

«Күйде» баяндаушы мен кейіпкерлер арасындағы «ара қашықтық» бірде алыстай түссе, бірде жымдасып кетеді. Баяндаушы өзі суреттеп отырған оқиғалардың куәгері ретінде қабылданады. Мысал келтіріп көрейік: «Бірде Жөнейіт көрші ауылға барып қайтып келе жатып, ауыл шетіне іліге бере дутардың үнін естіді. Жұрт бұның үйіне дәт қылып кіре бермейтін; ауылда қалған адамның бәрі үйдің көлеңкесіне шығыпты, қазан басында құрт қайнатып жүрген қатын-қалаш та жер ошаққа үділіп мүлгіп отыр. Бұл да құлақ салып еді, тамыр-тамырыңды мұздатып әкетіп бара жатқан салқын саз екен» немесе «Аттылы-түйелі қара құрым тізбектің қыр соңында алты тұтқын келеді. Мынау жер қайысқан қалың дүрмектің өздерін қандай күнге тап қылатынын біле алмай, айналаға алақ-жулақ қарай береді». Баяндаушы кейде оқиғаға тікелей араласса, кейде оның орнын кейіпкердің өзі басады, сөйтіп баяндаушы мен кейіпкер ойлары араласып кетеді. Ал шығарма соңында баяндаушы «дауысы» естілмейді, тек Жөнейіттің ішкі монологына ерік беріледі.

Әдебиет тізімі:

1. Әбдезұлы Қ. Қазақ прозасы және ұлттық идея: Оқу құралы. – Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2005.
2. Бекниязов Т. Кейіпкердің адамгершілік проблемасы. – Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 1997.
3. Кекілбаев Ә. Ханша Дария хикаясы. Балладалар мен роман. – Алматы: Атамұра, 2003.
4. Кішібеков Д., Сыдықов Ұ. Философия. – Алматы: Атамұра-Қазақстан, 1994.
5. Пірәлиева Г. Көркем прозадағы психологизмнің кейбір мәселелері (Түс көру, бейвербалды ишараттар, заттық әлем). Монография. – Алматы: Алаш, 2003.

*Morel Morel Dmitry Alexander,
Belgorod National Research University,
associate professor, Department of foreign
languages and professional communication*

Existential concepts in the Russian naïve picture of the world: dynamics revealed through diachronic comparative study of associative fields

The subject matter of concepts of culture is of great interest and topicality to researchers in the fields of linguoculturology and cognitive linguistics¹.

¹ Q. v.: Колесов В. В. Концепт культуры: образ – понятие – символ. Вестник СПбУ. Сер. 2. История, языкознание, литературоведение. 1992. Вып. 3 (№ 16). С. 30–40. Воркачев С. Г. Лингвокультурная концептология: становление и перспективы. ИРАН СЛЯ. 2007. Т. 66, № 2. С. 13–22. Степанов Ю. С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. М. Языки русской культуры. 1997.

According to V. A. Maslova “core (basic) units of the picture of the world having existential significance both for an individual linguistic identity and community in whole” can be referred to as key concepts of culture¹. M. V. Pinenova specifies that such concepts should “occur in frequent common forms of language — words, collocations, proverbs and sayings, riddles”² and gives their classification: 1) universal categories of culture (categories of philosophy), 2) sociocultural categories, 3) categories of national culture, 4) ethical categories, 5) mythological categories (including religious ones)³.

We have undertaken our own study of several “constants of culture”⁴ to corroborate the hypothesis that the dynamics of such concepts can be somewhat schematically but reliably revealed through the analysis of the alterations in structure and content of their associative fields over time⁵. The study has also shown that the above-mentioned classification should be supplemented with “existential concepts”.

Such universal concepts being deeply entrenched in any modern culture meet the specific ontology of existentials of human being conceived as “a new interpretation of metaphysics faced human, his fear, loneliness, anguish, freedom, despair, boredom, nausea as transcendentalia determining the human being”⁶.

The subject of the present study is the concept “fear” in the naïve Russian picture of the world, whereas the scope has been limited to associative fields of stimulus ‘страх (fear)’ fixed as of 1988–1997 (T_0) and 2013–2014 (T_1). The first field is built upon the materials of “Russian associative dictionary”, while the second one is retrieved from the results of the author experiment reproducing the raw data acquisition procedure adopted in the mentioned dictionary⁷. Then followed morphological and semantic clusterization⁸ and “comparative analysis of the associative fields differing in the time of fixation”⁹.

¹ Маслова В. А. Лингвокультурология. М. Academia. 2001. С. 51.

² Пименова М. В. Коды культуры в пространстве языка. Новые парадигмы в когнитивной лингвистике. Алматы. 2014. С. 66.

³ Там же. С. 65–66.

⁴ Степанов Ю. С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования. М. Языки русской культуры. 1997. С. 76–77.

⁵ Морель Морель Д. А. Динамика культурных концептов сквозь призму ассоциативного эксперимента. Современные проблемы языкознания, литературоведения, межкультурной коммуникации и лингводидактики. Белгород. ИД «Белгород». 2014. С. 205–209.

⁶ Гагарин А. С. Феноменологическая топика: смысложизненное пространство экзистенциалов человеческого бытия. Научный ежегодник Института философии и права Уральского отделения Российской академии наук. 2009. Вып. 9. С. 6.

⁷ Русский ассоциативный словарь. М. Астрель; АСТ. 2002. Т. 1. С. 3–4.

⁸ Морель Морель Д. А. Напитки во французском, английском и русском ассоциативных словарях (стимул → реакция). Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2012. № 3 (14). С. 56.

⁹ Алимужкина О. А. Возможности изучения стереотипов в ассоциативных полях. Альманах современной науки и образования. 2010. № 2 (33). Ч. 2. С. 15.

Thus, two samples (being of the same age group: 17–25) represent two different generations born and formed under two different social systems — Soviet and post-Soviet — that have antipodal value systems and world outlooks thence divergent pictures of the world.

The analysis of associative materials allowed us to reveal 11 clusters in total, one of which can be subdivided into 12 subclusters. Thus, the fear —

1) is its cause, e.g.: a) death, b) darkness, c) height, d) certain psychophysiological state, e) certain general situation, f) studies, g) animals, h) supernatural creatures, i) enemies, j) police, k) other people, l) films, computer games;

2) is a certain psychophysiological state similar to the fear (differing by the level of intensity) or related to it;

3) has a certain intensity;

4) is instinctive;

5) for somebody;

6) of God;

7) is experienced or not;

8) affects or stops stressing;

9) is like a living creature;

10) is that it causes;

11) and hatred.

Next follows the overview of obtained results.

1. T_0 -field state

The field consists of 72 associations with 100 occurrences (including two refusals). The share of single associations is 81,9%, whereas the share of their occurrences is only 57%. The shares of gender-mutual answers are 11,1% in associations and 28% in their occurrences.

The top-frequent associations are ‘ужас (horror)’ (7 occurrences), ‘Божий (of God)’ (5), ‘смерти (of death)’ (5), ‘животный (bodily)’ (4), ‘большой (great)’ (3), ‘испуг (fright)’ (3).

The T_0 -field includes representatives of all revealed clusters and of 8 subclusters. Its field structure is as follows:

— the core is formed by clusters No. 2 (15% of reactions (occurrences)/8,3% of associations) and 3 (12%/11,1%);

— the close periphery embraces (sub)clusters No. 4 (7%/5,6%), 5 (6%/8,3%), 1a (6%/2,8%), 1e (5%/7,0%), 7 (5%/5,6%), 1b (5%/5,6%), 6 (5%/1,4%), 8 (4%/5,6%), 10 (4%/5,6%), 1f (4%/4,2%);

— the far periphery includes (sub)clusters No. 9 (3%/4,2%), 1d (2%/2,8%), 1j (2%/2,8%), 1k (2%/2,8%);

— the extreme periphery is presented by monocusters No. 11 (1%/1,4%) and 1c (1%/1,4%).

Formally, cluster No. 1 dominates the structure of the field with its 30% of reactions and 34,7% of associations, but due to its semantically heterogeneous substructure and different relevance of its subclusters it should be considered piecemeal. It appears from this that the “core — periphery” distribution graph has a smooth, sloping profile.

2. T_I -field state

The field consists of 63 associations with 100 occurrences (including 5 refusals). The share of single associations is 74,6%, whereas the share of their occurrences is only 46%. The shares of gender-mutual answers are 12,7% in associations and 36% in their occurrences.

The top-frequent associations are ‘ужас (horror)’ (8 occurrences), ‘смерть (death)’ (5), ‘испуг (fright)’ (5), ‘боязнь (phobia)’ (5), ‘сильный (strong)’ (3), ‘ненависть (hated)’ (3), ‘темнота (darkness)’ (3).

The T_I -field includes representatives of 8 clusters and of 10 subclusters. Its field structure is as follows:

- the core consists of cluster No. 2 (26% of reactions/14,3% of associations);
- the close periphery comprises (sub)clusters No. 1a (7%/4,8%), 1e (7%/9,5%), 1l (6%/9,5%), 1b (6%/4,8%), 9 (4%/6,4%), 1g (4%/4,8%), 10 (4%/4,8%);
- the far periphery is presented by (sub)clusters No. 3 (4%/3,2%), 11 (4%/3,2%), 7 (3%/4,8%), 1c (3%/3,2%), 1d (3%/3,2%), 1h (2%/3,2%), 1i (2%/3,2%);
- the extreme periphery is made up of monoclusters No. 8 (1%/1,6%) and 1f (1%/1,6%).

Dominating “gestalt” cluster No. 1 accounts for 41% of reactions and 47,6% of associations.

The structure of the field is notable for the breakaway of the core from the periphery.

3. Field dynamics

The total number of associations and the weight of single associations have decreased, whereas the average frequency of associations and the weight of gender-mutual ones have grown.

The set of top-frequent associations has undergone obvious changes with only three reactions holding their own. While ‘ужас’ has kept its leading position, ‘испуг’ has boosted figures. The idea of death has kept the second rank, but we witness a small-scale but important shift: instead of genitive case which makes a collocation out of stimulus and reaction (“страх смерти (fear of death)”) we see nominative one emerging that can result in a whole sentence with a meaning of identification: “страх — смерть (fear is death)”. The idea of the “size” of fear has been supplanted by the one of its strength. The number of adjectival associations has decreased.

In its development the field under study lost representatives of three clusters (No. 4–6) and of two subclusters (No. 1j–1k). So, the ideas of the fear of God, police and other people, of the fear for somebody, and of the instinctive nature of fear have completely lost their relevance for the contemporary linguistic consciousness, as well as two combinatory patterns: “страх за [кого-то] (fear for smb)” “страх перед [чем-то] (fear of smth)”. On the contrary we witness the emergence of four subclusters (No. 1g–1j, 1l) referring to animals, supernatural beings, enemies, films and computer games as causes of fear.

Four (sub)clusters (No. 3, 7, 8, 1f) have fallen into a decline losing both in frequency and in representativity, two (sub)clusters (No. 1b, 10) stagnate; 8 (sub)clusters (No. 11, 1c, 2, 1d, 1e, 1a, 1 (in general), 9) demonstrate more or less stable growth.

(Sub)clusters No. 2, 1a 1b, 1e remain highly relevant for the linguistic consciousness at both stages (T_0 and T_1), whereas No. 1c, 1d, and 11 are of low relevance over the whole period.

Considerable increment of refusals should be noticed, as well as reduction in adjectival and verbal associations.

The undertaken study lets us come to the following conclusions.

1. The system of associations under study manifests a certain consolidation and reduction over the time. It shows up both in general figures and in structure details.

2. Analysis of associative materials also helps to reveal the relations between existential concepts (“fear ↔ death” par excellence).

3. In spite of the moderate number of given associations the findings the close examination of the system provides us with are enough to make up conclusions about the concept’s structure with a sufficient level of details.

4. The structure of the concept “fear” revealed upon its associative field’s structure has not undergone any crucial changes. The main differences lie at the quantitative level of relevance.

As of T_0 the concept core refers to different states similar to fear (the core of the concept’s nominative field is made up of synonyms of the word ‘страх’), while the linguistic consciousness is firmly fixed on causes of fear. Due to their variety and different relevancy they form the whole “cognitive sector”¹ in the concept structure.

Both of these peculiarities just kept reinforcing in case of T_1 concept state. But the cognitive characteristic of intensity having been highly relevant as of T_0 has almost fallen into oblivion. The contemporary state of the concept is also characterized by loosening of relations between fear and humans (both *for* and *of*) and slackening of activity aspect of fear in the cognitive structure. It should be noted that a certain reduction in share of adjectival and verbal representatives of different concepts is rather common for T_1 -respondents picture of the world².

5. Really surprising is that the fear of God was remembered only by Soviet epoch respondents (thought to be atheists), but completely forgotten by T_1 -ones.

A truly novelty in the concept structure is the slot referring to films and computer games as causes of fear. Its emergence is consonant with the spirit of the times reflecting the drastic changes in mass-cultural practices and attitudes.

Pulling ahead of refusals into the top-frequent associations group can be evidence of respondents’ attempt to avoid a vexatious matter playing ostrich, not to relive such existential memories.

¹ Рудакова А. В. Когнитология и когнитивная лингвистика. Воронеж. Истоки, 2004. С. 52.

² Q. v.: Morel Morel D. A. Medium-term dynamics of the naive picture of the world through the prism of associative experiment. Applied and Fundamental Studies: Proceedings of the 5th International Academic Conference. St. Louis. Publishing House “Science and Innovation Center”. 2014. P. 236.