ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ СПЕЦИФИКИ МИКРОГРУПП «ТРУДОВАЯ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ, СВЯЗАННАЯ С ПИСЬМОМ, ЧЕРЧЕНИЕМ И ИЗОБРАЗИТЕЛЬНЫМ ИСКУССТВОМ» В РУССКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

И. Ю. Вострикова

*ФГБОУ ВО 'Воронежский государственный университет',
Воронеж, Россия, ivostrikova@mail.ru*

В статье выявляется степень выраженности национальной специфики микрогрупп "Трудовая деятельность, связанная с письмом, черчением и изобразительным искусством" ЛСП "Трудовая деятельность" глагольных единиц в русском и английском языках с применением приемов сопоставительно-параметрического метода. Национальная специфика характеризуется как умеренно-выраженная.

Ключевые слова: Национальная специфика, сопоставительно-параметрический метод; индекс; формализованные параметры.

REVEALING NATIONAL SPECIFICITY OF MICRO-GROUPS "LABOR ACTIVITY RELATED TO WRITING, DRAWING AND FINE ARTS" IN RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH

I. Y. Vostrikova

*Voronezh State University,
Voronezh, Russia, ivostrikova@mail.ru*

The paper presents the analysis of the national specificity of the micro-groups "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" within the lexico-semantic field of verbs "Labour activity" in Russian and English by means of the comparative-parametric method techniques. The national specificity is characterized as moderately-expressed.

Keywords: National specificity, comparative-parametric method; index; formalized parameters.

It is widely known that language is closely connected with people's life activity in any of its aspects: in everyday life, history, cultural traditions, description of nature.

The relationship between the language of people and its national peculiarities has been worrying linguists for several centuries. Different hypotheses about the influence of language on people suggested the discussion of the problem of "language and people". Over time, however, it became clear that the impact of language on people is secondary, and the primary is the impact of national specificity on the language of the people. Many scholars, starting from Humboldt in the 19th century and ending with the representatives of such relatively young linguistic sciences as linguoculturology and the theory

of intercultural communication, have addressed the question of the national cultural specificity of language.

In modern studies, linguists note that the very existence of language is oriented towards human beings, while each language is nationally specific. Determining the features and factors that reveal the specific properties of the national character of a particular language is a priority task of comparative linguistics at present. Thus, V.G. Gak notes that "the selection of features from the elements of reality when naming them is of paramount importance for the whole organization of the lexicon of a language. All differences in the lexical systems of two languages, in the stock of word meanings, in the use of words in speech, ultimately depend on the features by which the members of a given collective classify and name the objects of the extralinguistic world" [2, c.15].

Over the last ten years, priority in this field has been given to the comparative-parametric method [4, 5] developed within the Voronezh theoretical-linguistic school by M.A. Sternina and I.A. Sternin at Voronezh State University. The main principle of this method is the implementation and application of formalized parameters (indices) while describing and comparing different lexical-semantic groupings in two or more languages. This allows making a more objective conclusion about the degree of the distinction of national specificity in one or another language or its absence [4, c. 3]. The researchers have developed more than one hundred formalized parameters so far, the comparison of which makes it possible to compare the distinction of national specificity in different languages in percentage points or absolute numbers.

As an example two micro-groups "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" included in the lexical-semantic field "Labor activity" in the Russian and English languages are compared to define national specificity of lexico-semantic groups.

The microgroup under consideration in Russian is represented by 31 lexemes denoting labor activity that is directly related to the work of the hand: a) work related to writing: *записывать, конспектировать, писать, стенографировать,* etc.; b) work related to drafting and graphics: *гравировать, снимать, строить, чертить,* etc.; c) work related to drawing: *писать, раскрашивать, растушевывать, ретушировать, рисовать,* etc.; d) work involving molding: *ваять, лепить,* etc.

It should be noted that 13 lexemes of this micro-group (*ваять, конспектировать, раскрашивать, стенографировать,* etc.) are one-meaning lexemes, the majority develop polysemy, though.

Three more lexemes (*исписать, отпечатывать, разрисовывать*) of this micro-group are included here by the D1 sememe [3, c. 31-32]. Two lexemes (*печатать, снимать*) are placed into this micro-group by the D2

sememe and lexemes *строить* and *мазать* are included into the micro-group by the K1 sememe ("*вычерчивать графики*" and "*рисовать плохо*" respectively).

It is noteworthy that nine lexemes are included in the analyzed micro-group by two and three sememes. (E.g. the lexeme *записывать* – D1 "*занести на бумагу*" and K1 – "*исписать*").

Three lexemes (*писать, снимать, строить*) of the "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" micro-group are assigned to other micro-groups of the field under study at the same time. (E.g. the lexeme *писать* is included into this micro-group by two sememes: the D1 sememe "*изображать на бумаге знаки, цифры*" and the K1 sememe "*создавать произведение живописи*"; and by the another K1 sememe "*сочинять, создавать текст*" this lexeme is placed into the "Labour activity connected with creative work" micro-group).

Thus, the index of uniqueness of the studied structural unit [4, с. 9-11] in the Russian language is 41.94%. The index of belonging to the field of the "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" micro-group is 57.47% [4, с. 9-11]. The index of structural-semantic connectivity of the analysed micro-group with other structural units of the field [4, с. 9-11] is 9.68%. The index of lexico-semantic closure [1, с. 38] is 54.84%.

With reference to the English language, it should be mentioned that there are 71 lexemes in the micro-group "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" that denote: a) work related to writing: *book, calligraph, capitalize, character, draft, epitomize, pencil, print, stenograph, typewrite, write,* etc.; b) work related to drafting and graphics: *chart, contour, diagram, grave, map, plot, rule, style,* etc.; c) work related to drawing: *cartoon, colour, illustrate, paint, portray, profile, retouch, sketch,* etc.; d) work involving molding: *model, sculpture, shape,* etc.

24 lexemes of the analysed micro-group are one-meaning lexemes (*calk, effigiate, indent, stenograph,* etc.). In addition to one-meaning lexemes, another 19 lexemes are included in this micro-group by the D1 sememe (*adumbrate, cartoon, etch, illustrate, sculpture,* etc.). Ten lexemes belong to the micro-group by the D2 sememe (*paint, plot, print, rule,* etc.) and four lexemes are placed here by the K1 sememe (*accentuate, incise, scratch, style*).

Note that 14 lexemes (*chart, draw, pencil, schedule, trace, transcribe, type, write,* etc.) are included in the considered micro-group by two, three and four sememes. (E.g. the lexeme *trace* is included into this micro-group by four sememes: the D1 sememe "*to draft*", two D2 sememes "*to calk*" and "*to record*" and by the K1 sememe "*to calligraph*").

It should also be noted that 28 lexemes of in this micro-group also belong to other structural units of the field. (E.g. the lexeme *paint* is included here by the D2 sememe "*to make a picture using paints*"; also it is included into the micro-group "Labor activity related to construction" by the D1 sememe "*to cover a surface with paint*", into the micro-group "Labor activity related to music and art" by the K1 sememe "*apply make-up*", into the micro-group "Labor activity related to medicine" by the D2 sememe "*anoint*").

In this regard, the index of uniqueness of the micro-group "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" in English is 33.8%, and the index of belonging to the field of this micro-group is 62.07%. The index of structural-semantic connectivity is 39.44%, and the index of lexico-semantic closure is 35.21%.

To sum up, the distinction of national specificity of the micro-groups "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" of the lexico-semantic field "Labor activity" of verbs in Russian and English can be revealed. Four formalized parameters are used to compare these micro-groups: the index of uniqueness (41.94% in Russian and 33.8% in English), the index of belonging to the field (57.47% in Russian and 62.07% in English), the index of structural-semantic connectivity (9.68% in Russian and 39.44% in English) and the index of lexico-semantic closure (54.84% and 35.21% respectively)

The scales of determining the degree of the distinction of national specificity of lexical groups within the comparative-parametric method in terms of individual parameters for parameters expressed in percentage and in absolute numbers [4, c. 4-5] can be applied. The differences between six parameters are as follows:

• 41.94% in Russian and 33.8% in English – the difference is within the range 5%-10% (noticeable);

• 57.47% in Russian and 62.07% in English – the difference is within the range 1%-5% (observable);

• 9.68% in Russian and 39.44% in English – the difference is more than 10% (significant);

• 54.84% in Russian and 35.21% in English – the difference is more than 10% (significant).

Using the scale of expression of national specificity of lexical groups [4, c. 5-7] the national specificity of the micro-groups "Labor activity related to writing, drawing and fine arts" in two languages can be characterized as moderately-expressed since significant and noticeable differences are dominant.

Библиографические ссылки

1. *Вострикова И.Ю.* Национальная специфика лексико-семантического поля "Трудовая деятельность" в русском и английском языках (на материале глагольной лексики): дис. … канд. филол. наук. Воронеж, 2006.

2. *Гак В.Г.* Сопоставительная лексикология. (На материале французского и русского языков). М. : Междунар. отношения, 1977.

3. *Копыленко М.М.* Очерки по общей фразеологии. Воронеж : Издательство воронежского университета, 1988.

4. *Стернина М.А.* Сопоставительно-параметрический метод лингвистических Исследований. Воронеж: Истоки, 2014.

5. *Стернина М.А.* Сопоставительно-параметрический метод исследования: возможности и перспективы // Сопоставительные исследования 2011. Воронеж, 2011. С. 3-18.