as well as with Japan, Russia is a weak state. Putting such an idea in their works, South Korean researchers contradict themselves. In their works, they repeatedly emphasize and prove the danger of Russia to Korea, at the same time saying that Russia is a “paper tiger”, that is, a weak country. A striking example of Park Tae Geun's negative attitude towards Russia and an expression of his disposition towards the West, in particular, the USA, is a comparison of the Russian admiral E.V. Putiatin and the American Commodore of the US Navy M.K. Perry. “*In particular, he emphasizes several times that the Russian ships were so “weak” that they couldn’t be compared with the American squadron, just as the courteous behavior and peacefulness of Putiatin clearly lost in comparison with the pressure and grip of the American commodore”* (Peterson, 2009). Thus, he leads the reader to the idea that the expedition of the Russian admiral was defeated, and the American Commodore won a brilliant victory. Describing negatively Admiral E. Putiatin and creating the image of a loser, Park Tae Geun, of course, does not indicate in his works, “*that Putiatin fulfilled its main task by*

concluding the first Russian-Japanese treatise on January 26 (February 7), 1855, in Shimoda, established diplomatic relations between the two countries, and that "from now on, the borders between Russia and Japan would pass between the Iturup and Urup islands", and Sakhalin was declared "undivided" between the two countries" (Feinberg, 1960; Nasri, Namaziandost, & Akbari, 2019).

In summary, it can be stated that classification vocabulary can be used both in a strictly delineated, logical-hierarchical sense, the boundaries of which are determined by the hierarchy and the criteria for constructing this hierarchy (the mega group, the group, the mini-group in the classification grid), and in a non-strict sense, logically diffuse meaning, the boundaries of which are undefined (for example, a group is described in the same manner as a mini-group). In Korean, we do not observe synonymization of the lexemes designating different levels of classification as different lexemes are assigned to scientific and non-scientific texts. Is it possible to interpret the obtained data as demonstrating the universality of the Russian classifying vocabulary, which the speaker can use in all text styles and any content, in contrast to Korean vocabulary, which is assigned to different styles of speech (in scientific and "extra-scientific" texts different vocabulary is used)? This question may be answered by further study of other words of this group (rod (genus), raznovidnost' (species), klass (class), etc.), as well as other LSG. The only conclusion that can immediately be made with certainty to some degree is that if the unclassifiable vocabulary in the Russian language is subject to a known law, according to which the difference in the meaning is due to the difference in compatibility, then to the words tip and vid this rule only partially applies (pol'zovat'sja kosmetikoj, but primenjat' metod). Their use (if y phrases) depends not so much on the mini-context (word combination) as on the characteristics and content of the text as a whole. The scientific text on multistage classifications or the text of any other text and style. It is a scientific text dealing with multistage classifications or the text of any other subject. The results of this study can be especially useful to Korean learners of the Russian language, and the principles can be applied to the classroom to help distinguish differences in the Russian and Korean use of the words. The results confirm the well-known thesis that one of the central questions in modern semantics remains the issue "about the difference between the lexical meaning of a word and its compatibility" (Apresjan, 1995, p. 60; Shakibaei, Shahamat, & Namaziandost, 2019). Based on the examined word pairs, we can determine that idiomatic phrases with these words can be specified by a list, and the meaning of the classifying vocabulary changes depending on the characteristics of the text (scientific versus non-scientific). The similarity between the Russian and Korean languages is that in the framework of multistage classifications, the classifying vocabulary has different meanings, and these values themselves are in the relations of subordinates. In addition, the difference between the languages is that in Russian, unscientific texts use the same vocabulary, and it can be synonymous. In the Korean language there is a stricter system for the

texts of different characteristics. From the lexicon we studied, two conclusions can be drawn. First, the meaning of the classifying vocabulary changes depending on the type of text; secondly, idiomatic phrases can be specified by a list. The similarity between the Russian and Korean languages is that in the framework of multistage classifications, the classifying vocabulary has different meanings, and these values themselves are in the relations of subordination. In addition, the difference between the languages is that in Russian, unscientific texts use the same vocabulary, and it can be synonymous, and in the Korean language there is a stricter focus on the vocabulary for the texts of different styles. Another conclusion is that not all words of Russian and Korean can be combined with classifying words, but the list in both languages is relatively small. Finally, we can discuss such words in the Korean language, which for some reason generally push aside classifying vocabulary (Sepehri, Hajijalili, & Namaziandost, 2019).

While Park Tae Geun in his works portrays the image of the "weak loser" Admiral E. Putiatin, moderate behavior of E. Putiatin, unlike the American Commodore M.K. Perry, had success among the Japanese. Here is a quote of the Japanese historian Kiyozawa Kiyoshi: *"They say that his behavior, unlike Perry's actions, was extremely tactful and restrained, and this caused the supporters of the slogan to appear even among the bakufu vassals: "Having concluded an alliance with Russia, turn against America"* (Feinberg, 1960).

4. Conclusions

At the moment all corpora of the Russian language and mostly the RNC are used by both Russian and foreign researchers. The RNC has English interface and the help system in English. Its sub corpora with their special annotation provide various possibilities for linguistic studies. The RNC site has a special division called Studiorum. It includes some data of researches in Russian language. The studies based upon the semantic annotation are of special interest. There are a few works which address word sense disambiguation and lexical constructions – the chains of lexical units, one of which is usually a lexical constant and others are variables [12]. The basic results obtained in the experiments have to do with revealing and classifying of different types of context markers to specify different meanings of target words. The type and degree of specification of the RNC semantic annotation could provide the rules for associating context tags of special semantic classes with different meanings.

Many of the works by South Korean researchers working on this issue have one thing in common - these works include a thesis about the so-called "paper tiger". The essence of this thesis is that in comparison with Western countries, as well as with Japan, Russia is a weak state. Putting such an idea in their works, South Korean researchers contradict themselves. In their works, they repeatedly emphasize and

prove the danger of Russia to Korea, at the same time saying that Russia is a “paper tiger”, that is, a weak country.

Of course, not all South Korean researchers share the opinion of Park Tae Geun, however, there are followers of such an idea. The image of an aggressor Russia in the minds of such researchers as Park Tae Geun is felt to be inspired by the strong influence of the United States.

Acknowledgments

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

References

Feinberg, E. (1960). *Russian-Japanese relations in 1697-1875*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury.

Peterson, M. (2009). *Brief history of Korea*. New York: Facts on File.

Apresjan, J. (1995). *Izbrannye trudy. Tom 2. Integral'noe opisanie jazyka i sistemnaja leksikografija (Selected works. Volume 2. The integrated description of language and systemic lexicography*). (2nd ed.). Moscow, Russia: Shkola Jazyki Russkoj Kul'tury.

Chastotnyi slovar’ russkogo yazyka (1977). Zasorina, L.N. (ed.). Moskva

Cheng, S. (2018). A contrastive analysis of word formation of English and Chinese neologisms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(2), 251-256.

Koneva, E. (2014). The role of comparative analysis in foreign language learning (German and Russian languages). *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 154,* 319-323.

Koneva, E. (2014). The role of comparative analysis in foreign language learning (German and Russian languages). *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 154*, 319-323.

Namaziandost, E., Neisi, L., Kheryadi, & Nasri, M. (2019). Enhancing oral proficiency through cooperative learning among intermediate EFL learners: English learning motivation in focus. *Cogent Education, 6*(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1683933

Namaziandost, E., Neisi, L., Mahdavirad, F., & Nasri, M. (2019). The relationship between listening comprehension problems and strategy usage among advance EFL learners. *Cogent Psychology*, 6(1), 1-19. DOI: 10.1080/23311908.2019.1691338.

Namaziandost, E., Sabzevari, A., & Hashemifardnia, A. (2018). The effect of cultural materials on listening comprehension among Iranian upper-intermediate EFL

learners: In reference to gender. *Cogent Education,5*(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1560601.

Namaziandost, E., Shatalebi, V., & Nasri, M. (2019). The impact of cooperative learning on developing speaking ability and motivation toward learning English. *Journal of Language and Education*, *5*(3), 83-101. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9809.

Nasri, M., Namaziandost, E., & Akbari, S. (2019). Impact of pictorial cues on speaking fluency and accuracy among Iranian pre-intermediate EF learners. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 8*(3), 99-109

Sepehri, M., Hajijalili, M. & Namaziandost, E. (2019). Hedges and boosters in medical and engineering research articles: A comparative corpus-based study. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 9*(4), 215-225.

Shakibaei, G., Shahamat, F., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). The effect of using authentic texts on Iranian EFL learners' incidental vocabulary learning: The case of English newspaper. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT), 2*(5), 422-432

Sternin, I. A. (2007). Kontrastivnaja lingvistika (Contrastive linguistics). Moscow, Russia: Vostok-Zapad.

Tahmasbi, S., Hashemifardnia, A., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). Standard English or world Englishes: Issues of ownership and preference**.** *Journal of Teaching English Language Studies, 7*(3), 83-98.

Yershov, A.P. (1979). *Metodologii postroeniya dialogovykh sistem*. Fenomen delovoi prozy. Novosibirsk.

Yoo H. S., & Kulkova R. A. (2016). *Uchim merit' na russkij arshin." (Learn to measure on Russian Arshin).* Russkij jazyk za rubezhom, specvypusk. Korejskaja rusistika.

Yoo. H. S. (2016). Lexico-Semantic group znak – priznak – projavlenie – svidetel'stvo: Internal Language Group Analysis and Interlingual Analysis." *Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science (CCS&ES), Middlebury College, 2*, 34-42.