



Semantic Field ‘Fairy Tales Heroes’ Relative to English

Gulnara Mohtarovna Nurtdinova¹, & Dilyara Marsova Sadykova²

¹Corresponding author, Institute of International Relations, Department of Theory and Practice of Translation, Kazan Federal University, Russia;
gnurtdinova@bk.ru

²Institute of International Relations, Department of Theory and Practice of Translation, Kazan Federal University, Russia; dmarsova@list.ru

Abstract

The article is presenting the results of the Tatar realia research. The authors have calculated the semantic distance coefficient (SDC) for one of the semantic fields of the Tatar realia “Fairy tales’ heroes”. It makes up 11.8, which shows that on average to explain the meanings of Tatar realia, we need approximately 12 words. This figure states the difference in perceiving world picture between Tatar and English peoples. The method of research is based on the statement proved by the linguists of Voronezh University (Russia). They believe the more words we need to explain the word meaning the less common concepts the pair languages have. We also compared the SDC for the other fields of the Tatar realia. For the field “Family” it makes up 8.57, for the field “Animals” it is 6.5, for the field “Religion” it is 12.44, for the field “Measures” it is 11.7, for the field “Food” it is 9.93, for the field “Household objects” it is 8.2. Thus, the numbers show in which fields we have fewer common concepts to avoid misunderstanding.

Keywords: Linguistics; Fairy Tales; Vocabulary; Lexical Gaps; Semantic Field.

1. Introduction

The word *lingua franca* was first invented by the Italians at the beginning of the 17th century. At that time, it represented a conglomeration of mainly Italian, consisting of French, Portuguese, Spanish, Turkish, Greek, and Arabic, and was predominantly used as a language of commerce. The word literally means “Frankish” since “Frank” has been a common name for all Western Europeans since around the 12th century. At the present time English plays the role of *lingua franca* in the world, however, sometimes it can be perceived as a threat to local languages and cultures (Bayyurt et al., 2019; Dippold, Bridges, Eccles, & Mullen, 2019; Jenkins, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2005; Si, 2019; Tweedie & Johnson, 2019; Wu, Mauranen, & Lei, 2020). On the one hand, English is a dominant language but on the other hand, being *lingua franca*, it can be a link between local cultures and can delete the line in the opposition friend/alien. Usually, people consider unknown things as something frightening or weird, so such prejudice can give rise to conflicts in all fields of our life and what is more important in the field of intercultural communication. One of the ways to prevent intercultural conflicts is to provide information about the traditions and lifestyles of various ethnic groups, the number of which is enormous. There are so many different cultures in the world that the exact number is impossible to declare. The difficulties in determining the number of cultures result due to the fact that “social entities are not always distinct enough to clearly warrant they are being considered as separate groups” (O’Neil, 2006). One of the definitions given in Wikipedia says “Culture is an umbrella term which encompasses the social behaviour and norms found in human societies, as well as the knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits of the individuals in these groups.” Moreover, because it is through the language that human beings express their views or opinions, language can be considered to ‘express cultural reality’ (Kuleli, 2019).

One of the ways to learn the new culture is to learn literary works both written and oral that contain the information about history, traditions, habits and other facts from the lifestyle. As English is *lingua franca* and literary works are usually written or told in the native language, they need to be translated into English in order to present the information to the world community. While translating a translator faces many problems, and one of them is how to



translate non-equivalent (out of vocabulary words or untranslated words). Non-equivalent words do not have straightforward equivalents in language A. Such words usually are researched for a pair of languages because they can have the equivalent in the language A, but they cannot have it in language B (Vereshchagin & Kostomarov, 2005). Many researchers have studied this phenomenon and tried to classify them. We support the classification made by L. Barchudarov, Russian linguist (Barchudarov, 1975). He distributed such words into three groups as follows: 1. Proper names; 2. Realias; 3. Occasional lacunas. We are researching realia, but this notion also has other names such as “culture-specific concepts” (Baker, 2018), “cultural words” (Newmark, 2010) culture (Nord, 1991) and culture-specific items (Davies, 2003). In Russia, the most accepted term is realia, and as we support the classification of L. Barchudarov, we will use this term.

1.1. Research Objective

The article presents the results of the research in the Tatar Realias.

2. Material and Methods

We are using general scientific (historical) and private (linguistic) methods such as comparative and semantic analyses (Mubarakshina & Abdrakhmanova, 2019) to research Tatar realias. We selected them from Tatar fairy tales written in 1900 and 1939-1940 in the Tatar language. Our choice is due to the fact that folklore works have a lot of culture-specific concepts. Moreover, as the Tatar language is spoken mostly on the territory of the Republic of Tatarstan which is one of the regions of Russia, where the most part of the population speaks Russian, so Tatar culture-specific concepts can be found mostly in the works of older times. The research is based on the method devised by the linguists of Voronezh University (Russia). They developed the formula of semantic distance coefficient: $SDC = D/Q$. It helps to show the difference in perceiving the world picture by the people speaking different languages. In the opinion of Russian linguist N. Fenenko, the first step while conducting the research of semantic gaps is to select the words that do not have straightforward equivalents in another language (Fenenko, 2013). Russian linguist V. Titov believes that the more words we need to explain the word meaning the less common concepts the pair languages have (Titov, 2002). So, we have selected Tatar non-equivalent words from the corpus of Tatar Fairy tales told by native speakers and exuded proper names. Then we have distributed them in a few thematic groups. One of the groups is “Fairy tales”, and we have calculated SDC for it, where D is the sum of all the words of the definitions in the semantic field and Q is the number of all the definitions in the semantic field. Basing this method, we have researched SDC for such semantic fields as “Family and Human Being Environment”, “Food”, “Household Objects”, “Measures: “Religion” and “Animals”.

3. Results and Discussion

It is well known that culture is encoded in language. While reading a text or in the process of communication one can easily define the culture to which a speaker or a reader belongs to due to various signs such as proper names or realias (culture-specific words). While translating a source text or a statement, a translator usually faces the problem of how to translate these culture signs presented by non-equivalent words. Non-equivalent words include proper names, realias and occasional lacunas (Barchudarov, 1975). On the one hand, it is not so difficult how to translate these words because there are some translation techniques such as transcription, transliteration, borrowing, calque, equivalence, adaptation, explanation and others. On the other hand, all of them have merits and demerits. First three are good for translating proper names but not much relevant to translate realias and occasional lacunas because they cannot present the meaning of the word. The rest techniques usually increase the volume of the text that causes problems for publication. We believe that one of the ways to solve the problem of translating realias and occasional lacunas is to make an explanatory dictionary, the definitions of which can be used to understand the target text (statement) and target culture. Here we are presenting the fragment of the explanatory dictionary of the Tatar realia. This fragment contains the definitions of Tatar folktales heroes in English. They are presented mostly by the nouns, and some of them are free word combinations (Sitdikova, Eremeyeva, & Valieva, 2017). At the end of the definition, we show the number of words we need to explain the meaning of the realia as the more words we need, the less common concepts the languages have. Some definitions were translated by the authors and edited by native speakers of English.

Pari - n. mythical superhuman being, originally represented as evil but subsequently as a good or graceful genie or fairy, a spirit in the image of a beautiful woman who protects people from evil. **32**

Qaf Mount - mysterious mountain was renowned as the "farthest point of the earth" owing to its location at the far side of the ocean encircling the earth fairy mountain. **26**

Shuraleh – n. shortish (cobby) and humpback wood goblin with long thin fingers and long legs, he has a short beard and a horn in the forehead. **25**

Iya – n. spectre, ghost, spirit, brownie spirit that lives in the house, forest and cattle shed, usually protects people from troubles. **20**

Ubyr-Taz – n. hero of Tatar fairy tales, very cunning and smart, however, he is considered a dummy; scabby man. **18**

(D)Jinn – n. genie, spirit which appears and disappears by magic and obeys the person who controls it. **17**

Su iya – water spirit, a woman or a man was living in the water with a fishtail. **15**

Yuha – n. a thousand-year-old dragoon turned to a female werewolf, an evil dragoon. **14**

Salam-Torkhan – n. a jackdaw in peacock's feathers, a lazy person, a hero of fairy tales. **14**

Div padishah- ruler of a class of divine beings, which are evil. **10**

Div pari – ruler of a class of divine beings, which are evil. **10**

Shombai – n. a fairy tales character, pushful/intrusive person; slyboots, blunderer. **10**

Div – n. evil and stupid giant divine being who kidnaps girls. **9**

Azhdaha – n. fairy tale dragon, kidnapping people; big snake. **8**

Atbash-Syerayak – n. the monster with horse head and cow legs **8**

Shaitan (Shaytan) – n. the Devil, Satana, or evil spirit. **7**

Ifrit – n. ifrit, afreet, powerful jinn or demon. **7**

Kyrygaldar – n. man, who is a sly cheater. **7**

Hal-ahval – n. life, the way thing going on. **7**

Ule su - water that helps to heal the wounds. **7**

Pahlevan – n. batyr, powerful and strong man. **6**

Ubyr (Ubyrly karchyk) – n. witch, werewolf, vampire woman. **5**

Simurgh – n. a benevolent, mythical bird. **5**

Tere su – the elixir of life. **4**

Batyr – n. powerful and strong man **4**

We have calculated the Semantic distance coefficient (SDC). To do it we used the formula derived by V. Titov, $SDC = D/Q$, where D is the sum of all the words of the definitions and Q is the number of all the definitions in the dictionary (Titov, 2002). It is 11.8 (Table 1).

Table 1. *Heroes of Tatar fairy tales*

| Number of Explanatory Words | Number of specific culture words | Total number of words |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 5 | 2 | 10 |
| 6 | 1 | 6 |
| 7 | 5 | 35 |
| 8 | 2 | 16 |
| 9 | 1 | 9 |

| | | |
|----|------|---------------|
| 10 | 3 | 30 |
| 14 | 2 | 28 |
| 15 | 1 | 15 |
| 17 | 1 | 17 |
| 18 | 1 | 18 |
| 20 | 1 | 20 |
| 25 | 1 | 25 |
| 26 | 1 | 26 |
| 32 | 1 | 32 |
| | Q=25 | D=295 |
| | | SDC= D/Q=11.8 |

Thus, on average we need approximately twelve words to present the heroes of the Tatar folktales for English speaking people.

Some of the definitions can be found on the internet because such names as Div, Pari, Mount Qaf and Simurgh are the heroes of Persian folklore. It is a well-known fact that cultural world picture is different due to the different climate conditions and historical development (Andreyeva, Korneva, & Sakhbullina, 2019). Tatars accepted Islam in 922, and it was introduced by missionaries from Bagdad around the time of Ibn Fadlan's journey in 922. This is one of the reasons that we have common realias with the countries where Islam is confessed, and that is one more proof that culture is encoded in language.

4. Summary

We have conducted the research of the Tatar realias in the filed "Heroes of Tatar Folktales" which has revealed that Tatars and English have little common in this field as SDC makes up 11.8. So, some folktales creatures such as Shuraleh, Iya, Ubyr (Ubyrly karchyk), Atbash-Syerayak, Yuha need many words for explanation, and some are known to English people as they came from Persian folklore due to similar religion. Some creatures can have similar features, but in the process of translation, it is better to use transcription as they have different nuances. The hero Shuraleh can be translated as a goblin, but it is better to learn its specific characteristic.

Shuraleh – shortish (cobby) and humpback wood goblin with long thin fingers and long legs, he has a short beard and a horn in the forehead. Shuraleh can tickle to death. Frequently it gets back horses from a herd and rides them to death. People catch Shuraleh by salving horseback with resin. Shuraleh is afraid of water so one can be saved by jumping across a brook.

Ubyr (Ubyrly karchyk) is a vampire, but in Tatar fairy tales it is usually presented as an old woman.

All peoples in the world have fairy tales, and the plots of them are similar, but all tales have their own particularity.

5. Conclusions

Semantic distance coefficient for the field "Heroes of Tatar Folktales" makes up 11.8 while for the field "Family" it makes up 8.57 (Gulnara M. Nurtdinova, 2015), for the field "Animals" it is 6.5, for the field "Religion" it is 12.44 (Gulnara M. Nurtdinova & Sadykova, 2018), for the field "Measures" it is 11.7, for the field "Food" it is 9.93 (Gulnara Mohtarovna Nurtdinova & Prosyukova, 2017), for the field "Household objects" it is 8.2. As we see the Tatar language has much common with the English language in the semantic field "Animals" that can be explained by the fact that we have similar climate conditions and similar animals but in the past Tatars were nomads and their attitude to such an animal as a horse is different. The semantic field where we have less common is the field "Religion" due to different historical development. In the field "Heroes of Tatar Folktales," the Tatar language has some realias that need from 4 to 32 words to explain their meaning. Thus, some of the heroes can be perceived as weird and cause some misunderstanding so it should be taken into account while translating and in the process of intercultural communication.

5.1. Contribution

The authors measured the semantic distance coefficient (SDC) for one of the semantic fields of the "Fairy Tales Heroes" Tatar realia.

Acknowledgements

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

References

- Andreyeva, Y. A., Korneva, I. G., & Sakhibullina, K. A. (2019). Values and anti-values in figurative phraseological units in the Russian and German languages. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(4), 427–432.
- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. Routledge.
- Barchudarov, L. C. (1975). *Language and Translation*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya. [In Russian]
- Bayyurt, Y., Yavuz, K., Öztekin, E., Guerra, L., Cavalheiro, L., & Pereira, R. (2019). English language teachers' awareness of English as a lingua franca in multilingual and multicultural contexts. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 185–202.
- Davies, E. E. (2003). A goblin or a dirty nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of the Harry Potter books. *The Translator*, 9(1), 65–100.
- Dippold, D., Bridges, S., Eccles, S., & Mullen, E. (2019). Taking ELF off the shelf: Developing HE students' speaking skills through a focus on English as a lingua franca. *Linguistics and Education*, 54, 100761.
- Fenenko, N. A. (2013). *French realias in the aspect of the theory of renomination*. Voronezh: Izdatelstvo Voronezhskogo Universiteta. [In Russian]
- Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford University Press.
- Kuleli, M. (2019). Identification of translation procedures for culture specific items in a short story. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3).
- Mubarakshina, A. M., & Abdrakhmanova, A. A. (2019). Theoretical bases of studying the vocabulary of sensory perception in the system of scientific research (On the material of Russian-speaking v. Nabokov's prose). *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(6), 93–97.
- Newmark, P. (2010). Translation And Culture (Dedicated Now To The Dear Memory Of A Fine Translation Teacher And Translation Critic Gunilla Anderson). *Meaning in Translation*, 19, 171.
- Nord, C. (1991). Text Analysis in Translation: Theory. *Methodology, and Didactic Application of a*.
- Nurtdinova, Gulnara M. (2015). Semantic distance coefficient for semantic field of tatar culture specific concepts" family and human being environment" and their lacunas in English. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 8(4), 169.
- Nurtdinova, Gulnara M., & Sadykova, D. M. (2018). Semantic Distance Coefficient for Semantic Field Religion of Tatar Culture-Specific Concepts and Their Equivalents in English. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 409–412.
- Nurtdinova, Gulnara Mohtarovna, & Prosyukova, K. O. (2017). Semantic Distance Coefficient for Semantic Field" Food"TM of Tatar Culture-Specific Concepts and their equivalents in English. *Revista Publicando*, 4(13 (2)), 711–720.
- O'Neil, D. (2006). World diversity patterns. *Retrieved From*.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), 339–341.
- Si, J. (2019). English as a Lingua Franca: A New Approach for English Language Teaching in China? *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 42(1), 113–135.



- Sitdikova, F. B., Eremeyeva, G. R., & Valieva, G. F. (2017). Implicit Negation in Dialogue Discourse. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 6(6), 175–181.
- Titov, V. T. (2002). Obshshaya kvantativnaya lexicologiya romanskich yazykov (General Quantitative Lexicology of Romanic Languages). *Voronezh: Izdatelstvo Voronezhskogo Universiteta, Russia*.
- Tweedie, M. G., & Johnson, R. C. (2019). Research directions in medical English as a lingua franca (MELF). *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 13(3), e12312.
- Vereshchagin, E. M., & Kostomarov, V. G. (2005). Yazyk i kul'tura [Language and culture]. *Moscow, Indrik Publ*.
- Wu, X., Mauranen, A., & Lei, L. (2020). Syntactic complexity in English as a lingua franca academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 43, 100798.



© 2020 by the authors. Licensee Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

