

Means of Nominal Group Uncertainty Expression in English and Tatar Languages

Venera N. Khisamova, Leila A. Nurgaliyeva and Elvira B. Fattakhova
Department of History and Oriental Studies, Institute of International Relations,
Kazan Federal University, Kremlevskaya Str. 18, 420008 Kazan, Russia

Abstract: This study presents a comparative analysis of the two languages with different structures (English and Tatar) within the aspect of uncertainty category study. Despite the fact that many linguists pointed to the absence or underdevelopment of uncertainty category in the languages without articles, in this case English language takes place. We set the task to identify the equivalents among the lexical and morphological means of Tatar language as the language without articles conveying similar uncertainty and certainty values by English language articles. Due to the fact that Tatar language does not have a system of means for the formal expression of uncertainty category, it is not a grammatical universal, however, it is undoubtedly a universal conceptual and functional-semantic category. Although, Tatar language does not have grammaticalized markers whose main function is to express the values of certainty and uncertainty, this category is expressed by a whole set of interacting means, belonging to different linguistic levels and operating in close relationship with each other. On the basis of the presented classification of the famous linguist G. Hawkins and the definite article use in English a huge number of equivalents in Tatar language was found.

Key words: Uncertainty category, definite and indefinite article, accusative, the uncertainty marker “ber”, demonstratives, possessives, position

INTRODUCTION

Until recently the category of uncertainty category was the only object of study due to the study of articles in Western European languages. Many linguists pointed to the absence or underdevelopment of uncertainty category in the languages without articles, to which Turkic languages also belong. Professor John. G. Kiebaev was the first specialist, who questioned this approach. On the basis of comparative-historical study of Ural and Altaic languages Kiebaev (1972), concluded that they have a common logical category of uncertainty, reflecting “in the minds of all people equally” and obtaining” its grammar expression in different languages within various forms. The academician Zakiev (1993) in his turn, wrote the following about the same problem: “In the absence of regular morphological means of expression the certainty uncertainty category in Tatar language may not be qualified as a morphological category”. G.G. Kiebaev emphasized that grammatical category of uncertainty in the Ural and Altaic languages is developed and is structurally complex as it pervades the whole grammatical system and is expressed in various forms. Due to the absence of articles as the primary means

of uncertainty meaning transfer, other means of these concepts (lexical, phonetic, morphological, syntactic) expression were developed in Turkic languages.

When the category of uncertainty is implemented, the indefinite article a/an serves as a signal of new information, introduces into the discourse a previously unknown item of description or discussion, points to the lack of communicator awareness on the subject of speech and also signals about the emergence of necessary information subject for its identification in the subsequent part of the discourse. It causes the sense of speech addressee expectation and requires further development of the narrative. An indefinite article has a disastrous, progressive trend that is most clearly seen in the beginning of the story when new characters, new circumstances of the actions disclosed in the future are introduced: in the first forty days a boy had been with him (E. Hemingway):

Беренчекырыккөннеанынбеләнбермал
айуткәрде

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In Tatar language the primary means of name uncertainty marking is the lexeme ber, the grammatical

status of which is considered as the numeral “one” for the lexical expression of a number, like other cardinal numbers as a special grammatical index of individuality and as the measure of uncertainty. Like the article a/an in English, *ber* is widely used at the beginning of the narrative in introductory sentences. The meaning of uncertainty provided by this marker is based on the fact that it characterizes a noun as a new one for a listener (G. Tukai):

**НәкъКазанартындабардырберавыдКы
рлайдиләр**

Past Kazan into the country there’s a village called Kurlai. The definite article “the” in English refers to the awareness of communicants on a subject of the speech, serves as the signal of preliminary information with anaphoric orientation, referring to the preceding text fragment, the recipient’s life experience or to the general knowledge about the world. In the referential chain, the definite study picks up a primary name and leads, supplements or simply repeats it in a text but it is the subject of speech as something known as the theme in the process of actual division: the old man had taught the boy to fish and the boy loved him (E. Hemingway):

**Картмалайныбалыкотыргаөйрәтте, шулма
лайаныратаиде**

The definite study is the most important determinant of certainty and is an exceptional example of grammaticalized identifiability. The main function of the study the is to indicate that a referent or rather a mental representation of the referent in the discourse universe with which the article is used should be interpreted as an entity that may be distinguished by an addressee among other members of the same class in a context. As is the case, with most languages of the world, primarily with Germanic and Roman languages, English definite article is derived diachronically from the demonstrative pronoun.

As the markers of certainty, demonstrative pronouns and definite articles are radically different by the availability of deictic component in the first ones and its absence in the last ones. The study “the” is an entirely neutral one with regard to deixis, person, number, gender or any other grammatical characteristics. The condition of demonstrative grammaticalization in definite articles is a gradual reduction of the deictic element role, often accompanied by phonological reduction, the loss of morphological and grammatical autonomy.

Although, Tatar language does not have a special deictic neutral demonstrative which could be grammaticalized then in the definite article, we argue that the demonstrative pronouns in Tatar language are one of

the most expressive markers of certainty. There is a number of demonstratives in Tatar language, which include not only the basic forms, opposed by three deictic levels (*By/in the noise, shul, that street/tag, that far*) but also their variatives, a large number of adjectives and adverbs: (*Andes*) (such), (*Mordi*) (such), (*Shunde*) (such), (*andagy*) (located there), *tag and age, (such) Shunde* (located there), *Muting* (thus), *keep calm (so) further (so)*. The language has demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative words: *won’t here, Mother (Vontam) bridge (here), menabw (this one), ana tag (that one), tag and end (there), menabw (here), ana tag (located here), noise ikad (in such an extent), Shlchakly (in such an extent), etc.*

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

J. Hawkins classification using the examples of english and tatar languages: The most complete classification of cases concerning the definite article use was proposed by Hawkins (1978). This classification distinguishes eight cases of the definite article use, six of which will be discussed in this study, on the example of the English language with the closest equivalents in Tatar language:

Anaphoric certainty: When a new element is introduced into discourse, it is understood that an addressee does not know it, so the indefinite article is used as in example. Upon the subsequent mentioning a familiar antecedent in the destination memory occurs and a name group is used with the definite article

- Fred was discussing an interesting book in his class
- I went to discuss the book with him afterwards (Ibidem)

We observe the use of the uncertainty marker “March” during the initial introduction of a referent into discourse and a demonstrative noun at its repeated mention as the equivalents to the article a/an and the in the context of the anaphoric certainty within Tatar language (X. КамалоВ):

**“Ишкәтәншакмаклыобкакигән, чөчләрен
башартынатөйнөгәнәш, матурйөзле, урт
ачаракбуулыберкызатыл ыпчыкты. Әбас
кычөстендөтүгәрәкбитле, старшинапогон
лыберкешекүренде, БуминуттатегекызМ
остафиннынбеләгенәкилепәбышты, еш-е
пгынала, кулларыдерелд идее”**

A pretty girl wearing a plaid skirt ran out the door; she was of average height, her hair in a bun. A round-faced man wearing sergeant major loops appeared on the

stairs. At that moment, the girl ran towards Mustafin and grabbed his arm, she was breathing heavily and her hands were trembling.

Associative anaphora: In the absence of antecedent discourse, a “trigger” is necessary (Hawkins, 1978), starting an associative anaphora. Associative anaphoras are the components or the attributes of a bigger object or a larger situation that is presented by a triggering word. The use of the definite article is possible only if a speaker and a recipient know about the relation between an anaphora and a trigger. They bought a used car. The engine was not working properly.

**Алариске машина сатып алдылар. Двигате
леначар эшинде**

In this example, the phrase “a used car” is the trigger for the anaphora “the engine” based on a partitive attribute.

One way to transfer such a meaning of certainty in Tatar language is the use of possessive constructions, providing in addition to the meanings of belonging the ratio of a part to the whole as in the abovestated example:

**“улбыел диплом яза. Темасыпактый авыр,
бәлки кызык**

He is writing a thesis this year. The topic is very difficult but interesting. In the example “улбыел диплом яза” (He is writing a thesis this year), we would like to emphasize the second way of a name group uncertainty marking. The direct object “diploma” is used in an unmarked accusative. The object without an accusative case is used in the statements, where the emphasis is on the action itself and its object either unimportant or is of secondary importance and clarifies slightly the meaning of the action. The studies confirm that the in Altaic languages including in Tatar one, the function of the indefinite article is often performed by a zero affix. In Tatar language, a direct complement expressed by a noun is always before a predicate and often takes the form of an indefinite accusative case.

Visual communication situation: When an object is in the field of view of a speaker and a recipient the definite article is used, provided that a referent is a uniquely identifiable for a listener: Pass me the apple please, “Мина алманы бирәле”.

In this context, the equivalent of the English article “the” in Tatar language is the direct object marked by accusative case, the determination of which is evident by context (М. Галәү):

**Сәжидә, иелеп, жирдән чәйнекне алдыда,
жәһәт-жәһәт атлап, инешбуентөшөп китте**

Sajida kneeled and took the kettle from the ground, then nimbly went down to the river. The accusative case formed by affix imposes a semantic load of certainty on the direct object of an action.

Private knowledge: When referring to a referent of which a speaker and a recipient have specific knowledge, the name group is formed by the definite article: do not play the music so loud. You can wake up the baby. General background knowledge of speech participants allows to use the definite article when a referent is mentioned for the first time. The residents of one neighborhood or a village may say “the post office, the pub, the soccer field”, without fear of being not properly understood. As Chen (2004) notes, the scope of the context covered by general background knowledge is the continuum that begins with an immediate situation and is expanded gradually into a physical, cultural and social environment where the participants of a speech act are located.

When the determination of a referent is evident from the context, based on common background knowledge in the Tatar language as a marker of certainty a variety of morphological, lexical and syntactic means may be applied, for example: a designed accusative. **Әкрәп, баланы уятакүрмә!** Quiet, don't wake up the baby! In possessive affixes (R. Nizamiev):

**Көнсаендимим, атнага берничә тапкыраны
авылларына кадәр озата барам**

Not every day, but a couple of times a week I walk her to the village; group name which is the subject of an utterance, in the position of a subject **Кибет бүгөн эши
әми.** The shop is closed today.

General knowledge: This category includes the cases which G. Hawkins calls “an extended situation” (Hopper and Thompson, 1993) when a speaker is appealing to the awareness of an addressee about a referent, the existence of which is a universal knowledge such as the sun, the moon: the moon had sunk and left the quiet earth alone with the stars (J.K. Jerome).

Such unique entities in the direct object position within Tatar language are drawn by an accusative suffix, marking a name group as a definite one: “**Айны каплап-акболыт белән**” (Н. Такташ) Covering the moon with milky white cloud.

In the position of the subject, the group name which is a unique one by its nature, is not marked by additional

morphological or lexical means. Linguists acknowledged that the subject and other sentence elements before the predicate, in most cases are represented by certain name groups. The discursive-pragmatic concept of a topic is the main factor determining the relationship between the predisposition to a certain position in a sentence and the identification of name groups. Lambrecht (1994) writes that a referent is considered as a theme of a sentence if a sentence is made up about this referent, i.e., the sentence provides some relevant information and deepens the knowledge of an addressee about this referent. Thus, the abovementioned example from J. K. Jerome book is read in the Tatar language as follows:

**Айбатгыһәм тынсыз жирней олдызлар бел
әнялгыз калдырды**

“Unexplanatory modifiers”: This group includes the name groups containing the qualifying words such as ordinal numbers, adjectives or adverbs in superlative forms requiring a mandatory use of a definite article. According to George. Hawkins, the inability to use the indefinite article in these cases is related to the semantic incompatibility between the element of uniqueness in the content of a modifier and the ambiguity of the indefinite article a (Hopper and Thompson, 1993). The only time he interrupted her was to agree with her views on nuclear power (T. Pratchett):

**Үланын белән атом төш энергетикасы туры
ндакиләшер өчен, сүзен бер генә мәртәбә
дәрдә**

I have the greatest respect and affection to your uncle (P. Wodehouse).

**Абыңа карата мин би күзрихтирам тоям,
аңарга күңелем ята**

The descriptive element of the name group points to the uniqueness of a referent. In this case, the only correct marker of certainty of the definite article “the”. This uniqueness and therefore certainty of a referent is achieved by lexical means in Tatar language, for example: **иңзурихтирам** (great respect), **иңбөек язучы** (the greatest writer), **бер генә мәртәбә** (one single time), **бердән бер** (the only one) and others.

Summary: Thus, despite the absence of grammaticalized markers in Tatar language the expressions of certainty/uncertainty, these meanings assigned to the articles in English are referred by lexical and

morphological means in Tatar language. The category of uncertainty in the Tatar language is a functional-semantic one.

CONCLUSION

From the comparative analysis of English and Tatar languages in terms of uncertainty category expression, we determined the most obvious equivalents for the English articles in Tatar language without articles. English indefinite article “a” is similar to:

- Uncertainty marker “ber”
- A direct object in a formed accusative

English definite article is represented by:

- Demonstrative pronouns before a name group
- Direct object in a formed accusative
- The name groups in possessive constructions and with possessive affixes
- Lexical means, providing the meaning of uniqueness like **иң** (the most), **бердән бер** (a unique), **бер генә** (only one)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

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

REFERENCES

- Kiekbayev, D.G., 1972. Introduction to the Ural-Altaic linguistics. D.G. Kiekbayev. Ufa: Bashknigoizdat, pp: 152.
- Chen, P., 2004. Identifiability and Definiteness in Chinese. Linguistics, 42 (6): 1129-1184.
- Hawkins, J.A., 1978. Definiteness and Indefiniteness: a study in reference and grammaticality prediction. London: Croom Helm, pp: 316.
- Hopper, P. and Thompson, S.A., 1993. Language universals, discourse pragmatics and semantics. P. Hopper, S.A. Thompson, Language Sci., 15 (4): 357-376.
- Lambrecht, K., 1994. Information Structure and Sentence Form: A Theory of Topic, Focus and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp: 388.
- Zakiev, M.Z., 1993. Tatar grammar. Volume II. Morphology, Kazan, Tatar Publishing House, pp: 383.