

Looking for Russian – Tagalog Lexical and Grammatical Equivalents***Meneliti Persamaan Leksikal dan Tatabahasa Bahasa Rusia – Tagalog***

Prof. Madya Dr. Elena G. Frolova
efrolova@iaas.msu

Institute of Asian and African Studies, Moscow State University, Russia 125009, Moscow, 11,
Mokhovaya Str.

Published: 28 April 2024

To cite this article (APA): Frolova, E. G. (2024). Looking for Russian – Tagalog Lexical and Grammatical Equivalents. *PENDETA*, 15(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.37134/pendeta.vol15.1.fa.1.2024>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.37134/pendeta.vol15.1.fa.1.2024>

ABSTRACT

Analysis of lexical and grammatical equivalents in different languages is an essential and necessary aspect of acquisition of command of a foreign language and translation as a type of speech activity. To do it properly a student must understand that distribution of various components of meaning in languages can differ and word by word translation can cause losses of information that should be compensated by some other means that can be both lexical and grammatical. The Tagalog and Russian languages often use various sets of constituents of meaning in words to describe the world around and the content expressed grammatically in one language can be expressed lexically in the other. The fact that Tagalog is one of the agglutinative languages while Russian is an inflectional language makes the process of translation even more complicated. This article is an attempt to show some differences and similarities in semantic and grammatical components in several groups of words in Tagalog and Russian. Understanding of these peculiarities of the languages can make translation easier for the students.

Keyword: situational model of translation; lexical and grammatical equivalents; demonstrative pronouns; kinship terms; the Russian language; the Tagalog language

ABSTRAK

Analisis padanan leksikal dan tatabahasa dalam pelbagai bahasa ialah satu aspek yang sangat diperlukan dalam usaha menguasai bahasa asing dan penterjemahan sebagai sejenis aktiviti pertuturan. Untuk memastikan analisis dapat dilakukan dengan tepat, para pelajar mesti sedar bahawa pengagihan pelbagai komponen makna dalam bahasa yang berlainan adalah tidak sama dan penterjemahan kata demi kata boleh mengakibatkan sejumlah maklumat yang hendak dipaparkan tercicir dalam komunikasi dan mesti disampaikan dengan cara-cara lain, baik secara leksikal mahupun gramatikal. Bahasa Tagalog dan Rusia sering menggunakan pelbagai set konstituen makna dalam perkataan untuk menggambarkan dunia sekeliling dan kandungan yang dinyatakan secara tatabahasa dalam satu bahasa boleh dinyatakan secara leksikal dalam bahasa yang lain. Proses penterjemahan menjadi lebih mencabar lagi disebabkan Bahasa Tagalog merupakan bahasa aglutinatif, manakala Bahasa Rusia ialah bahasa fleksi. Justeru, kajian ini cuba memperlihatkan perbezaan dan persamaan tertentu dalam komponen semantik dan tatabahasa yang dikesan dalam beberapa kumpulan perkataan bahasa Tagalog dan bahasa Rusia. Pemahaman terhadap ciri khas kedua-dua bahasa tersebut menjadikan penterjemahan dapat dilakukan dengan lebih mudah oleh para pelajar.

Kata Kunci: model situasi terjemahan; padanan leksikal dan grammatik; kata ganti penunjuk; istilah kekeluargaan; Bahasa Rusia; Bahasa Tagalog

INTRODUCTION

While learning or teaching a foreign language students and teachers are always engaged in looking for equivalents in different languages because translation is an important part of learning of a foreign language. The goal of translation is to produce a text bearing the same relation to the extralinguistic situation as the original one and semantically equivalent to it. But while translating it comes out that languages can use various sets of constituents of meaning in words to describe the world around and the content expressed grammatically in the source language can be expressed lexically in the target language and vice versa. Semantic relations affect translation both in the initial stage of analysis and in producing of the target language text. Besides that, sometimes, due to a different vision the meaning of a word in the source language is wider and less differentiated and corresponds to two or more correlated words in the target language. If the meaning of a lexeme in the source language is more differentiated it should often be translated by a word combination in a target language.

We can't say that there are strict rules of correspondence in identifying equivalents but never the less there are some regularities that can really help.

Most of the words (except terms) are polysemes so their equivalents in other language can coincide only in part of their meanings. Besides that, words are always elements of the unique grammatical system of a language and obtain particular grammatical characteristics. A translator should analyze all peculiarities of the languages while substituting words of a source language by the words of the target language and find ways of compensation of the possible losses of information. Sometimes these losses can be compensated for in other portions of a message and even by different devices and means.

To show some differences and similarities in semantic and grammatical components in several groups of words in Tagalog and Russian we'll analyze and try to find equivalents to the most simple and common groups of words (demonstrative and personal pronouns, family terms, some adjectives, nouns and verbs) in Russian and Tagalog that only seem to be monosemantic and describe the extralinguistic situation in their own very peculiar way.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The problem of Russian – Tagalog equivalents is not yet discussed directly in any scientific literature as there are very few translations from Tagalog published in Russian and even less translations from Russian published in Tagalog. But many linguists including Russian scientists have already paid special attention to the description of the Tagalog and Russian languages and to the problems of translation in many other languages, for example British linguist J. Catford (1965) and Russian linguists V.G. Gak (2000), Y. I. Retsker (2007) and A. V. Fedorov (1968). The theories of translation developed by them for other languages make it possible to analyze the problem and come to some conclusions in different languages.

The first Russian linguists who paid special attention to the problems of the theory of translation were Y. I. Retsker (2007) and A. V. Fedorov (1968). They have developed the theory of regular correspondences that was based on a linguistic analysis of translation problems. Translation, they argued, is inconceivable without a sound linguistic basis, and this basis can be provided by a contrastive study of linguistics phenomena and the establishment of certain correspondences between the language of the original and that of the translation. The authors of this theory were mainly concerned with a typology of relationships between linguistic units (equivalents - permanent correspondences, not sensitive to context, and context-sensitive variant correspondences) but also investigated some of the translation techniques, thus mapping out some ways of dealing with translation as a process.

The situational model of translation developed by V. G. Gak (2000), J. Catford (1965) and others is based on situational analysis in linguistics. It is based on the assumption that languages use somewhat different sets of semantic components (constituents of meaning) to describe identical extralinguistic situations.

In search of equivalents in different languages we usually turn to the dictionaries and glossaries where we can seemingly easily find them. But these dictionaries are apparently not enough for solving

all problems of translation as they can't mention all meanings of words, their grammatical and stylistic features. Besides that there are only two Russian – Tagalog dictionaries published in Russia. They are: “Russian – Tagalog Dictionary” by M. Cruz and S. Ignashev (1965) (about 23 000 words) and “Training Russian – Tagalog Dictionary” by E.G. Frolova and E.A. Baklanova (2023) (about 7500 entries). And there are two Tagalog – Russian dictionaries: “Tagalog – Russian Dictionary” by M. Cruz and S. Ignashev (1959) (about 20 000 words) and “New Tagalog – Russian Dictionary” by G.E. Rachkov (2012) (about 60 000 words).

As far as I know there are no Russian – Tagalog or Tagalog – Russian dictionaries published in the Philippines.

Besides dictionaries mentioned above while looking for Russian – Tagalog equivalents our students use English – Tagalog and Tagalog – English dictionaries like “English – Tagalog Dictionary” (1965) (approximately 84,000 entries, 1211 pages) and “Tagalog – English Dictionary” (1986) (1583 pages) by L.J. English, “VICASSAN’S Pilipino – English Dictionary” by Vito C. Santos (1978) (over 68,000 entries).

In addition to these dictionaries there are several monolingual Tagalog / Pilipino / Filipino dictionaries published in the Philippines and they can also help to find Russian – Tagalog equivalents, for example: “Diksiyunaryo – Tesaurus Pilipino – Ingles” by J.V. Panganiban (1972) (number of words is not mentioned, 1027 pages), “UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino” by Virgilio Almarino (2001) (over 100,000 words), “Tagalog Slang Dictionary” by David Paul R. Zorc (1993) (164 pages) and others.

Looking for translation equivalence we see that one language can describe the extralinguistic situation more explicitly and the degree of detalization may differ in the Russian and Tagalog languages. It means that the interpreter should know pretty well not only vocabulary and grammar of a language but traditions, folklore and literature, nature and other details of way of living of speakers of a source and a target languages. There are a lot of publications about it by American and Filipino researchers, for example: “Filipino Social Structure and Value System” by F. Landa Jocano (1966), “Culture and Customs of the Philippines” by Paul A. Rodell (2002), “Pilipino Through Self-Instruction” (Revised Edition) by John U. Wolff, Maria Theresa C. Centeno and Der-Hwa Rau (2002). There is also a number of works of this kind published by Russian scientists, for example: “Sampaguita, Cross and Dollar” by I.V. Podberezskiy (1974), “Son of Betel Nut and Betel Leaf”: the Symbolism of Areca Catechu and Piper Betle in Oral Literature and Traditional Culture of the Ifugao and Other Peoples of the Philippines” by M.V. Stanyukovich (2010), “On contact-induced changes in modern Tagalog: A case study” by E.A. Baklanova (2017), “Language Changes in the Philippines in the Context of Language Situation” by E.G. Frolova (2019) and others.

All these surveys help to understand better the texts in a source language and find equivalents in the target language.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in the article for the description of Russian – Tagalog lexical and grammatical equivalents is based on the communicative-functional approach which takes into consideration not only semantic and grammatical differences of languages but the situation in which the original text was produced, aim of communication and other extralinguistic factors. One of the founders of such approach in Russian theory of translation was Alexander Schweitzer who emphasized that translation is an act of communication which includes two stages: (1) communication between the source text sender and the translator; (2) communication between the translator and the target text recipient (Schweitzer, 1973, p. 61-76). Later he dwelled on such aspects as the communicative intention of the source language sender, the functional parameters of the text and a communicative effect of the utterance (Schweitzer, 1988, p. 147).

This method of analysis of equivalents provides insights into vocabularies and grammatical systems of the both languages and mechanism of translation from one into the other.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

While looking for Russian – Tagalog equivalents it becomes obvious from the very beginning that there is a great difference in the Russian and Tagalog languages in all levels: phonetics, vocabulary and grammar. And the role of a teacher here is to analyze and try to explain these differences to the students. If the difference in phonetics and vocabulary is quite expected by the students the difference in grammar of Russian and Tagalog often appears to be a surprise to them.

Speaking of difference in phonetics we mean discrepancy in sounds and their possible combinations. The most difficult Tagalog sounds for Russian students are glottal stop that often appear at the end, beginning or middle of Tagalog words and posterial nasal sound especially in combination with different vowels. But as a rule students overcome this difficulty rather quickly. Similarly easily they master the fact that there are prepositional and postpositional forms of personal pronouns in Tagalog as these facts only reflect formal distinctions in the two languages. But when the distinctions in grammar or lexicon show different ways of description of reality around us it causes problems in translation as the distribution of semes may be different in the languages. As J.C. Catford puts it, "Meanings, in our view, is a property of a language. An S.L. (Source Language) text has an S.L. MEANING, and a T.L. (Target Language) text has a T.L. meaning —a Russian text, for instance, has a Russian meaning (as well as Russian phonology/graphology, grammar and lexis), and an equivalent English text has an English meaning " (Catford,1965, p.35). We can easily prove the idea comparing meanings of Russian and Tagalog lexemes.

It is necessary to mention that there are three types of lexical meaning of lexemes that should be distinguished and rendered in translation (referential, emotive and stylistic) and that in the article we'll only deal with the referential meaning (also called logical, denotative) that has direct reference to things or phenomena of objective reality, including abstract notions and processes as well.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS

The difference in the meaning of Russian and Tagalog lexemes can be easily demonstrated by personal pronouns. There are two personal pronoun plural forms of the first person ('we') in Tagalog. One of them includes the listener and the other one excludes him or her.

Table 1. Tagalog personal pronouns

| Case | Inclusive Forms | Exclusive Forms |
|---------------|--|---|
| Nominative | <i>tayo</i> 'we' | <i>kami</i> 'we' |
| Genitive | <i>atin</i> 'our' (prepositional form) <i>natin</i> 'our' (postpositional form) | <i>amin</i> 'our' (prepositional form), <i>namin</i> 'our' (postpositional form) |
| Prepositional | <i>sa atin</i> 'to / for us' | <i>sa amin</i> 'to / for us' |

In Russian there is one form of personal pronoun plural of the first person ('we') which can include or exclude the listener. So while translating from Tagalog into Russian you should add information in Russian if the listener is included or not in the number of 'we' using word combinations 'with you' or 'without you'.

DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

One can find similar situation comparing demonstrative pronouns in Russian and Tagalog. In Russian there are two types of demonstrative pronouns depending on degree of remoteness of an object from the speaker: one is closer to the speaker and the other one is closer to the referent (can be translated as 'this' and 'that'). In Tagalog there are three degrees of remoteness.

Table 2. Tagalog demonstrative pronouns

| Case | Close to the referent and the speaker | Closer to the referent but far from the speaker | Far from both the speaker and referent |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Nominative | <i>ito</i> ‘this’ | <i>iyon</i> ‘that’ | <i>iyon / yaon</i> ‘that’ |
| Genitive | <i>nito</i> ‘of this’ | <i>n[i]yan</i> ‘of that’ | <i>niyon, noon</i> ‘of that’ |
| Prepositional | <i>dito</i> ‘in/on this’ | <i>diyan</i> ‘in/on that’ | <i>doon</i> ‘in/on that’ |

KINSHIP TERMS

We can see even more distinctions in Russian and Tagalog in such groups of words as kinship terms of both close and extended family. They can cause some difficulty for the students because they obtain different semantic structure in Tagalog and Russian even in their denotative meaning. It’s interesting to analyze them because as a rule this group of words belongs to the oldest layer of the vocabulary of any language and clearly shows the way people understand and describe the world around.

In Russian most of these terms are polysemes as they define the degree of kinship and gender of the relative in their denotative or referential meaning. For the Tagalogs gender is less important because most of these terms (but not all) don’t indicate it. So, they can be used as masculine or feminine depending on the context. In Tagalog gender is a kind of additional information that can be added or not by an additional definition, by a separate word (so, it will be a word combination) with the help of such words as *lalaki* ‘man’ or *babae* ‘woman’.

VERTICAL LINE OF KINSHIP

If we take a vertical line of kinship from the point of view of older relative to younger in Tagalog we’ll see that all terms of this kind can be used for both masculine and feminine nouns.

Table 3. Tagalog terms of vertical line of kinship (from the point of view of older).

| Neutral to Gender | Masculine | Feminine |
|---|---|---|
| <i>anak</i> ‘son, daughter’ | <i>anak na lalaki</i> ‘son’ | <i>anak na babae</i> ‘daughter’ |
| <i>apo</i> ‘grandson, granddaughter’ | <i>apong lalaki</i> ‘grandson’ | <i>apong babae</i> ‘granddaughter’ |
| <i>pamangkin</i> ‘nephew, niece’ | <i>pamangking lalaki</i> ‘nephew’ | <i>pamangking babae</i> ‘niece’ |
| <i>manugang</i> ‘son-in-law (daughter’s husband), daughter-in-law (son’s wife)’ | <i>manugang na lalaki</i> ‘son-in-law (daughter’s husband)’ | <i>manugang na babae</i> ‘daughter-in-law (son’s wife)’ |

One can see the same regularity in the Tagalog lexeme *panganay* denoting the firstborn child (both boy and girl) and the lexeme denoting the process of adopting a child (both son and daughter) as one root word is used for both of them: *pag-aampon* ‘adoption’, *ampunin / mag-ampon* ‘to adopt’. In Russian they will be different words *усыновлять* ‘to adopt a boy’ and *удочерять* ‘to adopt a girl’ from the Russian root words *сын* ‘son’ and *дочь* ‘daughter’.

Russian family terms always contain the seme of gender and should be translated in Tagalog by a word combination if we don’t want to lose any element of information. Maybe it’s necessary to add that in Russian there is also a word meaning both son and daughter. It’s *дunya* (‘child’ in English), but this word can also mean “child” or “baby” who is not one’s relative but simply a young person. In Tagalog these family terms mentioned above don’t denote age, they only denote type of kinship.

But the situation is quite different and gender is always important and defined by both the Tagalogs and Russians if we take a vertical line of kinship from the point of view of a younger relative to an elder one. This rule is valid for loan-words too:

ina / inay / nanay ‘mother’,
ama / tatay / tatang ‘father’
ti[y]a (Spanish) / *tita / ali / ale* ‘aunt’,
amain / tiyo (Spanish) ‘uncle’,
apo / lolo (Spanish) ‘grandfather’,
impo / lola (Spanish) ‘grandmother’.

The terms *lolo* ‘grandfather’ and *lola* ‘grandmother’ are also used to address with respect to old people.

So, we can say that when the Tagalogs speak about elder relatives gender will be combined with the degree of kinship, and sets of semantic components (constituents of meaning) will coincide in Tagalog and Russian and substitution of one word in one language by a word in the other language is quite possible.

TAGALOG TERMS OF KINSHIP IN ONE GENERATION

As a rule, the same denoting gender is not included in the Tagalog terms describing relatives in one generation.

Table 4. Tagalog terms of relatives in one generation in a close family

| Neutral to gender | Masculine | Feminine |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>asawa</i> ‘husband, wife’ | <i>asawang lalaki</i> ‘husband’ | <i>asawang babae</i> ‘wife’ |
| <i>kapatid</i> ‘brother, sister’ | <i>kapatid na lalaki</i> ‘brother’ | <i>kapatid na babae</i> ‘sister’ |
| <i>pinsan</i> ‘cousin (man or woman)’ | <i>pinsang lalaki</i> ‘cousin (man)’ | <i>pinsang babae</i> ‘cousin (woman)’ |

In Russian it’s impossible to define one of the couple without denoting their gender. The same with brothers and sisters.

But denoting age of siblings we’ll again see discrepancy: in Tagalog even elder sister and elder brother are denoted by different words. Gender is always included in the meaning of these words though they describe relatives belonging to one generation or siblings:

ate ‘elder sister’
ditse ‘second sister according to the age’
kuya ‘elder brother’
diko ‘second brother according to the age’

The terms *ate* ‘elder sister’ and *kuya* ‘elder brother’ are also used to address with respect to any older but not old woman or man.

In Tagalog all these words contain semes meaning degree of kinship and gender. In Russian these meanings are distributed between words ‘elder’, ‘sister’, ‘brother’ and ‘second’ and so expressed by word combinations: *старшая сестра* ‘elder sister’, *старший брат* ‘elder brother’, *второй по старшинству сестра* ‘second sister’, *второй по старшинству брат* ‘second brother’.

The terms denoting cousins in Russian also differ greatly from the Tagalog terms. They are denoted by the same words *брат* ‘brother’ and *сестра* ‘sister’ defined by the words *родной* or *родная* ‘own’ or *двоюродный* or *двоюродная* ‘related through grandparents’. So, in Russian this meaning is expressed by word combinations *двоюродный брат* and *двоюродная сестра* that contains the following set of semantic components (constituents of meaning): degree of kinship and gender of the person. But in Tagalog it’s quite enough to use the word *pinsan* which shows the type of kinship but

not gender. And if you need you can add words *babae* ‘woman’ or *lalaki* ‘man’. It will be *pinsan[g] babae* or *pinsan [g lalaki]*. So, in Russian it’s always a word combination and in Tagalog one word is enough.

It means that it is also a word combination including semes of degree of kinship and gender but they are distributed in different ways in Russian and Tagalog.

If we continue to analyze the relative terms denoting persons belonging to one generation in an extended family we’ll see again that the distribution of different semes in Russian and Tagalog may be different. In this group of terms gender in Tagalog is important and this semantic component is included in the terms of relatives but type of kinship is less detailed and there are no special terms for them but in Russian there are special terms.

Table 5. Kinship terms in an extended family

| Tagalog | Russian |
|---|--|
| <i>bayaw</i> ‘brother-in-law’ (wife’s brother / sister’s husband) | <i>шурин</i> ‘wife’s brother’ |
| | <i>зять</i> ‘sister’s husband’ (the same as ‘daughter’s husband’ for daughter’s parents) |
| <i>hipag</i> ‘sister-in-law’ (husband’s sister / wife’s sister / brother’s wife). | <i>золовка</i> ‘husband’s sister’ |
| | <i>свояченица</i> ‘wife’s sister’ |
| | <i>невестка</i> ‘brother’s wife’ (the same as ‘son’s wife’ for son’s parents) |

It’s necessary to mention that the Tagalog term *bayaw* ‘brother-in-law’ is also used by fishermen to address to a stranger while fishing far in the sea.

Describing an extended family we again come across some discrepancy. The Tagalog term *biyanan* can be translated by both ‘father in law’ and ‘mother in law’ as it doesn’t denote the gender though it denotes an elder relative. So, if you translate it from Russian where the seme of gender is included in the lexeme you should use a word combination with the words *lalaki* ‘man’ or *babae* ‘woman’:

мечть – *biyanang lalaki* ‘father in law’
мёща – *biyanang babae* ‘mother in law’.

Having analyzed these family terms one can see that while in Tagalog a younger relative speaks about an elder one gender is important and denoted by the terms of kinship but when an elder one speaks of a younger relative gender is not denoted. The same regularity is observed when the relatives belong to one generation. While in Russian gender is much more important and most of the family terms denote degree of kinship and gender irrespective of the fact that they describe elder or younger relative.

It’s important for us because difference in meanings of seemingly equivalent words in the languages also emphasize the difference in perception of the world by the people. It shows us what is more important and what is less important for native speakers of different languages.

It should be also mentioned that while in Tagalog words *ate* ‘elder sister’ and *kuya* ‘elder brother’ are used to address any older but not relative person in Russian it will be lexemes *дядя* ‘uncle’ and *тетя* ‘aunt’.

DIFFERENCE IN RUSSIAN AND TAGALOG GRAMMAR DISCREPANCY IN MORPHOLOGY

There are a lot of other examples of different distribution of separate characteristics in Tagalog and Russian vocabulary but real difference between the two languages appears in morphology and syntax.

Discrepancy in the grammatical structures of the Russian and Tagalog languages which is an important part of their overall systems is no less important, in fact, than discrepancy in their lexicons or vocabularies. So called "grammatical" or "structural", as distinct from lexical meanings are carried by the elements of the grammatical structure, such as affixes, forms of inflection and derivation, syntactic patterns, word order, functional words, etc.

Russian is one of inflectional languages and Tagalog is a typical agglutinative language as many other languages of the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia and the whole region of the South-East Asia. Morphology of the Tagalog is very rich. There are many forms of affixes used in it. And besides that we can see a lot of examples of syllable reduplication that typically marks various tense forms of the verbs or number of nouns and adjectives. Many Tagalog words consist of several affixes and syllable reduplication (for example, *mag-ka-ka- sama* 'comrades, partners doing something together' from the root word *sama*, *pa-ki-ki-pag-tulong-an* 'cooperation, collaboration' from the root word *tulong*). There are six syllable positions in Tagalog words and one position for reduplication (Shkarban, 1995, pp. 80-81) for example: *na-pa-ka-ma-pag-pa-tawa* 'very funny' from the rootword *tawa* 'laugh'.

Agglutination in Tagalog is not as simple as in many other agglutinative languages (for example in Turkish) where each affix has only one grammatical or derivative meaning. "Some linguists even mention "inordinate complexity of verb forms in the languages of the Philippines" (Reid, Liao, 2004, p.17). Many Tagalog affixes have several different meanings being used in different parts of speech, for example prefix *ma-* can be a derivative prefix for adjectives (for example: *maganda* 'beautiful', *mayaman* 'reach', *malaki* 'large'), a derivative prefix for active verbs (for example: *maligo* 'to bath', *mahiga* 'to lie', *matulog* 'to sleep') and passive verbs (for example: *mabili* 'to be bought', *masabi* 'to be said'). In passive such verbs has also additional meaning of possibility or opportunity of accomplishing of activity denoted by a root word.

A lot of Tagalog derivative affixes obtain semantic syncretism as they show not only focus but also the way of action, for example: *makabili* 'to be able to buy', *makasulat* 'to be able to write', *sumulat* 'to write instantaneously', *magsulat* 'to write regularly'.

To translate such words perfectly students have to analyze the structure of the sentence to understand the meaning of the words with these affixes which have several semes and very often the students have to translate one Tagalog word by a word combination in Russian.

For example, a lot of Tagalog verbs revealing meaning of causation contain prefix *pa-* and can be translated in Russian by word combinations like 'to order or recommend to do something': *magpahuli*, *ipahuli* 'to order to arrest', *ipagpagawa* 'to order to do', *ipapatay* 'to order to kill'.

The derivative verb prefix *maka-* can also mean that something causes some feelings, for example: *makahiya* 'to cause shame', *makasuya* 'to cause disgust', *makataka* 'to cause surprise'.

There are a lot of such examples in other parts of speech, too. For example, Tagalog adjectives meaning equal quality can be derived with the help of prefix *ka-*, but they can be only translated by word combinations in Russian, for example: *kalakas* 'equal in force, strength', *kasinlaki* 'equal in size'.

Though we can see such phenomena while translating words of different parts of speech from Tagalog into Russian but most vivid examples denote different actors and types of activity because Tagalog affixes can be easily added to stems to produce such types of nouns. But in Russian such meanings are usually revealed by word combinations consisting of a verb and object or adverbial modifier, for example:

punla 'young plants in a a seedbed; seedlings' – *magpunla* 'to plant seeds'
layag 'sail (of a boat)' – *maglayag* 'to use or put up a sail; to travel by water or sea'
kaliskis 'scale; one of the thin, flat, hard covering of the body of some fishes, snakes, etc.' – *magkaliskis*, *kaliskisan* 'to scrape off the scales off, referring esp. to fishes'
pulbos 'powder; face powder' – *pumulbos* 'to reduce or crush into powder'
pilak 'silver' – *pilakan* 'to plate or overlay with silver'.

Tagalog affixes can express a big scale of semantic meanings including direction of action and its other details. Sometimes affixes can even change the meaning of a verb to the opposite, for example:

limos ‘alms’, *maglimos* ‘to give alms’, *magpalimos*, *mamalimos* ‘to ask for alms’
hiram ‘borrowed’, *pahiramín*, *magpahiram* ‘to lend something to’, *humiram*, *hiraman*,
hiramin ‘to borrow’

So, we see that the degree of detailing in Russian and Tagalog lexemes differ very often. Russian word combinations often consist of some general notion and some word that add more precise definition. Tagalog equivalents to such Russian word combinations often appear to be one word as there are a lot of different derivative affixes, for example, confix **ka-an** deriving collective nouns, or prefix **taga-**, which derive nouns according to the place of their origin or place of living:

bukid ‘farm; field’ – **kabukiran** ‘countryside; rural region’
bundok ‘mountain’ – **kabundukan** ‘mountain region’
lalawigan ‘province’ – **tagalalawigan** ‘living in a province’
rito ‘here’ – **tagarito** ‘living here’
roon ‘there’ – **tagaroon** ‘living there’.

Besides that, root words or stems in Tagalog often appear to be more differentiated than in Russian from the point of view of semantics, for example:

hampas ‘a strike or blow with smth elongated held by the hand’
kalabugan ‘loud, heavy noises as that caused by two wrestlers struggling on the floor’
saksak ‘act of stabbing; a thrust, as with a knife or any pointed instrument’,
pukpok ‘act or manner of hitting, beating, or pounding smth with or as with a hammer’.

Russian equivalents to all these Tagalog words will be word combinations.

DISCREPANCY IN SYNTAX

Discrepancy in the structure of sentences in Russian and Tagalog is one more problem for the students looking for Russian – Tagalog equivalents. The Tagalog sentence is often described in the following way: “The most common view – is that most Philippine languages have an “active” voice, sometimes called “actor focus”, and a number of “passive” voices, being variously labelled “goal / object / patient / theme / direct focus”, “instrument / associative focus”, “locative / referent focus”, “benefactive focus”, etc., which supposedly determine, or agree with, the case of the “focused / topic / subject” noun phrase (Reid, Liao, 2004, p.17). But in Russian there is only one passive construction with the patient in the subject and the use of the passive form of the verb in Russian is typical of the literary, formal or bookish style. So it’s quite impossible to preserve the syntactic relations of the original while translating from Tagalog into Russian and vice versa.

Besides that, Russian and Tagalog differ in the word order to the considerable extend. In Russian the subject of the sentence usually precedes predicate while in most of Tagalog sentences predicate occurs first with nominal complements, adjuncts and other modifiers of the predicate typically occurring after the predicate. And there is one more peculiarity in the Tagalog language: if the sentence subject is expressed by a personal pronoun it is usually put straight after the predicate though if it is expressed by a noun it is put after the object, for example:

Bumabasa siya ng aklat ‘Reading he / she book’
Bumabasa ng aklat ang estudyante ‘Reading book student’.

But I am not going to dwell on syntactic difference in the two languages though it influences greatly on the choice of Russian – Tagalog lexical and grammatical equivalents because otherwise we should pay more attention to translation techniques which is a distinct topic.

CONCLUSION

The semantic analysis of the possible Russian – Tagalog lexical and grammatical equivalents shows discrepancy and correspondences in the semantic and grammatical systems of the languages and differences in the way the languages describe the extralinguistic situations. The comparison of the language systems reveals national peculiarities in the value systems.

This short survey shows that most of the lexemes that seem to be equivalents can be only recognized as partial equivalents because even though sometimes they obtain the same set of semes the role of these semes in the structure of meaning can be different and beside that they belong to different language systems.

The results of this review can be used for the further research of lexicon and grammar of the Tagalog language and the process of selection of such equivalents that can help the students to master it because it makes them analyze and compare vocabularies and grammar structures of the languages determining their similarities and distinctive features. Besides that it can push forward the development of the theory, methods and skills of translation.

REFERENCE

- Baklanova E. (2017). On Contact-induced Changes in Modern Tagalog: A case study. *Mezhcivilizacionnyye kontakty v stranakh Yugo-Vostochnoj Azii: istoricheskie perspektivy i globalizaciya [Intercivilization Contacts in the Countries of the South-East Asia: Historical Perspectives and Globalization]*. (In Russian). Saint-Petersburg, 2017. Pp. 329-359.
- Castle Corazon & McGonnell Laurence. (2003). *Teach Yourself Tagalog, (Second Edition)*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2003.
- Catford J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Fjodorov A.V. (1968). *Osnovy obshhej teorii perevoda: Lingvisticheskij ocherk. [Theoretical Framework of Translation]*. (In Russian). M., 1968.
- Frolova E.G. (2019). *Yazykovye izmeneniya na Filippinakh v kontekste yazykovej situacii [Language Changes in the Philippines in the Context of Language Situation]*. (In Russian). Moscow, 2019.
- Gak V.G., Grigoryev B.B. (2000). *Teoriya i praktika perevoda. Francuzskij yazyk. [Translation Theory and Practice. The French Language]*. Moscow, Interdialekt+ Publ., 2000.
- Jocano F. Landa. (1966). *Filipino Social Structure and Value System*. Filipino Cultural Heritage. Lecture Series No. 2. Manila: PWU, 1966.
- Makarenko V.A. (1990). Tagalskij yazyk. *Lingvisticheskij ehnciklopedicheskij slovar. [The Tagalog Language. Linguistic Encyclopaedia]*. (In Russian). Moscow, 1990. Pp. 501-502.
- Podberezskij I.V. (1974). *Sampagita, krest i dollar. [Sampaguita, Cross and Dolar]*. (In Russian). Moscow, 1974.
- Podberezskij I.V. (1976). *Uchebnik tagalskogo yazyka. [Textbook of the Tagalog Language]*. (In Russian). Moscow, 1976.
- Rachkov G.E. (1981). *Vvedenie v morfologiyu sovremennogo tagalskogo yazyka. [Introduction to the Morphology of the Modern Tagalog Language]*. (In Russian). Leningrad, 1981.
- Reid L.A., Liao Hsiu-Chuan. (2004). *A Brief Syntactic Typology of Philippine Languages*, 2004. [<https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/32298117.pdf>] (28.07.2023).
- Retsker Ya. I. (2007). *Teoriya perevoda i perevodcheskaya praktika. Ocherki lingvisticheskoy teorii perevoda. [Translation Theory and Translation Practice. Essays on the Linguistic Theory of Translation]*. (In Russian). Moscow, 2007.
- Rodell Paul A. (2002). *Culture and Customs of the Philippines*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002.
- Schachter P., Otones Fe T. (1972). *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London:University of California Press, 1972.
- Schweitzer A.D. (1973). *Perevod i lingvistika (Gazetno-informacionnyj i voenno-publicisticheskij perevod) [Translation and Linguistics (Newspaper and Information and Military-Journalistic Translation)]*. (In Russian). Moscow, Voenizdat Publ., 1973.

- Schweitzer A.D. (1988). *Teoriya perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty*. [Translation Theory: Status, Problems, Aspects]. (In Russian). Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1988.
- Shkarban L.I. (1995). *Grammaticheskij stroj tagalskogo yazyka*. [Grammar Structure of the Tagalog Language]. (In Russian). Moscow, 1995.
- Stanyukovich M.V. (2010). “*Syn betelnogo orekha i lista betelya*”: *Simvolika areca catechu i piperbetle v folklore i tradicionnoj culture ifugao i drugikh narodov*. [‘Son of Betel Nut and Betel Leaf’: the Symbolism of Areca Catechu and Piper Betle in Oral Literature and Traditional Culture of the Ifugao and Other Peoples of the Philippines]. (In Russian). Saint-Petersburg, 2010. Pp. 306-340.
- Wolff John U. & Centeno Maria Theresa C., Rau, Der-Hwa. (2002). *Pilipino Through Self-Instruction (Revised Edition)*, Parts 1-3. NY: Cornell SEAP, 2002.

Dictionaries

- Cruz M., Ignashev S. (1959). *Tagalsko-russkij slovar*. [Tagalog-Russian Dictionary]. (In Russian). Moscow, 1959.
- Cruz M., Ignashev S. (1965). *Russko-tagalskij slovar*. [Russian-Tagalog Dictionary]. (In Russian). Moscow, 1965.
- English Leo James. (1965). *English - Tagalog Dictionary*. Department of Education. Republic of the Philippines, 1965.
- English Leo James. (1986). *Tagalog - English Dictionary*. Department of Education. Republic of the Philippines, 1986.
- Frolova E.G., Baklanova E.A. (2023). *Uchebnyj russko tagalskij slovar*. [Training Russian-Tagalog Dictionary]. (In Russian). Moscow, 2023.
- Panganiban J.V. (1972). *Diksiyunaryo - Tesauro Pilipino - Ingles*. Quezon, Pilipinas: Manlapaz Publishing Co., 1972.
- Rachkov G.E. (2012). *Novyj tagalsko-russkij slovar*. [New Tagalog-Russian Dictionary]. (In Russian). Volume 1, 2. Saint-Petersburg, 2012.
- Santos, Vito C. (1978). *VICASSAN'S Pilipino - English Dictionary*. National Bookstore, 1978. *UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino*. (2001). Virgilio Almario, Punong Editor. Quezon City: UP-SWF, 2001.
- Zorc David Paul R. (1993). *Tagalog Slang Dictionary*. Manila: DLSU Press, 1993.