



Intensity Category in the Russian and German Languages

I. I. Abdulganeeva¹, I. I. Kurmaeva² and E. A. Denisova³

Kazan Federal University, Department of Education, Kazan, Russia

E-mail: ¹<IrIAbdulganeeva@kpfu.ru>, ²<airre@rambler.ru>, ³<denisova.e.e@mail.ru>

KEYWORDS Learning. Linguistics. Discourse. Semantics. Suffix Derivation

ABSTRACT Word formation and derivational system of a language are reflected in linguistic worldviews, indicating the features of the language pictures of the world and its speakers. This study deals with comparing cognitive and discursive features of intensity category using word-formation in the Russian and German languages. Another objective is to find the equivalents of intensified units in the translated language. The materials in this study are the Russian intensified substantives of literature and their analogs in German. This study also describes the characteristics of the representation of the intensity category by word-formation means and subsequently examines cognitive and mental aspects of word formation in the Russian and German languages. The subject of the research is substantive derivatives with word-formation formant of intensification in the Russian language and their analogs in German.

INTRODUCTION

The intensity category is a reflection of the linguistic picture of the world. The actualization of this category in a language can be determined by linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (Abdulganeeva 2015; Abdulganeeva 2016). The linguistic units representing the semantics of intensity at different levels of the language are also organized in a certain way and form an independent category - the intensity category (Leontyeva 2006); which is closely related to the cognitive type of quantity, having a global character, equal in position with quality category, and associated with thinking and language as one of the two universal aspects of certainty of existence. Besides, this category has a long and diversified study in general linguistics and Germanistics (Galich 2002). Understanding how language works require attending to how culture works. Given how pervasive language is in human culture, the reverse is true as well. At the center of both culture and language are conventions (Loewenstein 2019). Various means of the language are also used to express the intensity category.

The great thinker Humboldt also considered language as an activity (*energeia*) of the spirit and a product of "language consciousness of a nation"; since it is a "worldview" of certain people that embody the very structure of language, namely in its "inner form" (Averintsev 1989). Thus, each language captures and reflects the "national cognitive picture of the world" (Popova 2002) and represents a cognitive and psy-

chological reality. At the same time, the highest type of reflection of the world appears precisely in a linguistic form, and how a person sees the world is mostly determined by the language - the language in general and the native language in particular (Kasevich 2013). Conceptual derivation can also be carried out according to metonymic and metaphorical models. For instance, these models form the semantics of a compound word by adding an evaluative component into its meaning (Babina and Fedenko 2015).

Objectives

It will be shown that only by relating contrastive linguistics to other subfields of comparative linguistics and by delimiting it from them will we obtain a clear picture of its cultural and mental traditions. Also, we will know substantive derivatives with word-formation formant of intensification in the Russian language and their analogs in German.

METHODOLOGY

The research methods used in this study are descriptive method, derivational analysis, component (semantic) analysis, comparative analysis, and methods of definitional, classification, contextual and quantitative analysis, as well as methods of cognitive analysis of word semantics. The study of semantic aspects of the language is also made from the cognitive and discursive paradigm of linguistic science. The re-

search materials are the derived nouns along with word-formation formants of intensification in the Russian language and their correspondence in the German language. Mini-contexts containing substantive derivatives with derivational formants of intensification are also analyzed. For the analysis, the National Corpus of the Russian language is similarly used, as well as examples of expressions of the colloquial style, which are recorded when the speech of speakers of the compared languages are observed.

Along with originals in Russian, original works by German authors and their translations into Russian are also used. The main analyzed style in literature, since it can include all styles of speech and is distinguished by the recurrence of derivatives with word-formation formants of intensification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A derivational formant or intensifier, as well as a derivative, can express cognitive semantics. These formants and expressive means of word formation have both evaluative and expressive meanings. They also represent one of the forms of expression of the national layer of the language, which allows for revealing expressive and evaluative “meanings,” whose mechanisms are motivated by cultural traditions; and as a result, there is a “fusion” of linguistic and cultural-national semantics (Abdulganeeva 2015; Abdulganeeva 2016). If we talk about a person as a bearer of linguistic heritage, the individual amount of linguistic knowledge should be taken into account that reflects their previous social, cognitive, and communicative experience and contains conventional units of the language learned through this experience.

Language is a tagging system that allows people to coordinate their behavior, allowing for the formation of stable, cumulative, widely dispersed cultural communities. Regardless of whether language or culture is seen as primary, though, systems of linguistic conventions generate information from which we derive the meanings that we use to make sense of our experiences and so our lives. But even more than that, we use language and develop language and refashion language as we engage with others and with the world (Loewenstein 2019).

Cognitive knowledge of the person also forms the basis of the transmitted information they intend to share with the receptor. This intention affects the choice of linguistic means. The result is thus a speech statement, whose content should inform the receptor about the cognitive knowledge transferred. It is a cognitive process influencing emotional reactions based on experiences as a perception of the internal state of the organism and a physiological focus on projective self-consciousness.

The linguistic mechanisms of categorizing these reactions can also develop and determine the expressive markers of the word. They arise because of the correlation between the most diverse nature and character. First of all, it should be noted that “expressive colors” seem to be added to the word by social and historical environments in which it was most often used or is being used”.

Language as a system is thus reproduced and perceived in speech based on the same reference links of linguistic units identified in their form and meaning. In this view, additional connotations of the word are explained by “subjective” perception and by “cognitive and mental traditions” of the derivational system of the language.

So, the cognitive and mental characteristics of the bearer of a certain linguistic culture, which are syncretic concerning the second position; namely, the cognitive semantics of the word-formation formants, should be attributed to cognitive aspects of word-formation. Indeed, concepts included in various semantic classes at the conceptual level of consciousness, possessing a similar emotional coloring or figurative similarity, are connotative synonyms or antonyms and form syncretic generalizations at deep levels of categorization (Petrenko 2012).

The actualization of the word-formation of intensity is not random, but it is a regular process like all other processes of the language system. The nature and the degree of manifestation of the given processes are thus determined by the specificity of the cognitive mechanisms of the national language. Indeed, “... in the formation of a new name in the structure of the generating word, all cognitive structures are activated - those structures underlying all previous components of the word and those belonging to the meaning from which the derived unit

is directly formed” (Kutuzov and Andreev 2015). In this regard, it is important to point out that “the content of any culture can be expressed using its language, and there are no such elements of language material, either meaningful or formal, that would not symbolize any real meaning, whatever this was the attitude of those who belong to other cultures” (Sapir 1993). New research studies focus on the fact that “different pictures of the world correlate with different types of knowledge, we can talk about common national invariant cognitive phenomena - cognitive pictures of the world, implemented in a variety of options, fixed by means of language - the language picture of the world” (Khizhnyak 2016).

Features of the “breadth of the Russian soul” (Zaliznyak et al. 2005) which are reflected in an interesting way in the Russian language and in its vocabulary, derivational system, and ways of actualization of communicative scripts by linguistic means with its expressiveness, emotionality, gradable degree of evaluation also make it difficult to translate the text, since “the connotative level of utterance is difficult to understand and process in the translating language” (Mironova 2013).

Means of word formation, the so-called intensification toolkit in the Russian language, does not often find word-formation analogs of intensification in the German derivational system. The study of word-building processes according to their semantics and especially functions, the analysis of a derived word referring to another unit, its understanding as units with dual reference properties, that is to the world of reality and to the world of words - similarly allow a broader interpretation of those onomasiological structures fixed by derivative words of different types (Kubryakova 2004). Within the cognitive and functional paradigm, Borisenkova considers the German language formation system as a cognitive phenomenon. Moreover, she emphasizes that the cognitive approach to the word-formation of the German language, which dominates the linguistic picture of the world and helps in understanding the patterns of its structuring and functioning more accurately and more deeply (Borisenkova 2005).

Word formation means of intensity category of the Russian language can be thus referred to

as the cognitive feature of the Russian language. The Russian derivational system is also rich in intensifier suffixes. Considering the derivation of the Russian language, Zemskaya points to the concepts of “gradable nomination” and “intensifying nomination.” The gradable meaning is also created via the words of the same word-formation structure, which conveys an equal categorial and qualifying meaning. A typical type of this nomination is a comparison in the same text of derivatives that implement different types of word-formation oppositions, and most-often used oppositions are of “diminution-magnification” type; for example, ceramic zavody, zavodiki, zavodishki of the size of a single stove (from newspapers). In this case, the intensifying nomination is given to suffixes -ik and -ishk (Zemskaya 1992). According to Kubryakova (2004), the choice of a nomination unit is always in line with its structural and semantic features. Both the personal meaning and the “binding” of its parts to nomination units also play an important role in generating speech utterance.

Literature is also marked by deep psychological factors of writers and translators. Each of them reflects the uniqueness and originality of national linguistic cultures. It is literature that presents clear evidence of conceptualization of cultural and specific codes in linguistic space. The analysis of the micro-context of literature (below are examples from the Russian National Corpus). National Corpus of the Russian Language allows for concluding that the Russian language is characterized by an explication of the intensity category by means of word formation, whereas the German language is dominated by the lexical level; for example, Dryannoy on byl chelovechek, na moi glaza, na moyu otsenku./ Er war in meinen Augen und nach meiner Meinung, kurz gesagt, ein Lump. Wenn ich wieder zu Geld gekommen bin, werde ich einen Privatdetektiv engagieren ... / Nu, smotrite, kak tol'ko u menya opyat' zavedutsya den'zhata, ya naymu chastnogo detektiva i.... (Genrikh Boll'. Glazami klouna Allein es erwies sich, daß er den ganzen “Komplex” ohne Rest vergessen hatte und über die Zeit auch nicht den geringsten Gedanken mehr in seinem Kopfe beherbergte. / No vdruz ponyal, chto nachisto zabyl ves' kompleks”, i otositel'no problemy vremeni v yego golove ne ostalos' ni yedinoj, dazhe samoy nich-

tozhnoy, myslishki (Tomas Mann. Volshebnyaya gora). The basics of Russian derivatives, as can be seen from the examples, may not contain this “intensity.” Still, they become “intensive” through certain derivational formants containing “national and cultural semantic shares” (Mironova 2004), while the German intensity category belongs to lexical level.

In contrast to the cognitive semantics of word-building means of the German language, a wide range of negative intensifiers can, for example, characterize the cognitive semantics of the suffixes-intensifiers of the Russian language. The analysis of the representation of the intensity category in German using word-formation also makes it possible to add a composition. In contrast, the Russian language is dominated by an affix derivation. However, when translating derivatives from Russian into German with intensifier suffixes, the leading position is occupied by analogues of the lexical level of the language. The representation of the intensity category by means of a word-formation is thus determined by the cognitive nature of the formants of intensification of a particular language as well as the subjective factor of the cognitive and mental processes of intensification.

CONCLUSION

Summarizing the main points, it should be emphasized that the linguistic worldview means the elements of the conceptual picture of the world and contents of the conceptual picture of the world of the ethnos, which become explicit using this language. The interpretation of the cognitive and discursive features of the compared languages also allows for revealing a huge difference like the very process of intensification by speakers of different-structured languages and points to similarities and divergences in the derivational systems of the Russian and German languages. The cognitive aspect of expressing the category of intensity is also explained by the discrepancy or absence of certain connotations in the minds of native speakers due to cultural and mental traditions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Connotations are present in one culture and do not find linguistic expression in another cul-

ture, so they represent the greatest difficulty when translated in the literature. This connection can be the topic of further investigations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

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

REFERENCES

- Abdulganeeva II 2015. Ways of translating Russian derivatives with suffixes-intensifiers into German. *Philological Sciences- Questions of Theory and Practice*, 7(18): 13-18.
- Abdulganeeva II 2016. The subcategory of intensification in multi-structured languages. Linguistic and extra linguistic factors. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(4): 38-41.
- Averintsev SS 1989. *Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Moscow, Russia: AST Publishing Group.
- Babina LV, Fedenko AYU 2015. Evaluative potential of two-component complex words representing knowledge of a person. *Questions of Cognitive Linguistics*, 1: 41-49.
- Babenko OV 2015. Language as a basic feature of ethnos uniting within the conditions of modern challenges. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 6(3): 168-170.
- Borisenkova LM 2005. Cognitive aspects of word formation (On the Material of the German Language). *The World of Linguistics and Communication: Electronic Scientific Journal*, (33): 1-7.
- Galich GG 2002. Cognitive Category of Quantity and Its Implementation in Modern German. *Monograph*. Omsk: Omsk State University.
- Kasevich VB 2013. *Cognitive Linguistics: In Search of Identity*. Massachusetts, Languages of Slavic Culture, Land of Magazines. Moscow, Russia: Rosman Publishing.
- Khizhnyak SP 2016. *Cognitive Problems in the General Theory of the Term*. Saratov: University Education Publishing House.
- Kubryakova ES 2004. *Language and Knowledge: Towards Gain Knowledge of the Language: The Parts of Speech with a Cognitive Point of View. The Role of Language in the Knowledge of the World [Ros. Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics]*. Slavic Culture Languages. Moscow, Russia: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Kutuzov A, Andreev I 2015. Texts in, meaning out: Neural language models in semantic similarity task for Russian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.08183*.
- Larina BA, Maslov Yu S 1963. *Questions of the Theory and History of the Language: A Collection of Works in Honor of Prof. Leningrad*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Leningrad University.
- Leontyeva NN 2006. *Automatic Understanding of Texts: Systems, Models, Resources*. Chelyabinsk/Russia: Arkaim Publishing House.

- Loewenstein J 2019. Culture and language. In: D Cohen, S Kitayama (Eds.): *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*. New York, United States: the Guilford Press, P. 267.
- Mironova NN 2004. Bilingual and bicultural problems of literary translation. *Knowledge, Understanding, Skill*, 1: 108-116.
- Mironova NN 2013. Cognitive Aspects of the Translation of Fiction. *Moscow University Bulletin, Series 22-Translation Theory*. Moscow, Russia: Publishing House.
- Paramonov GV 2014. Language and Philosophy of Education. *Dialogue and Universalism*, (3): 126-130.
- Petrenko VF 1983. *Introduction to Experimental Psychosemantics: A Study of the Forms of Representation in the Ordinary Mind*. Moscow: Publishing House of Moscow State University.
- Popova ZD 2002. Language and national consciousness. *Questions of Theory and Methodology*, 1(1): 8-50.
- Sapir E 1993. *Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies*. Moscow, Russia: Language Science Press, Progress.
- Subich VG, Mingazova NG, Shamsutdinova EK 2016. Comparative analysis of English, Arabic and Tatar national corpora. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2): 150-154.
- Valeeva NG 2010. *Cultural-Cognitive and Communicative-Functional Aspects: Monograph*. Moscow, Russia: Publishing House.
- Zaliznyak Anna A, Levontina IB, Shmelev AD 2005. *Key Ideas of the Russian Language Picture of the World: Sat. Art. M Languages of Slavic Culture*. Moscow, Russia: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Zemskaya EA 1992. *Word Formation as an Activity*. Moscow, Russia: Vysshaya Shkola Publication.

Paper received for publication in October, 2019
Paper accepted for publication in December, 2019