

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ

УДК 81-23

Asta Balčiūnienė
 PhD, Associate Professor, Senior Researcher
 Klaipėda University
Laima Kuprienė
 PhD, Associate Professor
 Klaipėda University

STEREOTYPICAL FEATURES OF THE JEWISH IN THE WORLDVIEW OF THE LITHUANIAN SAMOGITIAN: LEXICOGRAPHIC DATA

СТЕРЕОТИПНЫЕ ЧЕРТЫ ЕВРЕЕВ В МИРОВОЗЗРЕНИИ ЛИТОВСКИХ ЖЕМАЙТОВ: ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИЧЕСКИЕ ДАННЫЕ

DOI: 10.31618/ESSA.2782-1994.2021.4.74.149

Аннотация. До Второй мировой войны еврейское население в городах расположенных на территории литовского этнографического региона Жемайтии было довольно большим, поэтому жемайты и евреи поддерживали тесные контакты. В статье на основе анализа лексикографического материала рассматривается отношение жемайтов к евреям с этнолингвистической точки зрения. Анализ речевых образцов, выражающих эту точку зрения, основан на структурном подходе к значению в сочетании с когнитивным, следующим от значения слова к значению предложения. Считается, что стереотипный «образ» еврея состоит из определенного набора общих характеристик и черт, о которых анализ языкового выражения дает более подробную информацию. Анализ стереотипных характеристик связан с выражением аксиологической системы. Исследование показало, что в социокультурном контексте чаще всего фиксируются стереотипы о евреях как о соседях, неверующих, иностранцах, оценочная шкала которых включает положительную, нейтральную и отрицательную оценку.

Abstract. Before the Second World War, urban Jewish communities in the Lithuanian ethnographic region of Samogitia were quite large, thus Samogitians and Jews used to maintain rather close contacts. The paper focuses on Samogitians' view on Jews from an ethno-linguistic perspective, based on lexicographic material. The analysis of speech samples that express this opinion is based on a structural approach to meaning combined with a cognitive one, following from word meaning to sentence meaning. A stereotypical "image" of the Jew is believed to consist of a specific set of certain common characteristics and traits, which is further elaborated by an analysis of linguistic expression. The analysis of stereotypical features is related to the expression of the axiological system. The research revealed that, in the socio-cultural context, the scale of evaluation of the Jewish people included positive, neutral, and negative evaluations, with the prevalence of stereotypes of Jews as of neighbours, people of other religion, foreigners.

Ключевые слова: этнолингвистика, этнический стереотип, стереотипность, еврей.

Key words: ethno-linguistics, ethnic stereotype, stereotypical feature, Jewish.

European ethnologists pay close attention to the analysis of stereotypical images of Jews [7; 6 pp. 160–213 etc.], since before the mid-20th century, substantial Jewish diaspora populations existed in various countries. The stereotype of the Jewish people in Lithuanian culture has been studied rather comprehensively¹⁷, however, the attitude of the representatives of individual Lithuanian ethnographic regions towards Jews¹⁸ has not been analysed in greater detail. Therefore, the paper focuses on the image of the Jew formed in one of the ethnographic regions of Lithuania, in Samogitia, where people still speak the Samogitian dialect and have maintained a number of cultural and identity differences, and revealed in the Samogitian linguistic expression.

Thus, the aim of the paper is to identify the stereotypical traits of the Jew entrenched in the Samogitian linguistic worldview and their evaluation, recorded in lexicographic sources.

Empirical material. The choice to examine not all Lithuanians', but only the Samogitian attitude towards Jews and therefore to narrow the scope of research materials, is also related to the following reasons: a) from the ethno-linguistic point of view, the Samogitian attitude towards Jews has not been analysed in details; b) before the mid-20th century, Telšiai, Kretinga, and other cities and towns of Samogitia were socio-cultural and economic centres of Jews¹⁹, and their diaspora in Samogitia was quite large, therefore certain specificity of communication between

¹⁷ The Jewish stereotype was thoroughly analysed in Lithuanian folklore [1; 2, pp. 41–54; 11, pp. 160–166], in Samogitian oral discourse [3, pp. 102–132], etc.

¹⁸ The territory of Lithuania is still heterogeneous in terms of dialectology and ethnoculture: it consists of

different ethnographic regions (see <https://www.ekgt.lt/about-the-council/>).

¹⁹ According to Russian ethnologist Belova, with the disappearance of one or another ethno-confessional community, the image of the "other/alien" tends to lose

Jews and Samogitians can be witnessed in the Samogitian dialect; c) based on the research of historians, we can hypothesise that a rather negative attitude towards Jews may be entrenched in the Samogitian worldview.

The object of the current research is the sentences or collocations (phraseologisms), recorded in Samogitia (100 units) and presented in the *Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language* (LKŽe²⁰), the *Dictionary of Phraseology* (FŽ) 2001, and in the dialectological dictionaries of the Samogitian dialect²¹, which reflect the Samogitians' view on Jews. The research material does not include sentences in which the *žyd-* root words naming a representative of the Jewish people (*žydas* is the Lithuanian word for a Jew) are used in a neutral, denotative meaning (i.e. merely name Jews as representatives of the Jewish people) and do not provide any information about Samogitians' attitudes towards them (non-informative for our purpose). Conversely, the object of the research includes lexical units that are indirectly related to the ethnonym (phraseology, metaphors, words that name or describe other realities, etc.), but provide significant information about the tendencies of Jewish stereotyping in the Samogitian linguistic expression.

The research uses a descriptive analytical method and the structural and semantic methodology of analysis, based on the interpretative logic of the research, and the methodological approach of ethnolinguistics and cognitive linguistics.

Theoretical premises

The studies of stereotypes, defined in a number of different ways, were inspired by the methodological approach of the science of sociology: based on it, a separate field of research in ethnic²² stereotypes has developed, used as the basis by the representatives of ethnolinguistics.

Aspects such as a stereotype and its linguistic sign, a stereotype and cognitive semantics, the cognitive structure of a stereotype, and ways of conceptualising linguistic reality are particularly important for the linguistic research in stereotypes [5, pp. 374–377, etc.]. In the ethnolinguistic school of Lublin, the concept of a linguistic stereotype is understood in a very wide sense: stereotyping encompasses the whole picture of the world – both the image of an object and a person.

The concept of an ethnic stereotype used in the paper narrows the scope of the concept of a linguistic stereotype, yet we adhere to the premise that language may reveal a subjectively predetermined “image” of representatives of other nations, encompassing its characteristic features. The concept is also supported by an argument of Gudavičius that “language, as one of the possible interpretations of the environment, reflects the attitude of its speakers towards the environment in a certain way” [8, p. 41]. However, the attitude of language users can be verbalized in various ways, depending on the system of a particular language; hence a problem of decoding a linguistic expression appears. Anna Wierzbicka provides the following method for decoding the language in which certain images are encoded: “Language is an integrated system, where everything ‘conspires’ to convey meaning: words, grammatical constructions and various ‘illocutionary’ devices [...]” [12, p. 16]. Thus, in the paper, both the lexical and the grammatical and semantic levels are important for the “decoding” of the stereotypical “image” of the Jew in language.

The issue of empirical material sources is also important in the study of ethnic stereotypes. In ethnolinguistic works, ethnic stereotypes (like other linguistic stereotypes) can usually be studied on the basis of the following sources: a) the language system (dictionary definitions, derivatives, phraseology); b) questionnaires, and c) texts (proverbs and sayings, poetry, etc.). Although the questionnaire methodology is especially common in this type of research, we believe that the analysis of the language system may reveal a more detailed and objective “image” of the research object, as the questionnaire in a sense limits / expands the data provided by the respondent, whereas lexicographic articles in dictionaries reflect collective discourse.

Various studies of ethnic stereotypes highlight the idea that the “images” of other nationals represent the vision of “aliens / others” through the prism of one’s own perception of the world, as it relates to ethnocentrism, as a universal intercultural phenomenon where “one’s own” traditions, religion, customs, and language are considered as genuine, “true”, and “right”. The social, anthropological, cultural, and religious differences between the Jews and the Lithuanians were

its regional characteristics and becomes increasingly more generalised, preserving only the most general (universal) features of the “alien” in the folk understanding [6, p. 171].

²⁰ The material was collected from an e-version of the dictionary. Online access: www.lkz.lt (LKŽe).

²¹ KTŽ 2011 – *Kretingos tarmės žodynas* [Dictionary of Kretinga Dialect], ed. by Juozas Aleksandravičius. 2011, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla; ŠRDŠŽ 1976 – *Šiaurės rytų dūnininkų šnektų žodynas* [Dictionary of the Northwestern (Dūnininkai) Samogitian Dialect], ed. by V. Vitkauskas. 1976, Vilnius: “Mokslas”.

²² The present paper uses the term of *ethnic stereotype*, although it has been criticised as redundant in

psychology studies, since the structure and model of ethnic stereotypes are not unique and therefore indistinguishable from any other stereotype; however, the term has taken root in the contemporary studies of psychology, sociology, and ethnolinguistics. The use of the terms of cultural, ethnic, and ethnocultural stereotypes is also problematic, as it is not always easy to distinguish between them. In the paper, a cultural stereotype is considered as a broader concept which may include the concept of an ethnic stereotype, therefore, the specificity of our research is better revealed by the term of an ethnic stereotype with a narrower meaning.

maximal, therefore they had to be noticeable and produce an evaluative “image” of “other / different / alien”. Despite the fact that ethnocentrism as if presupposes a certain negative attitude towards a foreign national from the perspective of an evaluating nation, we assume that the said phenomenon cannot be associated solely with negative evaluation, as that can distort the “image” of an ethnic stereotype and make it primitive. One cannot ignore the fact that “other” characteristics untypical of the evaluating nation can be evaluated positively or neutrally. It is for this reason that ethnolinguistic and cognitive linguistic research carry out in-depth studies of the characteristics of the stereotyping process: certain traits typical of the research object are identified, which are noticeable, distinguished, and made relevant in the linguistic activities of the evaluating nation. These characteristics can be physical (biological), socio-cultural, psycho-cultural, etc.

Contemporary researchers of stereotypes emphasise that stereotypes as a result of culture and socialisation can be diverse: accurate and inaccurate, positive and negative, and also neutral. The emotional aspect of ethnic stereotypes has been emphasized by a number of ethnolinguists who highlight the predominance of negative ethnic stereotypes: “stereotypes go hand-in-hand with negative emotions” [10, p. 161], yet do not rule out the existence of neutral stereotypes [10, p. 166; 9, pp. 54–55].

While acknowledging that ethnic stereotypes reflect only a certain generalised image of an ethnic and / or confessional neighbour through simplifying and summarising it, we adhere to a standpoint that, based on the ethnolinguistic approach of the present research, only certain trends of Samogitians’ view on Jews can be revealed.

Stereotypical traits of Jews and their evaluation

In order to identify the stereotypical traits of Jews and their evaluation, the research has not been limited to the semantic analysis of Jewish ethnonyms recorded in illustrative sentences. Phraseologisms recorded in the lexicographic sources as well as various lexemes including the *žyd-* component (e.g. the names of plants, mushrooms, etc.), the semantics of which contributes to revealing the Jewish traits relevant to Samogitians through becoming the basis of semantic motivation in denominating one or another reality, have been explored. The semantic analysis of such linguistic expression and its interpretation through linking it with extralinguistic facts allows for a more rational and detailed evaluation of the specificity of Jewish stereotyping.

It has been observed that stereotypical traits of an ethnocentric nature, associated with the opposition *we* (Samogitians) / *they* (Jews), are revealed in different contexts. Usually, those contexts are based on differences in religion, customs, models of social stratification as well as anthropological and linguistic aspects of these ethnic groups [2; p. 130]. The paper examines specific characteristics of the Jewish ethnic group related only to the **socio-cultural context** (neighbourhood, traditions, language and food).

The context of **neighbourhood** (that is, the aspects of living together and getting on between Jews and Samogitians) is closely related to the opposition *our own* (we) / *other, alien* (they), which can be neutralised or especially emphasised and highlighted in speech samples. Sentences recorded in LKŽe revealed that a positive view of the **friendship and close relationships between Samogitians and Jews** is expressed both through grammatical means (representatives of the Jewish nationality were referred to by hypocoristic diminutive derivatives *žydelkėlė* Lkš / *žydelkėlė* Vgr, S. Dauk *žydaitė*; *žydelkaitė* [a Jewish girl]) and through lexical pragmatics and syntactic means (constructions including verbs with a positive emotional evaluation): *Ans daug metų jau draugavo su ta žydelkelė* [He has for many years been friends with that Jewish girl] Klk. *Aš didliai liuobu su toms žydelkėlėms jau sudraugausiu* [I used to be good friends with those Jewish girls] Yl. (LKŽe). The analysis of the presented speech samples reveal that the positive attitude of Samogitians is more often related to female Jews.

There are fewer samples that present a generalized positive view of Jews, with emphasis placed on their positive character traits (**kind, friendly**) emerging in the context of neighbourhood: *Biednam žmoguo geri buvo [žydai] su žydais galėjo sutarti* [(Jews) were kind to poor people, you could get on well with them] Jdr (LKŽe). Such samples indicate that Samogitians accepted Jews as their own, close neighbours, thus neutralising the divide of *our own* / *alien*.

However, a completely opposite attitude towards Jews as **inferior** people, presupposing “racist content that excluded persons of Jewish nationality from among the people” [4, p. 111], was confirmed by the question of writer Žemaitė: *Is a Jew not a person, not created by the Lord God himself, is he not our neighbour?* (LKŽe). It revealed the relevance of the principle of equality to Lithuanians in the early 20th century, which promoted tolerance of religious as well as other personal and national differences.

The humiliating attitude towards alien Jews (incidentally, also towards women, regardless of their nationality) was rooted in the Lithuanian (Samogitian) culture, as demonstrated by a Samogitian proverb recorded by the bishop M. Valančius *Alus ne [v]anduo, ožka ne gyvolis, motriška ne šeimyna, žydas ne brolis* [Beer is not water, a goat is not an animal, a woman is not family, and a Jew is not a brother] VP5 (LKŽe). The fact that the Jew was considered as a person of a lesser value was also indirectly confirmed by the compound including the lexeme *žydas*, *-ė*: *žydmazgis* [lit. a Jewish knot: a fake, badly tied and easily slackening knot], which has a derogatory connotation: *Kaip tu čia surišai žydmazgį – tujau pasileis* [How did you tie that knot – it is going to untie] Vdk. (LKŽe).

An anti-Semitic attitude (**physical** violence (beating) or **psychological** violence experienced by Jews) is recorded in the comparison *Pripranti kai žydas par galvą mušamas* [One gets used, like a Jew punched on the head] Vks. (LKŽe), as the compound *per galvą*

mušti [punch on the head] can be associated with both physical and psychological violence. The semantics of the verb to “get used” recorded in the sentence suggests that Jews may have been abused for quite a long time and even got reconciled with that. Manifestations of anti-Semitism can also conditionally be seen in the phraseologism *žyda karti, pakarti (kiřsti Tl)* [to hang / hit the Jew], which names the game of throwing pebbles and having them bounce off the surface of the water several times: *Vaikai, einam žydo karti, tik gerų akminiukų ieškokit* [Kids, let’s go to hang the Jew, just look for good pebbles] Krš. (FŽ 2001, 871). We can hypothesise that the basis for the formation of the phraseologism was an anti-Semitic action (Jews could have been hit with stones in certain conflict situations)²³. The fact that the conflicts between Lithuanians and Jews may have been settled through other than legal means was demonstrated by Lithuanian jokes about Jews, in which cheating or swindling characters “would often get beaten and thus taught a lesson by locals” [4, p. 111].

Thus, speech acts recorded in lexicographic sources reveal that the attitude of Samogitians towards their neighbours Jews is of a very broad range: from recognising their particularly well evaluated positive traits, such as **friendliness, kindness**, to the approach of **abuse and inequality**.

The stereotype of Jews as **adherents of a different faith**, as shown by the lexicographic materials, is abundantly testified in the Samogitian dialect. This stereotype is often viewed negatively because the linguistic expression is related to the concept of *fear*. The feeling of fear is mutual, as it is experienced by Jews and Samogitians. The image of a Jew professing Judaism is associated with the symbols or rites of the Catholic religion (usually a cross). This is particularly evident in the often used comparative phraseologism *kaip žydas kryžiaus* [Lit. about sb. who is afraid of or avoids something]: *Bijo kaip žydas kryžiaus* [(Sb.) fears (sth.) like a Jew of the Christian cross] End. (FŽ 2001, 871); Krtn, NmŽ (LKŽe). The sample *Žydai bijo, kad katalikė priėmėja vaiko neužžegnotum katalikiškai* [Jews have a fear of a Catholic midwife who may make the sign of the cross upon their newborn infant] Šts. (LKŽe) verbalises the Jewish fear of Catholic midwives. It can be stated that in this way Samogitians elevate the supremacy²⁴ and

power of their religion (Jews are afraid of it). On the other hand, numerous samples testify to Samogitians’ (and especially children’s) fear of Jews. The semantic environment of the use of the ethnonyms *žydas; žydėlis* [Lit. a Jew, a person of Jewish nationality] indicates that Samogitian children were intimidated by the danger of being abducted by a Jew: *Vaikai, nelįskiat, neikiat, sėdėkiat pri pečiaus, žydas pagaus* (taip gąsdindavo vaikus) [Children, be quiet, stay at home, or a Jew will catch you] (this is how children were frightened) Žr. (LKŽe). Samogitians’ fears and their negative view of Jews are revealed by verb combinations *žydas pagaus* („pagrobs“) [a Jew will catch (kidnap) you]; *gandina su žydeliu* [to scare children with Jews]; *liuobam bijoti* („bijodavome“) *žydu* we used to be afraid of Jews]. Historian Vareikis argues that such a concept of a Jewish infidel was presupposed by “the anti-Jewish tradition inherited from the Middle Ages (myths of ritual murders, common among rural communities; accusations of deicide²⁵)” [13, p. 33].

Jews differed from Samogitians not only in their religion, but also in their **customs, traditions, and language**. These differences in the Samogitian dialect could be described by the adjective *žydiškas, -a* [typical of Jews, their language, of a Jewish kind] and by the adverb *žydiškai*. This adverb is usually used to refer to the “Jewish” language, e.g. *Muno tėvuko nabaštikas žydiškai mokėjo* [Lit. My late Dad spoke Jewish] Krž (LKŽe). Thus, we can argue that the language of the Jews was considered by Samogitians as a particularly important distinguishing trait of the nation: what was characteristic of Jews was to be primarily related to their language. The samples in the lexicographic sources testify that Jews as speakers of a different language were viewed positively or neutrally. The closeness and tolerance of Samogitian-Jewish relationships is also revealed by the fact that Samogitians spoke or understood the “Jewish” (Yiddish) language, while Jews could speak Samogitian, e.g. *Ana nežydiāvo, šnekėjo žemaitiškai dailiai* [She did not have a Jewish accent and spoke nice Samogitian] End. (LKŽe).

The noun *Jewishness* was used to describe customary characteristics typical of Jews. It was mainly found in the context of their specific eating habits: *Daktaras žydiškumo neturėjo: valgė kiaulėną* [The doctor had no Jewishness: he ate pork Nt.; Žd. (LKŽe).

²³ The semantic motivation of the phraseologism *nors žydas dėgtų pėlkėje* [Even if a Jew were burning in a marsh] meaning ‘by all means, in any case’: *Nors žydas pėlkėj degtu, turi vienu laiku karvę milžti* [Even if a Jew were burning in a marsh, [sb.] must milk the cow at the same time] Dr. (FŽ, p. 871) is difficult to identify or to associate with extralinguistic factors; the verb *degti* [to burn] is used figuratively, by emphasising the absurdity of the place of action (one cannot burn in water (a marsh)), yet we cannot rule out that the phraseologism also reflects the attitude of abuse and inequality towards Jews.

²⁴ Considering one’s own religion to be better than other ones is typical not solely of the Lithuanian culture.

According to Belova and Petruchin, the Slavic culture took a negative view of “foreign” faith, which in language was expressed by various emotional epithets, such as *pagan faith*, etc. [7, pp. 131–132].

²⁵ Such a view could have been inspired not only by various legends prevalent in Western Europe, but also by the national policies towards non-Christian nations (for more details, see [1; 2]). Incidentally, negative attitudes of Jewish infidels towards Christians were also recorded by Slavic dialectological material, providing storylines very similar to Samogitian samples [6, pp. 172–174].

In this case, atypical behaviour of a Jew (who ignored the custom of never eating pork) was related to the context of higher education and the medical profession, since Samogitian linguistic data testified to the importance of that diet for Jews: the strict ban on eating pork was emphasised in several sentences. This special characteristic of their cuisine was also indirectly reflected in folklore, ironically depicting the Jew's unsuccessful experiences with pigs: *Žyds žyds žydėjo, žyds ant kiaulės sedėjo; žydo barzda sukrutėjo, žyds nu kiaulės nurietėjo* [The Jew was blooming, the Jew was sitting on a pig; the Jew shook his beard, the Jew fell off a pig] (a counting-out rhyme) Lk (LKŽe). The derisive sample of folklore indicated that Samogitians found such a diet of Jews incomprehensible, therefore its evaluation approached a negative scale of assessment. The importance of differences in Jewish eating habits for Samogitians is also shown by the names of plants with the *žyd* root: *Žydiniaiš vadinios* [rugiai] – *iš anų žydai kepė macus* [(Rye) was called Jewish – Jews made matzah from it] Rt. (LKŽe). A certain characteristic of Jews' eating was also revealed by a phraseologism *žydo kásniais* [lit. in Jew's morsels: (to be snowing) in large clumps of flakes]: *Užvis juo [patinka], ka sninga žydo kásniais* [Most of all he [likes] when it snows in Jew's morsels] End (LKŽe).

Another cultural difference of Jews important for Samogitians was their writing: they wrote Hebrew from right to left. This way of writing seemed unusual to Samogitians, therefore in the language this specificity might have been related to the semantics of “doing sth. in the opposite way, in reverse order”. We can therefore hypothesise that the specific way of writing was generalised, and the Jew was seen as a person doing everything back to front, in reverse order: *Ko tu vis antraiš kaip žydas* [Why is everything in the opposite way with you, like with the Jew] End. (LKŽe). Such generalisation of the trait of **behaving in the reverse order** attributed to Jews was also suggested by other norms of Jews' behaviour, related to the aspects of religion, traditions, and lifestyle, and different from those of Samogitians. It was particularly precisely revealed through the phraseologisms *atbulinis žydas* “about a person who does everything in the reverse order”: *Atbulinis žydas: viską atbulai daro* [lit. a reverse Jew, running counter to everybody] Žeml (LKŽe); *ar su žydū gulėjai* [Did you sleep with a Jew] End. (when sb. puts on the clothes inside out) (FŽ, p. 871). Thus, Samogitians took a negative view of the stereotypical trait of Jews **to behave or to do something in a way contrary to the usual**.

To sum everything up, it can be stated that the stereotypical features of Jews related to the socio-cultural context are assessed differently in the Samogitian linguistic worldview. Samogitians were quite tolerant of the “Jewish” language and cuisine, as evidenced by a neutral evaluation of those characteristics predominating in the samples. The negative attitude is related to the Jewish religion. The context of neighbourhood includes positive, neutral and negative evaluations.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The paper is based on the analysis of 100 sentences recorded in Samogitia. The analysis of the Samogitian speech samples recorded in lexicographic sources and related to the stereotypical “image” of the Jew revealed that phraseologisms, the justification of the semantic motivation of which is difficult to identify due to blurred semantic links with the meaning of a direct word and due to lack of extralinguistic information, are the most difficult to semantically deconstruct, while the grammatical (diminutives) and semantic levels are interpreted more accurately.

2. The description of a Jew(ess), as suggested by the materials of the LKŽe and dialectological dictionaries, could be supplemented by the following characteristic traits: very devout, hostile to Catholicism and firmly adhering to their own traditions, kind, friendly and inferior to Samogitian Lithuanians.

3. The positive stereotypical traits of a **kind and friendly** Jew(ess) in the socio-cultural context suggested Samogitians' tolerance of the Jewish nation. The negative stereotyping of **an infidel Jew who feared / hated Christianity** was related to the long-standing myths; their entrenchment evidenced that religious differences between Samogitians and Jews were one of the main factors that separated the two ethnic groups and encouraged the intolerance of Jews.

4. The positive stereotyping of Jews neutralises the divide of *our own / alien* specific to ethnocentrism, while the negative one highlights it.

REFERENCES

1. Anglickienė L. A Stranger, but not Badly Known: the Image of a Jew in Lithuanian Culture. *Darbai ir dienos*, No. 34, - 2003 – P. 213–234 [Anglickienė L. Svetimas, bet neblogai pažįstamas: žydo įvaizdis lietuvių liaudies kultūroje. *Darbai ir dienos*, Nr. 34, - 2003 – P. 213–234 (in Lith.).]
2. Anglickienė L. The Image of Foreigners in Lithuanian Folklore. *Versus Aureus*; 2006. [Anglickienė L. Kitataučių įvaizdis lietuvių folklore. *Versus Aureus*; 2006 (in Lith.).]
3. Balčiūnienė A., Petrošienė L. Stereotypical Features of Jews in Samogitian Dialect Texts. *Res humanitarie*, No. 28, - 2020 – P. 102–132. [Balčiūnienė A., Petrošienė L. Stereotipinės žydų ypatybės žemaičių tarmės tekstuose. *Res humanitarie* Nr. 28, - 2020 – P. 102–132. (in Lith.).]
4. Bandoriūtė S. Traditional Anecdotes: What Lithuanians of the Late 19th and mid-20th Centuries Laughed About. *Tautosakos darbai*, No. 49, - 2015 – P. 105–122. [Bandoriūtė S. Tradicinis anekdotas: iš ko juokėsi XIX a. pabaigos–XX a. vidurio lietuviai. *Tautosakos darbai*. Nr. 49, - 2015 – P. 105–122. (in Lith.).]
5. Bartmiński J., Panasiuk J. Linguistic Stereotypes. *Contemporary Polish Language*. Wydaw; 2001, P. 371–395. [Bartmiński J., Panasiuk J. Stereotypy językowe. *Współczesny język polski*. Wydaw; 2001, P. 371–395. (in Pol.).]
6. Belova O. V. The Individual in the System of Ethno-Cultural Stereotypes. / Tolstaja S. M. *The Image*

of Man in Language and Culture, 2018, , P. 160–213. [Belova O. V. Человек в системе этнокультурных стереотипов. // Отв. ред. С. М. Толстая Образ человека в языке и культуре, 2018, P. 160–213. (in Rus.).]

7. Belova O. V., Petruchin V. J. "Jewish Myth" in Slavic Culture. 2008 [Belova O. V., Petruchin V. J. "Еврейский миф" в славянской культуре, 2008. (in Rus.).]

8. Gudavičius A. Ethnolinguistics. SUL; 2000. [Gudavičius A. Etnolingvistika. SUL; 2000. (in Lith.).]

9. Krawiec M. Language as a Mirror of Cultural Stereotypes – an Ethnolinguistic Perspective. Acta Neophilologica No. XIV (2), - 2012 – P. 47–58. (in Eng.)

10. Łaskiewicz M. National stereotypes in Polish studies and research. Stereotypes and linguistic prejudices in Europe. Budapest; 2017 – P. 157–173. (in Eng.)

11. Lukošiuūtė I. Cultural Stereotypes in Lithuanian Anecdotes: a Jew, a Gypsy, a German. Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai No. 1(34) - 2012 – P. 160–166. [Lukošiūtė I. Kultūriniai stereotipai lietuvių pasakojamuose anekdotuose: žydas, čigonas, vokietis. Jaunųjų mokslininkų darbai. Nr. 1(34) - 2012 – P. 160–

166. (in Lith).]

12. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. The Semantics of Human Interaction. Moutin de Gruyter; 1991. (in Eng.)

13. Vareikis V. History of Lithuanian-Jewish Relations in the 19th Century - Social and Economic Aspects. Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmai, No. 3(4), - 2000 – P. 27–50. [Vareikis V. Lietuvių ir žydų santykių istorija XIX a. Socialiniai ir ekonominiai aspektai. Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmai, Nr. 3(4), - 2000 – P. 27–50. (in Lith.).]

SOURCES

Paulauskas J. Dictionary of Phraseology. LKI; 2001. [Paulauskas J. Frazeologijos žodynas. LKI; 2001. (in Lith.).]

LKŽe – Lithuanian Language Dictionary. [Lietuvių kalbos žodynas: www.lkz.lt (in Lith.).]

Aleksandravičius J. Kretinga Dialect Dictionary. LKI; 2011. [Aleksandravičius J. (sud.) Kretingos tarmės žodynas. LKI; 2011. (in Lith.).]

ŠRDSŽ – Vitkauskas V. Dictionary of Northeastern dūnininkai Dialects; 1976. [Vitkauskas V. (sud.) Šiaurės rytų dūnininkų šnektų žodynas; 1976. (in Lith.).]

Y.I. Khakimjanova, N.R. Khairullina, E.I. Nesterenko

1. Khakimzyanova Yulia Ilhamovna,
senior lecturer

Kazan National Research Technical University named after Tupolev

2. Khairullina Nailya Ramilevna,

PhD in philological science, associate Professor,

Department of foreign languages,

Kazan National Research Technical University named after Tupolev

3. Nesterenko Elena Igorevna,

lecturer, Kazan Federal University

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND CHINESE LANGUAGES

Хакимзянова Ю.И., Хайруллина Н.Р., Нестеренко Е.И.

1. Хакимзянова Юлия Илхамовна,
ст преподаватель КУИМЦ

Казанского Национального Исследовательского Технического Университета им Туполева

2. Хайруллина Наиля Рамилевна,

к.ф.н., доцент кафедры иностранных языков

Казанского Национального Исследовательского Технического Университета им Туполева,

3. Нестеренко Елена Игоревна,

преподаватель кафедры алтаистики и китаеведения института международных отношений

Казанского Федерального Университета

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И КИТАЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ

DOI: [10.31618/ESSA.2782-1994.2021.4.74.147](https://doi.org/10.31618/ESSA.2782-1994.2021.4.74.147)

Аннотация. Данная статья посвящена схожим и отличительным чертам в изучении английского и китайского. Цель исследований – изучение и определение идентичных и неидентичных аспектов в изучении двух абсолютно разных языков. Изучены особенности обучения алфавиту, лексике и грамматике английского и китайского языков.

Abstract. This article focuses on the similarities and differences between learning English and Chinese. The purpose of the research is to study and determine the identical and non-identical aspects in the study of two completely different languages. Studied the features of teaching the alphabet, vocabulary and grammar of the English and Chinese languages.

Ключевые слова: иностранный язык, английский язык, китайский язык, фонетика, лексика, грамматика