
A Comparative Study of Existing Laws in the Use of Tatar and English Language in the Society

Ruzilya Talgatovna Sharafutdinova¹, Nailya Gabdelkhamitovna Mingazova², Vitaly Glebovich Subich³

1Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia

Email: nailyahamat@mail.ru

2Graduate Student, Institute of International Relations at Kazan Federal University

ruzilya-1971@mail.ru

3Candidate of Philology, Head of Oriental, African and Islamic Studies Department, Institute of International Relations at Kazan Federal University nailyahamat@mail.ru

4Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor of Oriental, African and Islamic Studies Department, Institute of International Relations at Kazan Federal University s_vitaly1@mail.ru

Abstract

An official language is a language that is legally chosen in a country or a region of the country that has the ability to establish specific laws for that region. Every country has its own official language, which is usually mentioned in the constitution of countries. This article deals with the comparative analysis of *izafet* constructions of Tatar (Turkic branch of the Altai language family) with non-*izafet* genitive constructions of English (Germanic branch of Indo-European language family) through the prism of Arabic *idafa* (Semitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family). Close comparison between Tatar and English evidently demonstrates asymmetric parallels in genitive constructions. The type of the ties in the Tatar genitive constructions is the one of the *izafet* (which is explained on the foundations of the Arabic *idafa*), while the English genitive is not marked by the *izafet*. In this regard, the English genitive constructions may be studied as correspondences to the Tatar *izafet*. Hence, the paper reveals the universal and unique features in the morphological domain of the phenomenon in question in the languages in question.

Keywords: law, regulations, *idafa*, *izafet*, genitive constructions, noun, Arabic, English, Tatar

Introduction

The phenomenon of *izafet* is typical for Iranian (Kurdish, Persian, Urdu, etc.), Semitic (Arabic, Hebrew, etc.), Turkic (Tatar, Turkish, etc.) and Uralic (Udmurt, etc.) languages. This phenomenon is called *idafa* in Arabic. It is an *ezafe* in Persian and Farsi, denoting a grammatical particle or pronoun between the words which it connects. The term *izafet* is borrowed from the Arabic grammar, where *idafa* denotes a genitive construction between two or more nouns, expressed by case endings. *Idafa* is a combination of two words, the second is always in genitive case and is the owner of what the first word points to, for example: *-qalamu tilmizin* 'a pupil's pencil'.

This construction has been studied by various scientists: Claire Tisdal (1902), Homainfarroh (1960), Moin (1962), Palmer (1971), Samiyan (1983), Karimi and Bram (1986), Rubinchik (2001), Honti L. (1812), Guiliani, Yasin and Kim Hua (2012), and others. So, Honti L. suggests that the given structure in the Uralic languages is focused on possessiveness and called by many researchers as the *izafet*. According to the scientist, the given notion is borrowed from Turkology, under the influence of neighboring Turkic languages. This may be the result of spontaneous internal development in the era of the Ural proto-language. There is a connection between the Uralic languages, using *izafet*, and Turkic, but these constructions developed independently in the mentioned language families [Mingazova, Subich, Carlson, 2018: 34].

Kunnapp A. analyzed the Turkish *izafet* II, in which the attribute is of the nominative case (mostly with a possessive suffix) [Kunnapp, 2009: 119]. Mingazova N. and Shangaraeva L. consider that the *izafet* construction in Tatar is similar to the genitive *izafet* in Persian [Mingazova, Shangaraeva, 2018: 29]. Ozturk and Taylan (2016) investigate the syntax and semantics of possessive constructions at the level of word combinations in the Turkish language, namely genitive-possessive constructions (GPs), possessive free genitives (PFG) and possessive compounds (PC). They determine that the semantic constructions are divided into two types based on the relation of the argument-modifier between the possessor and the possessed. Genitives in genitive-possessive constructions (GP) were reasoned, while in possessive free genitives they were modified. Relations between two nouns in genitive-possessive constructions and possessive compounds lean on lexical properties of the main noun [Mingazova, Subich, Carlson, 2018].

The goal of the research is to compare *izafet* constructions of Tatar with non-*izafet* genitive constructions of English through prism of the *idafa* of the Arabic language.

Materials and Methods

Mingazova N., Subich V. and Carlson Ch. compare languages with izafet and non-izafet genitive constructions: “The phenomenon of izafet is considered typical to Iranian (Persian), Afroasiatic (Arabic), Turkic (Tatar), and Uralic (Udmurt) languages, i.e. in languages with more or less agglutinating morphology. However, we do register non-izafet genitive patterns in some other languages (English, Japanese, Russian, Swahili), representing different language families, which possess the patterns similar to izafet or slightly/radically different” [Mingazova, Subich, Carlson, 2018: 34]. As a result, the languages of our study – English and Tatar – belong to this parallel: Tatar with the izafet construction and English with non-izafet genitive constructions.

From the point of view of genealogy and morphological structure, Tatar, English belong to different language families; Tatar belongs to the Altaic language family (the Turkic group), English belongs to the Indo-European language family (the Germanic group). There are similar and distinctive features in the functioning of the investigated phenomena in the languages compared.

The *idafa* (izafet) is an Arabic word meaning “connection”. It forms nominal combinations in Arabic. Rustemov O.D. considers syntactic and stylistic functions of izafet constructions in the *cadiasker* compilations of the Crimean khanate of the XVII-XVIII centuries. The *Izafet* of Arab-Persian origin played the role of terms. The Arabic isafets in the texts of *sijil* of the Crimean khanate act as an attribute which may combine in the sentence with its other parts, using corresponding Turkic suffixes and case prefixes. In the Turkic written monuments of the XIV-XIX centuries Arabic formants in izafets and in usual combinations keep features of the morphology of Arabic. Rustemov O.D. asserts that the influence of the Arabic and Persian izafet constructions on the level of complex sentences led to the borrowing of Arabic and Persian auxiliary words and changed the word order of the Turkic sentence structure namely the usage of the compound clause not only in preposition, but in postposition in relation to the main clause [Rustemov, 2017]. We see the influence of the Arabic *Idafa* on the Turkic languages.

There are nominal phrases in Tatar. The phrases have been the subject of discussion in Tatar linguistics for a long time. Among the linguists that have made a great contribution to this field are Hangildin V.N. (1954), Zakiev M.Z. (1963), Tumasheva D.G. (1964), Ganiev F.A. (1985), Valiullina Z.M. (1993) and others. In the Tatar grammars of the XIX century, nouns were considered as part of names, their general and morphological categories are described (Giganov I. (1801), Halfin I. (1809), Ivanov M. (1842), Troyansky A. (1860), and others.

The noun is characterized by the category of belonging in Tatar. Affixes of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd persons express the relation to a certain person, for example: *anyng daftäre* ‘his copybook’ or to an object – *jortnyng ishege* ‘the door of the home’.

Affixes of the third person became the subject of discussion of linguists. Tumasheva D.G. writes about the presence of the connection of the noun in the category of belonging with the noun in the possessive case. The relationship is established between the name components. The first noun is used in the nominative case, the second noun acts as the owner of the subject, for example: *balanyng kitaby* ‘a child's book’, *atineng östele* ‘father's desk’ [Tumasheva, 1964].

There are three types of the izafet in Tatar:

I type – $N_1 + N_2$ – the combination of noun + noun in the nominative case, for example: *tash yort* ‘stone house’, *altyn yozek* ‘golden ring’;

II type – $N_1 + N_{2PosInfl}$ – noun-attribute is used in the nominative case, the second noun accepts a possessive affix of the 3rd person, for example: *balalar hastahanäse* ‘children's hospital’, *däulät sayasäte* ‘government policy’;

III type – $N_{1gen} + N_{2Pos infl}$ – noun-attribute is in the genitive case, and the noun modified is formed by a possessive affix, for example: *aëbineng shale* ‘a shawl of grandmother’, *öineng toubese* ‘the roof of the house’. The I type izafet construction (for example: *agach kapka* ‘wood gate’, *altyn beläzek* ‘golden bracelet’, etc.) is interpreted by researchers in various ways.

R.H. Zalakova explains this phenomenon as “concretization of one subject through another”, for example: *kün itäk* ‘leather skirt’, *karavylchi babai* ‘a watchman’ [Zalakova, 2003]. Two components of the I type izafet are in nominative case. The function of the main case in Tatar is different. Valiullina Z.M., Zinnatullina K.Z., Sagitova M.S. point that the noun in the nominative case passes subject, object, various relationships between items [Valiullina, Zinnatullina, Sagitova 1972].

Tumasheva D. G. asserts that nouns in their syntactic functions are close to adjectives, for example: *tash yort* ‘stone house’ [Tumasheva, 1964].

The question of the conversion of parts of speech into adjectives was considered by Ganiev F. in the book “Tatar Grammar. Volume II”. The author considers this case as a process of adjectivation. He confirms his point of view on such examples as *kömesh kashyk* ‘silver spoon’, *altyn sägat* ‘gold watch’. He thinks that the first components of such phrases express the quality and answer the question “what?”, i.e. *kömesh kashyk* ‘silver spoon’ [Ganiev, 1985]. Regarding the II type izafet Zalakova R.H. assumes that in the phrases *Tatar zhirlary* ‘Tatar songs’, *avyl houzhalygy* ‘agricultural industry’, *Kytai studenty* ‘a Chinese student’, *zhäi bashy* ‘the start of summer’, *kul sägate* ‘a wrist watch’, *avyl halky* ‘village population’, *kuyan tyni* ‘rabbit fur coat’ there is no relationship of belonging, they characterize the subject according to a certain feature [Zalakova, 2003].

Khisamova F.M. assumes that a noun in the category of belonging defines another noun thus forming the II type izafet, for example: *oukuchi kaläme* ‘a student's pen’, *student eshe* ‘the work of a student’ [Khisamova, 2015].

Valiullina Z.M. points out that in the third type of izafet, a possessive affix of a noun modified expresses possessiveness and with the help of a possessive affix of the 3rd person the II and III type izafet constructions are formed, for example: *kolkhoz ræyse* 'the chairman of the collective farm', *balanyng külmäge* 'a child's shirt' [Valiullina, 1993].

Khisamova F.M. considers that the possessive case expresses common grammatical meaning with the shade of certainty. Common grammatical meaning in the context has different semantic aspects. The noun in nominative case expresses:

- a) the relation of an object to a person, belonging to someone, for example: *balanyng uenchygy* 'a child's toy', *oukytuchynyng kitaby* 'a teacher's book';
- b) the relation of an object to another object: *yortnyng tübese* 'the roof of the house', *ishekneng totkasi* 'a door handle';
- c) the relation of person to the place of work: *kafedranynyng oukytuchylar* 'teachers of the department', *universitetnyng rektory* 'rector of the university';
- d) a psychological state: *kiznyng hiyalı* 'a girl's dream', *ananyng shatlygy* 'mother's joy' [Khisamova, 2015].

From the point of view of Galiev M., the genitive case in Tatar expresses definiteness and relations between objects, for example: *kitapnyng tyshy* 'cover of (this) book', *kesheneng tavysly* 'the voice of (this) person', *tashnyng asty* 'the lower part of (this) stone'; the relationship between an action and its subject: *balanyng elavy* 'the crying of (this) child', so genitive acts as a relativizer in a broad sense. The genitive affix does not function in isolated word forms, but is an integral part of the nominal phrase of the III type izafet: (model: base1-nyng + base2-y), therefore, genitive can also be considered as a component, consisting of the affix of genitive and the possessive affix of the 3rd person: -nyng/-y [Ganiev, 2014].

Nouns in the category of possessiveness of the 3rd person can be a part of a syntactic structure with a pronoun or a noun, for example: *anyng kitaby* 'his book', *apanyng kitaby* 'sister's book'. Researchers Ramazanov Sh. and Khismatullina Kh. consider the examples when a noun in the category of possessiveness can be used separately in a sentence, for example: *Ähmätneñ yazuy yakhshi, söyläve yakhshi tügel* 'Akhmat's spelling is good, but his speech is not very good' [Sharafutdinova, 2018]. Kabutari Kh. also mentions it. As an example, he gives such phrases as: *koyashnyng nury* 'sun rays', *alma agachy* 'apple tree'. He makes a note that with an izafet combination it is possible to simultaneously discard both the possessive affix and the mosaf affix (i.e., the affix of possessiveness of the 3rd person): *tash yul* 'stone road', *kuyan bürek* 'a rabbit hat' [Miftakhova, 1998].

From the point of view of Garipova R.K., the III type izafet as in *Kazannyng uramnary* 'the streets of Kazan', *Tatarstannyng bashkalysy* 'the capital of Tatarstan' represents a combination of nouns; both of its members retain the meaning of objectivity. The first component is used in the genitive case, and the second component contains a possessive affix, for example: *okeannyng öleshe* 'part of the ocean' [Garipova, 2016].

Scholar Zakiev M.Z. divides nominal phrases into the following groups:

1. the noun with a possessive affix, with the preceding name in the genitive case, for example: *malainyng atasy* 'the boy's father', *agachynyng botagy* 'tree branch';
2. the noun with a possessive affix, with the preceding name in the nominal case, for example: *halyk rouhy* 'the spirit of the people', *shäher backchasy* 'city garden', *pechæn kibæne* 'a haystack' [Zakiev, 1999].

Zakiev M.Z. considers Tatar nominal phrases on the model of the Turkish izafet [Zakiev, 1999]. The term 'izafet' is borrowed by Turkologists from Arabic linguistics where it denoted a possessive construction. Izafet, as a grammatical description in Tatar, begins to be considered in the educational literature only since 2000 [Sharafutdinova, 2018].

So, the izafet is a grammatical construction consisting of two nouns, where one defines the other. The izafet is used to express a combination of two nouns, substantive adjectives, numerals, and some pronouns. As a result of the consideration of izafet in Tatar, the izafet may denote objectivity, concretization, possession, relation, and belonging.

In English, the izafet has corresponding parallels, i.e. nominal and genitive constructions. This can include the apostrophe, the affix -s and the preposition *of*.

So, Hawwari A., Attia M., Honame M., Diab M. consider that "There is no exact equivalent to IC (izafet constructions) in English. When studying Arabic idafa, it is a common misconception to compare it to the English genitive construction. In fact, Arabic idafa is used for what may be expressed in English as noun-noun compounds, e.g. *a bus stop*; the Saxon genitive, e.g. *a student's book*; the Norman genitive, e.g. *end of the day*; in addition to many other constructions, such as quantifiers, prepositions, and adjectival phrases. Accordingly, it is conventionally preferred to use the Arabic term *idafa*" [Hawwari, Attia, Ghoneim, Diab 2016].

Among the genitive constructions in English, we highlight: $N_1 + of + N_2$ (noun + noun combination), $N_1 + of + N_2$ (Norman genitive), $N_1 + 's + N_2$ (Saxon genitive). These constructions have corresponding analogs in Tatar. The English phrase $N_1 + N_2$ has as its equivalent the I type isafet construction. Noun without affixes defines another noun in Tatar. English noun acts as an attribute in preposition. Ivanova V.V., Burlakova V.V., Pocheptsov G.G. came to the opinion that *a stone wall* is an attributive phrase with a noun in the function of an attribute [Ivanova, Burlakova, Pocheptsov, 1981].

Linguists R. V. Ezhkova, N. A. Kobrina, E. A. Korneeva, M. I. Ossovskaya, K. A. Guzeeva came to the conclusion that -s formant expresses individual possession.

N.N. Matveeva paid attention to the parallel existence of the attributive phrases with the formant *-s* and the preposition *of*. One combination can be replaced by another.

According to M.V. Milovanova, constructions with *of* are used if the possessed object is known, and the possessor is new information.

From the point of view of V.L. Malakhova, the ability to form the form of the genitive case was ascribed by the noun, denoting animate objects, while nouns denoting inanimate objects are considered as dependent components in constructions with the preposition *of*.

E.A. Popova highlights the following factors that influence the choice of $N_1's+N_2$ or N_1+of+N_2 : shift in word semantics, the place of the word in the information structure of the sentence. Choosing between constructions $N's$ and $of+N$ are defined by the context, in which it occurs [Sharafutdinova, 2018].

So, the English N_1+N_2 construction corresponds to the I type isafet construction:

$N_1+N_{2english}$	N_1+N_{2tatar}
<i>a stone wall</i>	<i>tash divar</i>

The English N_1+of+N_2 construction corresponds to the II and III type isafet constructions:

N_1+of+N_2	$N_1+N_{2Pos\ infl}$
<i>the beginning of the lesson</i>	<i>dæres bashy</i>
N_1+of+N_2	$N_{1gen}+N_{2Pos\ infl}$
<i>the roof of the building</i>	<i>jortnyng tybæse</i>

The English formant *-s* is used to express the meaning of the possession of one object to another. Using of the formant is limited lexically. In this form nouns denoting living things are used.

The English $N_1's+N_2$ construction corresponds to the II and III type isafet constructions:

$N_1's+N_2$	$N_1+N_{2Pos\ infl}$
<i>blacksmith's hammer</i>	<i>timerche chykeche</i>
<i>student's meeting</i>	<i>studentlar zhielyshe</i>
$N_1's+N_2$	$N_{1gen}+N_{2Pos\ infl}$
<i>mother's garden</i>	<i>ænineng bakchase</i>

Results

On the base of analysis of izafet/non-izafet constructions in the languages studied, it became clear that Tatar and English have correspondences in izafet constructions. The parallels in the functioning of these constructions are as follows:

Tatar	English
N_1+N_{2tatar}	$N_1+N_{2english}$
$N_1+N_{2Pos\ infl}$ $N_{1gen}+N_{2Pos\ infl}$	N_1+of+N_2
$N_{1gen}+N_{2Pos\ infl}$ $N_1+N_{2Pos\ infl}$	$N_1's+N_2$

Conclusion

The phenomenon of Arabic idafa is realized in some Turkic, Indo-European, and Uralic languages. It is evident in Tatar where it is called the izafet. The izafet is used to express a special kind of phrase-combinations of nouns, as well as substantive adjectives, numerals and some pronouns. It is discovered that the Tatar izafet as a possessive construction is of three types: N_1+N_{2tatar} – combination of nouns in the nominative case; $N_1+N_{2PosInfl}$ – noun-attribute in the nominative case and the noun modified with a possessive affix of the 3rd person; $N_{1gen}+N_{2Pos\ infl}$ – noun-attribute is in the genitive case and the noun modified with a possessive affix. The phenomenon has no grammatical manifestations in, for example, English. English is characterized by non-izafet genitive constructions, represented by the N_1+N_2 noun phrase (noun+noun combination), N_1+of+N_2 (Norman genitive) and $N_1's+N_2$ (Saxon genitive) constructions. Universal and differential features are revealed in the functioning of the studied constructions in the compared languages. In this regard, the English genitive constructions may be studied as correspondences to the Tatar izafet. Hence, the paper reveals the universal and unique features in the morphological domain of the phenomenon in question in the compared languages. The $N_1+N_{2english}$ phrase corresponds to N_1+N_{2tatar} , the N_1+of+N_2 construction has the $N_1+N_{2PosInfl}$ and $N_{1gen}+N_{2Pos\ infl}$ parallels, and the $N_1's+N_2$ construction has the $N_{1gen}+N_{2Pos\ infl}$ and $N_1+N_{2Pos\ infl}$ correspondences.

References

- [1] Valiullina, Z.M., Zinnatullina, K.Z., & Sagitova M.S. (1972). Hazerge tatar edebi tele [Modern Tatar literary language]. Kazan, Russia. 206 p. (In Tatar)
- [2] Valiullina, Z.M. (1993). Imya sushestvitelnoe. Tatarskaya grammatica. T.II. Morfologia [The noun. Tatar grammar. Vol. II. Morphology]. Kazan, Russia: Tatatrskoye knizhnoe publishers. 396 p. (In Russian)

- [3] Ganiev, A.M. (2014). Indiziliruyushayas semantica v sisteme tatarskih padezhey // Materialy mezhdunarodnoy konferensii «Tipologia morfosintacsueskih parametrov 2014» [Individualizing semantics in the system of Tatar cases // Materials of the international conference «Typology of morphosyntactic parameters 2014»]. Vip. I. Moskva MGGU im. M.A. Sholohova, 2014. 12-22 p. (In Russian)
- [4] Ganiev, F.A. (1985). Konversia v tatarskom yazike [Conversion in Tatar]. Kazan, Russia: Tatatrskoye knizhnoe publishers. 112 p. (In Russian)
- [5] Garipova, R.K. (2016). Osobennosti prossesov kategorizatsii v raznostrukturnih yazikah [Specifics of categorization processes in different languages]. Vestnik Bashkirskogo universiteta publishers. №3. 739-742 p. (In Russian)
- [6] Zakiev, M.Z. (1999). Tatar grammatikasi. T.III. Sintaksis [Tatar grammar. Vol. III. Syntax]. Moskva, Russia: Insan publishers, Kazan, Russia: Fiker publishers. 512p. (In Tatar)
- [7] Zalakova, R.X. (2003). Izafetniy opredeleniya v tatarskom yazike. // Aktualniy voprosi tatarskogo yazikoznania: sbornic statiy [Izafet construction in the Tatar language]. Kazan, Russia: Fiker publishers. Issue.2, 128-133p. (In Russian)
- [8] Ivanova, I.P., Burlakova, V.V., & Pocheptsov, G.G. (1981). Teoreticheskaya grammatical sovremennogo angliskogo yazika [Theoretical grammar of modern English]. Moskva, Russia: Vishaya shkola publishers. 285 p. (In Russian)
- [9] Miftakhova, I.G. (1998). Istiriya tatarskih grammatik: issledovaniya imennih chasteyi rechi (XIX-nachalo XX vv.) chast I [The history of Tatar grammar: the study of the nominal parts of speech (XIX-beginning of XX centuries.) Part I. Kazan, Russia: Hater publishers. 162 p. (In Russian)
- [10] Mingazova, N., & Shangaraeva, L. (2014). Comparative study of number and case categories in English, Tatar and Arabic. International Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 6, 26-33.
- [11] Mingazova, N., Subich, V., & Carlson Ch. (2018). Izafet vs non-Izafet genitive patterns in non-related languages. XLinguae, 11(2), 34-49.
- [12] Hawwari, A., Attia, M., Ghoneim, M., & Diab M. (2016, May 23-28). Explicit fine grained syntactic and semantic annotation of the idafa construction in Arabic, presented at Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, Portorož, Slovenia. Retrieved from http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2016/pdf/1172_Paper.pdf.
- [13] Rustemov, O.D. (2017). Tipy i funktsii izafetov v tekstah kadiaskerskih defterov Krimskogo khanstva XVII- XVIII vv. [Types and functions of izafet constitutions in the texts of the Crimean khanate kadiasker's books of the 17th-18th centuries]. Mova. № 27.134-135 p. (In Russian)
- [14] Tumasheva, D.G. (1964). Hezerge tatar edebi tele morfologiasie [Morphology of the modern Tatar language]. Kazan, Russia: Kazan universiteti publishers. 299p. (In Tatar)
- [15] Khisamova, F.M. (2015). Tatar tele morfologiasie [Morphology of Tatar language]. Ikenche basma. Kazan, Russia: Tatar kitap publishers. 335 p. (In Tatar)
- [16] Sharafutdinova, R.T. (2018). Vzaimosvyaz arabskoj idafy i izafetnyx/neizafetnyx konstrukcij v tatarskom i anglijskom yazykah [Interrelation of Arabic idafa and izafet/nonizafet consruction in Tatar and English]. Arabistika Evrazii [Eurasia Arabistics], no.4, pp. 26-39. (In Russian)