

Bilingualism, Norm, Interference (Based on the Material from Spoken Tatar)

By

Fauzia Kabirovna Sagdeeva

Candidate of Philology, senior research scientist of the Department of General linguistics,
Institute of Language, Literature and Art of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences

Email: fauzija.sagdeewa@yandex.ru

ORCID 0000-0002-0406-631X,

Chulpan Zufarovna Abdullina

Candidate of Philology, senior research scientist of the Department of General linguistics,
Institute of Language, Literature and Art of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences

Alfiya Karimovna Bulatova

Candidate of Philology, senior research scientist of the Department of General linguistics,
Institute of Language, Literature and Art of Tatarstan Academy of Sciences

Alsu Khalilovna Ashrapova

A post graduate student, Institute of Language, Literature and Art of Tatarstan Academy of
Sciences

Abstract

One of the main trends in the language development of the Republic of Tatarstan is bilingualism. The most common type of bilingualism is Tatar-Russian bilingualism. National-national bilingualism is widespread in the border areas of the Republic (for example, Bashkir-Tatar or Tatar-Bashkir, Tatar-Chuvash or Chuvash-Tatar, etc.). Russian-Tatar bilingualism is of Great social and political importance. But it is not widespread in Tatarstan. Russian-Tatar bilingualism has certain differences from other forms of national-Russian and Russian-national bilingualism. First of all, they are caused by the presence of their own national qualities in each of them, as well as by the commonality and difference in the structural and functional stylistic features of the Tatar and Russian languages. The norm for the theory of bilingualism is a very important concept, since it is a criterion for the qualitative assessment of the speech of a bilingual individual in both their native and non-native languages. Bilingualism, contributing to the intensive interaction of languages, is projected on the bilingual language consciousness. This is reflected in the interfering influence of both the native language on the second language and the second language on the native language. This article attempts to continue studying the phenomenon of interference based on the material of the Tatar oral speech, to reveal the causes and mechanisms of its manifestation. However, we will only touch on some aspects of this problem, namely, the use of lexical units of the Russian language in the native speech of Tatar bilinguals. This work is of some importance in the development of the problems of development of bilingualism in the Republic of Tatarstan, as well as to improve the culture of the Tatar speech in the conditions of the Tatar-Russian and Russian-Tatar bilingualism.

Keywords: Bilingualism, Bilingual Individual, Bilingual, Speech Culture, Norm, Interference, The Russian Language, Spoken Tatar

1. Introduction

Tatar-Russian bilingualism and the development of complex processes of Tatar-Russian linguistic contacts have left a distinctive mark on Tatar oral speech of a bilingual Tatar, which is characterized by certain fluctuations and deviations in different tiers of the speech structure caused by an interfering influence of the Russian language.

The lexical level of spoken Tatar is most susceptible of interfering influence of the Russian language. This is especially evident in the fact that semantically diverse words from Russian penetrate into spoken Tatar.

Scholars, relying on the achievements of the modern theory of speech culture, have justified the need for studying this phenomenon since it is of independent scientific interest.

Bilingualism is projected onto linguistic consciousness of a bilingual, which contributes to the interpenetration of languages. This is reflected in the interfering influence of the mother tongue on the second language and the second language on the native one.

The purpose of the paper is to pinpoint the types of bilingualism common on the territory of Tatarstan, as well as to elicit and describe the interfering influence of the Russian language on the Tatar language, which becomes obvious in the process of using lexical units of the Russian language in the Tatar oral speech of bilingual Tatars. The source of actual material of the inquiry are interference phenomena records. When writing this article, more than 100 informants were engaged in the interview. As a reference source, explanatory dictionaries of the Tatar and Russian languages, bilingual Tatar-Russian and Russian-Tatar dictionaries were used. When solving this goal, the following *methods* were used: observation, descriptive method, generalization, method of component analysis, conversation with informants.

This work is of particular importance in elaborating the problems of the development of bilingualism in the Republic of Tatarstan, as well as improving the culture of spoken Tatar in the conditions of Tatar-Russian and Russian-Tatar bilingualism.

2. The Character of Development of Bilingualism in Tatarstan

Currently, in the territory of Tatarstan, there are different types of bilingualism. In the borderland of the Republic of Tatarstan, national-national (bilateral) bilingualism is widespread (for example, Tatar-Chuvash and Chuvash-Tatar, Tatar-Mari and Mari-Tatar, Bashkir-Tatar or Tatar-Bashkir, etc.) [1: 107] ... This type of bilingualism with both components expressed by the literary forms of languages mainly functions in the spheres of education in mixed general academic schools. However, the most common is national-national bilingualism with both components expressed in vernacular or dialectal forms which is mainstream within and in the marginal zones of the region. N. I. Isanbayev writes, “According to the dispersal of contacting languages, the interaction of the Eastern Mari dialects (Baltachevsk, Belebeysk, Birsk, Kaltasinsk, Belsk and Tatarstan (Menzelinsk) can be qualified as intraregional, and the interaction of the Morkinsk-Sernursk dialect of the meadow dialect (Shinshinsk-Shorunsk and Mari -Turek, Paranginsky kusty), Malmyzhsky, Elabuga, Kasno-Ufi (Malaya Tavra village)) dialects of the eastern dialect – as a marginal, borderline” [2: 19]. National-national bilingualism especially wide functionates in the spheres of family and everyday communication, trade, etc.

Multilingualism in the republic is common among representatives of small nationalities and ethnic groups (Bashkirs, Chuvash, Mordovians, Mari, Ukrainians, etc.) who speak their

native languages. Some of the Tatars who live in the neighborhood of these peoples are also multilingual. One-sided national-Russian bilingualism (in particular, Tatar-Russian) is the most prevailing type of bilingualism in Tatarstan.

Bilingualism at the present stage is integral to social life of a multinational society of a multinational country, in particular the multinational Republic of Tatarstan since it provides connections between national regions, including the exchange of experience, material and cultural values, facilitates communication between people of different nationalities in the process of their joint activities.

3. Lexical Interference in Spoken Language of Tatar Bilingualists in Terms of Speech Culture

The frontmost aspects of considering the issues of speech culture in the context of bilingualism is the study of the phenomenon of interference. It is now manifest that one cannot seriously approach understanding the mechanism of linguistic change without an intense study of the social factors that determine the evolution of language. From our point of view the same is applicable in the study of the so-called reverse interference often observed in bilingual Tatars' spoken language.

L. K. Bayramova points to the fact that by origin interference is subdivided into internal (intralingual) and external (interlingual), each of which fall into certain groups [5: 6]. So, intralingual interference can be subdivided into: a) paraphasia, b) formation by false analogy, c) contamination [6: 6, 1].

Cross-language interference associated with the transfer of skills of a native language of the bilingual to the studied one is usually subdivided into: a) lexical, b) semantic, c) lexical and semantic, d) phonetic, e) accentological, g) morphological, h) syntactic. It follows therefrom that the nature and essence of external and internal interference are different. According to L. Ayupova, a purely linguistic approach to their study is insufficient, it is necessary to take into account external and social factors [7].

Currently, the term *interference* is also used to consider the results of the influence of Russian on national languages (on Tatar in a given case). There are works of our times which have engaged the question of interference of natural (national) language, but this problem has been partially solved in connection with other questions. This refers to the study of an abstract interference. It is most often attributable to borrowing that penetrates from the Russian language into the national language, calquing, the formation of a common lexicon in Russian and national languages, etc.

The lexical level of Tatar speech is most susceptible to the interfering influence of the Russian language. Words with different meanings penetrate from the Russian language into the Tatar oral speech.

The material analyzed shows that the use of Russian words and expressions in spoken Tatar answers to certain communication purposes. Tatar speech could do without them, seeing that from the point of view of the culture of speech it is wrong. However, this type of oral speech today serves as a kind of communication and is massive. Therefore, we cannot but reckon with the existence of this phenomenon and must find out why this happens in conditions of bilingualism.

And yet it seems that the final reason for interference of Russian words in spoken Tatar should be sought in extralinguistic factors and in the totality of the laws of development of the very language that borrows them.

Thus, it is possible to explain the fact that, for example, in spoken Tatar the words that have come from the Russian language such as *ничу* (ничего), *гунчим* (вообщем) function regularly in a modified form. And the words, such as, for example, *жәлләү* (жалеть), *бит* (ведь), *гер* (гиря), etc. are lexicalized in explanatory and Russian-Tatar dictionaries.

When analyzing the use of Russian words in Tatar speech, a kind of difference was found between the meanings of seemingly equivalent Russian and Tatar words. It turns out that certain Russian words can enter into definite functional-semantic relations with the words corresponding to them in the Tatar language. These words undergo semantic changes expressed in the formation of a new meaning, introduced by the native speaker of the Tatar language. The meaning of the Russian word in the native oral speech of a Tatar bilingual is transformed in accordance with a communicative aim.

As you know, in any language there cannot be two words that could be considered as absolute synonyms, then we would have two different variants of the vocabulary in one language, that is impossible. Therefore, each loan word that has a synonym in the original language must have its proper character of a semantic connotation. Otherwise, it either displaces the original word from the language, causing harm to it, or it cannot solidify in the lexicon of this language. Such a redistribution of semantic loads is observed in the previous examples which have already come into the Tatar language.

In spoken Tatar, Russian and Tatar words usually have some coincidence in the meaning and are unlikely to be substituted, since beyond their congruity, they are very different in meaning and in use. A word from the Russian language used in native speech may have a greater or lesser breadth of meaning. Sometimes the Russian word may turn out to have narrower meaning than the Tatar one. Let us give an example. Interesting is the use of the Russian word *вечеринка* (*party*) in this context: – *Мәҗлес үткәрәсезме! – Юк, вечеринка гына*. It is meant by the word *мәҗлес* a celebration to which many guests are asked to come. Using the Russian word *вечеринка*, the informant differentiates his thought more clearly. He wants to invite his close relatives and friends. In this case, the use of the word *вечеринка* is explained by the narrowness of its meaning in relation to the Tatar word *мәҗлес*. In other words, the meaning of the Russian word in speech can be determined not only by its relation to the subject, but also by its relation to the meaning of the Tatar word.

It is not infrequent that a great discrepancy between the content of signs in Russian and Tatar words can lead to the appearance of two independent words in the speech of a Tatar. The penetration of this kind of words into Tatar speech is much more likely to be caused by the need to facilitate communication when it is necessary to distinguish between significates. In other words, if a word from the Tatar language can denote both a singular feature and their combination; then the used Russian word meets only one of these conditions.

Some Russian words in Tatar oral speech acquire new semantic and emotive shades. In our opinion, such units are introduced when in the native language there are no words containing a necessary expression. The very possibility of their use in speech lies in their attribute of words to convey conceptual and evaluative content.

The vocabulary of the Tatar language has a fair number of synonyms, which makes it

possible for a spoken language to convey various emotional and expressive colors. Apparently, an affective meaning is important in words of this type, which is used by the speaker depending on the context of speech situation. Nuanced semantic richness is customary to be divided into two large categories: meanings with a positive and negative tinge.

In the overwhelming majority of cases of this kind, Russian words in Tatar spoken language are most often used as stylistically negative means. For example: *Хэзерге яшьлар шундый образованный, хэтта олылар сүзенә бөтенләй дә колак салмыйлар.* (Современная (нынешняя) молодежь такая образованная, что даже не прислушивается к словам старших).

In this expression, the Russian word *образованный* is used instead of the Tatar word *укымышлы*. This Russian word is the semantic and emotional center of the utterance. In this context, both the Russian word *образованный* and the Tatar *укымышлы* have the same meaning. However, under the influence of the evaluative connotation, the correlation of these words proved to be different [9: 104].

This means that in the given example the fact of choosing and using a Russian word and an additional emotional and stylistic element arising from the very use of this word is important.

The words that express concepts the content of which is feeling, also come from the Russian language into the living Tatar speech. For example: *Ужасно матур хатын.* (Ужасно красивая женщина / An eerily beautiful woman). The Russian word *ужасно* and the Tatar word *матур* form together a phrase with a strong emotional connotation, which is intensified by the contradiction between the contents of these words. The use of such words, in all probability, is based on the fact that the informant considers them best suited for conveying the emotional content of the utterance, i.e. he chooses from two languages the means corresponding to his attitude.

The observations also show that doublets from the Russian language often come into the colloquial Tatar language. In other words, interchangeable words of the Russian and Tatar languages coexist in spoken language. This interchangeability is explained by the fact that the words of the two languages are equal in their functional charge. The speaker himself/herself most often does not notice these mutual substitutions. For example: *Свекровь янына барам.* (К свекрови иду / I'm going to my mother-in-law). *Школда укыйм.* (В школе учусь / I study at school).

So, as evidenced by the material analyzed, the use of Russian words in Tatar oral speech satisfies certain communication goals. However, from the point of view of the standardized Tatar literary language, the fact of their use in Tatar spoken language does not mean its legitimacy. From the above examples, it is clear that interference does not affect the structure of the language, its system. A native speaker of the Tatar language understands the difference between a standardized language and his/her own mastering, but he/she cannot readjust himself/herself.

4. Conclusion

As evidenced by the results of this paper, one of the leading trends in the linguistic life of the Republic of Tatarstan is the development of Tatar-Russian bilingualism which become manifest in the use of the Russian language and the Tatar language in various fields of activity with account taken of specific situation of communication.

The study of the interfering influence of Russian on Tatar made it possible to describe the phenomenon of interference in relation to the cultural-speech aspect from the point of view of its manifestation in the Tatar spoken language of bilingual Tatars.

The Tatar spoken language in the conditions of active Tatar-Russian bilingualism is very mobile. It is mobile in the sense that words and phrases from the Russian language freely penetrate into it. Such speech is common, but this does not mean that it is correct.

Part of Russian words in Tatar speech of a bilingual can take various semantic forms depending on the extralinguistic and linguistic factors. As a result, there are certain semantic relations between these words and the corresponding Tatar words.

These words and expressions have nothing to do with linguistic borrowings that have entered into the lexical system of the Tatar language. They are almost not fixed in the language and can be ousted by the sourced words of the Tatar language. Their use in speech is the result of interference and does not affect the linguistic system of the Tatar language, but only characterizes the spoken language of bilingual Tatars in the bilingual environment.

References

- [1] 1. Al-Jubari I, Mosbah A, Talib Z. Do intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relate to entrepreneurial intention differently? A self-determination theory perspective. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*. 2019;25(25):1-14. Available from: <https://www.abacademies.org/articles/8658.html>
 - Ch. Z. Abdulina, “The Question of the Determination of Types of Bilingualism”. Issue 2, P.106–109, 2019.
 - [2] N.I. Isanbayev, “The Basic Types of Mari-Tatar Language Communication”. *The Problems of Bilingualism and Multilingualism в современных условиях*. Йошкар-Ола, С. 17–20, 1993.
 - [3] L.A. Shaigerova, R.S. Shilko, Y. P. Zinchenko, “Bilingualism and multilingualism as an interdisciplinary phenomenon: socio-cultural context, research problems and perspectives”. *National Psychological Journal*, [Natsional’nyy psikhologicheskiy zhurnal], vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 3–15. doi:10.11621/npj.2019.0101
 - [4] A. Ashrapova, R. Zamaletdinov, A. Uderbaev, “Code Switching and Linguistic Identity”. *Modern journal of language teaching methods*. Vol.8, Is.11. pp.124–132. 2018.
 - [5] L.K. Bairamova, “Introduction into Contrastive Linguistics: Manual for Graduate Students”. Kazan: Kazan University Press, 119 p, 1994.
 - [6] Y.Y. Desherieva, “Problems of Interference and Language Scarcity (Based on the Material of Spoken Russian of English Native Speakers)”. М. 259 p, 1976.
 - [7] L.L. Ayupova, “The Questions of Sociolinguistics: Types of Bilingualism in Bashkiria”. Sverdlovsk: Ural University Press, 69 p, 1988.
 - [8] A.H. Ashrapova, A. Yusupova, “Language and national identity in linguistic dictionaries (on the material of bilingual dictionary of the Tatar language of the 19th century and the turn of the 20th century)”. *Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 318–321, 2015.
 - [9] F.K. Sagdeeva, “The Problems of Culture of Spoken Tatar in the Conditions of Active Bilingualism”. Kazan: Ficker, 160 p, 2003.
 - [10] A. Pavlenko, “Emotion and Emotion-Laden Words in the Bilingual Lexicon”. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. Cambridge: CUP, vol.11, no. 2, pp. 147–164, 2008.
 - [11] A. Ashrapova E. Litvinenko, D. “Shakirova Language identity and its context policies [Identidad del lenguaje y sus politicas de contexto]”. *Utopia y Praxis Latinoamericana*. Vol. 24, Is. Extra5, pp. 44–50, 2019.
- Fauzia Kabirovna Sagdeeva, 1) born in 1960; 2) Candidate of Philology; 3) V. I. Ulyanov-Lenin Kazan State University, 1985. Was awarded the qualification of a philologist.

- Teacher; 4) a dissertation defence *The Problems of the Culture of Tatar Spoken Language in Conditions of Active Bilingualism*, 2001; 5) a leading research associate of the department of general linguistics of the autonomous structural unit “G. Ibragimov Institute of Language, Literature and Art of AS RT”; 6) areas of expertise: sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, cognitive linguistics, speech culture, semasiology.
- Chulpan Zufarovna Abdullina, 1) born in 1989; 2) no degree; 3) Kazan Federal University, 2012. Qualification: Manager with a degree in Human Resources Management; 4) The topic of the thesis *Opportunities for Improvement of the Personnel Management System in Organization (The Case Study: JSC “NofisKosmetiks”)*; 5) postgraduate student of the third year of study majoring in Linguistics and Literary Studies – 06.45.01, profile: Languages of the peoples of the Russian Federation (Tatar language) - 02.10.02, the autonomous structural unit “G. Ibragimov Institute of Language, Literature and Art of AS RT”; 6) areas of expertise: language policy, language situation, speech culture, semasiology.
- Bulatova Alfiya Karimovna, 1) born in 1982; 2) Candidate of Philology; 3) Kazan State Pedagogical University, 2005; 4) a dissertation defence *Polysemy in the Modern Tatar Literary Language*, 2012; 5) Researcher of the Department of Lexicology and Dialectology of the autonomous structural unit “G. Ibragimov Institute of Language, Literature and Art of AS RT”; 6) areas of expertise: lexicology, dialectology, lexicography, grammar, sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, translation theory.
- Ashrapova Alsu Khalilovna 1) born in 1980; 2) Candidate of Philology; 3) Kazan State Pedagogical University, 2003; 4) a dissertation defence *Functional-Semantic Field of Conditionality in Multi-Structural Languages*, 2006; 5) Head of the Department of Language and Intercultural Communication, IFIC KFU, Associate Professor; 6) areas of expertise: lexicology, comparative lexicology and syntax, bilingualism, identity.