STRUCTURAL MODELS OF THE PAREMIOLOGICAL UNITS WITH THE MODALITY COMPONENT IN SPANISH, ENGLISH, AND TATAR LANGUAGE

MODELOS ESTRUCTURALES DE LAS UNIDADES PAREMIOLÓGICAS CON EL COMPONENTE DE MODALIDAD EN LENGUA ESPAÑOLA, INGLESA Y TÁTARA

Diana F. Kajumova[1] (ID); Aida G. Sadykova[2] (ID); Diana N. Davletbaeva[3] (ID); Liliya Sh. Shafigullina[4] (ID) Nailya R. Khairullina[5] (ID); Guzel M. Tuktarova[6] (ID)

1. Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia. missdiana7@mail.ru
2. Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia. sadykova@bk.ru
3. Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia. dianadi@bk.ru
4. Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia. liliyashamilovna@mail.ru
5. Kazan National Research Technical University, Kazan, Russia. nailya.gafiatullina@inbox.ru
6. Kazan National Research Technical University, Kazan, Russia. tuktarova.gm@mail.ru,

*corresponding author: Diana F. Kajumova, missdiana7@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This present study is focused on the comparative analysis of the grammatical and structural characteristics of paremiological units (PUs) with a modality element in Spanish, English, as well as the Tatar language. PUs with that element is absorbing for analyzing the linguistics worldview of Spanish, English, and Tatar language. This study's relevance is defined by the reality that PUs are among the most contradictory and complex notions in linguistics. The subject of the study is related to linguistics to recognize the structure and features of PUs of Spanish, English, and also Tatar language. To fulfil the study's aims, a descriptive-analytical method is utilized. This study revolves around the structural - lexical and structural - grammatical characteristics of the PUs expression of the compared tongues. The particular and general sorts utilizing the modality component of the linguistic worldview are determined, and their classification as well. The study outcomes provided are highly interesting to scientists examining the notions of PUs in Spanish, English, and Tatar language. The results have the capacity to be employed in the analysis and study of research and cultural issues and language learning procedure.

Keywords: component; modality; linguistics; paremiological units; culture.

RESUMEN

El presente estudio se centra en el análisis comparativo de las características gramaticales y estructurales de unidades paremiológicas (UP) con elemento de modalidad en español, inglés, así como en lengua tártara. Las UP con ese elemento son absorbentes para analizar la cosmovisión lingüística del español, el inglés y el tártaro. La relevancia de este estudio se define por la realidad de que las UP se encuentran entre las nociones más contradictorias y complejas de la lingüística. El tema de estudio está relacionado con la lingüística para reconocer la estructura y características de las UP del español, inglés y también del idioma tártaro. Para cumplir con los objetivos del estudio, se utiliza un método descriptivo-analítico. Este estudio gira en torno a las características estructurales - léxicas y estructurales - gramaticales de las UPs de expresión de las lenguas comparadas. Se determinan las clases particulares y generales que utilizan el componente de modalidad de la cosmovisión lingüística, así como su clasificación. Los resultados del estudio proporcionados son muy interesantes para los científicos que examinan las nociones de UP en español, inglés y tártaro. Los resultados tienen la capacidad de ser empleados en el análisis y estudio de investigaciones y cuestiones culturales y procedimientos de aprendizaje de idiomas.

Palabras clave: componente; modalidad; lingüística; unidades paremiológicas; cultura.

INTRODUCTION

Studying paremiological units, there has been a significant interest in the investigation of the modality category. In linguistic science, the modality category is little analyzed and examined, particularly in Spanish, English, and Tatar language, which is the focus of the current study (Khairullina, 2022).

The concept of «linguistic worldview» initially ammerged in the studies of L. Wittgenstein (1994), dedicated to study in the arena of logic and philosophy. Over the next years, that term commenced to be utilized in other scientific areas, the most important of which is the investigation of man and his communication with the surroundings. Contemporary linguists, including G.V. Kolshansky (1961), V.N. Teliya (1996), Yu.D. Apresyan (1995), N.D. Arutyunova (1993), A.P. Babushkin (1998), P.S. Gurevich (1998), F.F. Fortunatov (1956-1957), and Yu.M. Lotman (1987) consider the the world image as a perfect formation comprising structurally organized elements, having specific features, conducting its innate functions, developing in a natural manner.

The modality category is one of the most complex linguistic categories because there are different ways of expression in a language. Modality refers to linguistic universals and occupies an important place in the system of such universal categories as predictivity, type, voice, time, and therefore is of considerable interest to linguists (Kolshansky, 1961; Szerszunowicz, 2021).

Modality is a multidimensional phenomenon, and therefore, in the linguistic literature, different opinions are expressed about the essence of this phenomenon. As you know, the division of modality into two types has already become traditional: objective and subjective. The first is understood as the relation of the utterance to extra-linguistic reality, formalized grammatically, the second - as an expression of the speaker's (writing) attitude to what he communicates. Researchers note that the objective modality is required for any utterance, while the subjective modality is optional.

The modality category, its contents, and framework is explained in linguistic literature in various manners: from the genuinely logical notion of modality as a statement of truth (Zolotova, 1962; Aleksandrovna Denisova & Yurievna Lipatova, 2020) to the inclusion in the classification of the modality of the expression of any, incorporating the emotional, mindset of the speaker to the utterance content (Petrov, 1982; Maria, 2018).

METHODS

Among most substantial theoretical studies on the differentiation of the notions of proverbs is the typological classification of G.L. Permyakov (2001). It expresses that «a proverb is regarded as a grammatically complete (owning a sentence form) utterance with a figurative motive of common meaning, in other words, necessitating an expanded interpretation». In spite of the existence of theoretical studies and examinations on paremiology, there exist few particular ones in Spanish studies focusing on proverbial statements. Amongs them, the analysis of X is outstanding. J. Sevilla Munoz and J. Cantera Ortiz de Urbina (2002), «Vida e interculturalidad del refrán. Pocas palabras bastan».

D. Lyons (1978) recognizes two sentences classes by the modality nature: imperative (instruction or express order) as well as interrogative (express additional modal signs, on particular anticipations of the speaker). Furthermore, he discovers in various languages several means of grammatical expression of the speaker's attitude to the the utterance content.

The authors of many studies discuss the morphological-syntactic nature of the expression of modality, which is viewed from the syntactic and morphological aspects as a linguistic phenomenon. This approach is consistent with the description of speech production proposed in psychological studies. Here is a diagram presented by professor R.S. Nemov (1983). Based on the theory of speech production, we can characterize the features of the grammatical expression of modality in PUs. Any statement has its own denotation. It is an extra-linguistic situation. The modality, figuratively speaking, is «superimposed» on the denotative content of the PUs statement, making it communicatively oriented, valuable for communication. The described processes take place at the level of thought formation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We have the idea that an adequate description of the modality can only be made based on the triad "method - form - means". With this approach, each side of the grammatical expression of the modality is analyzed. The described approach to the study of modality requires a very clear definition of the ways, forms and means of expressing modality, and not the indiscriminate use of these words when describing modality.

Undoubtedly, language synthesizes phenomena, but the task of a researcher is to use analysis to understand the essence of language, its structure.

In English, the modality component is expressed by:

- The modal verbs can, may, must, should, ought to, have to, need - many others are needed: friends may meet, but mountains never greet; you cannot get a quart into a pint pot; every man must eat a peck of dirt before he dies - anything happens in life, you can't live without troubles in life.

- Lexically, may be, certainly, and others: a bird may be known by its song; never quit certainly for hope etc.

In Spanish, the modality component is expressed:

- Modal verbs poder - to be able, deber - to be due, querer - to want, constructions tener que + verb infinitive - this construction is almost synonymous with the verb deber, with one exception: tener que + verb infinitive implies a more obligatory nature of the action; saber + verb infinitive - the ability to do something: no se puede chiflar y beber agua - you will chase two hares, you will not catch a single one; el que sabe errar, que sepa enmendar - be able to make a mistake, be able to get better.
- Lexically: obviamente, al parecer, evidentemente - obviously; probablemente, puede, seguramente - probably others as well: no pasa seguro quien corre por un muro - maybe yes, I suppose (yes somehow) they will not lead to good; sólo la vida que has vivido con el amor se puede llamar victoria - only a life lived with love can be called a victory.

In the Tatar language, the modality component is expressed:

- Modal verbs алу - to be able, булу- to be able to, белү - can, теләү - want, йөрү - to intend, уйлау - think, иту – decide, тоту - decide, калу - need: кояш түгел - бөтен дөньяны җылыта алмассың – not the sun - you cannot warm everyone; үз кадерен белмэгэн ил кадерен белмэс - who does not know how to respect (value) himself, he does not respect (value) others.
- Lexically: димәк - it means, obviously, кызык - interesting, , әлбәттә - undoubtedly, of course, of course, кирәк - others are also needed: тамаксау – димәк сау - gluttonous means healthy; кунаклык димәк тыйнаклык – guest position - modesty; без курәсен кеше курмәс, димәк тузәргә кирәк - we must endure: what is destined for us is not useful to anyone; ничек туганыңны белү кызык түгел, кем булып үләчәгеңне белү кызык - it is interesting not to know how you were born, but to know who you will become; кымыз барда кызык бар – wonder when there is kumiz; бай эт була алмый, ә эт, әлбәттә, бай була алмый -a rich (man) cannot be a dog, and a dog, of course, is rich.

Investigating the features of PUs, in structural models of which a modal verb, a semantic verb and a noun are used, we identified the following structural varieties of models. For example, in English:

V mod + Vf + a + N
«modal verb + semantic verb + indefinite article + noun»: you can not make an omelet without breaking eggs; one can not make a silk purse out of a son's ear etc.

We have found a similar two-vertex structural model of PUs in Spanish:

V mod + Vf + a + N
«modal verb + semantic verb + indefinite article + noun»: querer enseñar a un tonto es lo mismo que ponerle cataplasmas (sinapismos) a un muerto - teach the fool that heal the dead; teach the fool that to carry water with a sieve.

For example, in the Tatar language:

N + Vf + Vmod
«noun + semantic verb + modal verb with a negative particle» mas «: җил тотка булмас - you cannot catch the wind.
N + Vf + Vmod
«noun + semantic verb + modal verb with a negative particle»: сәламәтлекне сатып алып булмый - you cannot buy health.

Here are examples of English paremiological units with the following structural model:

Vmod + Vf + the + N
«modal verb + semantic verb + definite article + noun»: you can (not) sell the cow and drink the milk. The negative form of the modal verb can in this PU allows the speaker to express such shades of his attitude to reality as doubt and desire; he who would eat the nut must first crack the shell - if you don't crack a nut, you won't eat a kernel; you can't easily take a fish out of the pond.

Note that there are no definite and indefinite articles in the Tatar language. The main marker of uncertainty in the Tatar language is the lexeme 'бер', the grammatical status of which is considered as the numeral 'one' as an indicator of uncertainty. We have found the following two-vertex structural model:

 N + Vf + Vmod + (not)
«noun + noun + modal verb + negative particle» mas «»: бер күктэ ике ай булмас - there will not be two moons in the same sky. The negative form of the modal verb булмас conveys the authenticity of the speaker's judgment.

We have found the following bimodal structural models with repetition of significant parts of speech in the Tatar language:

N + N + Vf + Vmod
«noun + noun + semantic verb + modal verb»: бу дөньяда вакыт бик әз, аны бик бәрәкәтле тотарга кирәк - there is very little time in this world, it must be spent sparingly.

Spanish also uses Pus with a modality component with repetitive denominators of speech:

A + N + Vmod + Vf + N
«definite article + noun + semantic verb + noun» el remedio puede ser peor que la enfermedad - mend the hole until it's big.

A feature of these PUs with a modality component is the use of monosyllabic verbs that do not have a pronounced assessment. PUs with a modality component of a given model are characterized by adverbial relationships.

In the overwhelming majority, bimodal PUs with a modality component with a subordinate link in their composition have various prepositions. It should be noted that the most common prepositions are in, about, at, for, near, which have a spatial meaning.
A very common specific to the English language is the following structural model:

V mod + (not) + V f + Prep + A + N
«modal verb + (not) + semantic verb + preposition + article + noun»: a cat may look at a king - and the cat is not forbidden to look at the king; and we are not bastard. a fool may sometimes speak to the purpose - sometimes a stupid person will tell the truth; a stupid person lies, lies, and he will tell the truth.

Analyzing the factual material, we came to the conclusion that a large number of bimodal PUs with a modality component with a subordinate structure are used in a negative form.

In English, there are the following specific structural models with a negative particle not as the first component:

V mod + (not) + Vf + A + N
«modal verb + (not) + semantic verb + article + noun»: you cannot get a quart into a pint pot - you can't pour a barrel into a thimble.

In Spanish, we found a structural model with a negative particle no as the first and second components:

Vmod + (no) + Vf + (no) + Vf
«Modal verb + negative particle + verb + negative particle + verb»: quien no puede morder, que no enseñe los dientes - do not be afraid of a bullshit dog, but be afraid of a taciturn one.

A + N + no + Vmod + Vf + A + N
"Definite article plural. + noun + negative particle + modal verb + semantic verb + plural definite article + noun «: los arboles no dejan ver el bosque - you can't see the forest because of the trees.

CONCLUSION

The comparative study of three languages with the category of modality is of theoretical and practical importance. The study allowed us to identify similar and distinctive features, to better understand the nature of the origin of the category of modality in the studied languages.

Thus, after analyzing the investigated bimodal structural models of the English, Spanish and Tatar languages, we found that common to the compared languages are the presence of modal verbs, semantic verbs, which are differently formed in a sentence. Specific to the English language is the predominance of articles and prepositions in bipartite structural models. For Spanish paremiological units, it is specific that there are two identical significant parts of speech in one sentence. For the Tatar language, specific is the absence of indefinite and definite articles in comparison with English and Spanish.

REFERENCES

Aleksandrovna Denisova, E., & Yurievna Lipatova, Y. (2020). Comparative Analysis of Structural-Semantic Characteristics of The Russian And German Prohibitive Paremias. Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 11(Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Applied Linguistics Issues (ALI 2020), Saint Petersburg, 13-14 June 2020), 183-190.

Apresyan, Yu. D. (1995). Integral description of the language and system lexicography. Moscow: School «Languages of Russian culture».

Arutyunova, N. D. (1993). Logical analysis of the language. Mental actions. Moscow: Science. Babushkin, A. P. (1998). Types of concepts in the lexical and phraseological semantics of the language, their personal and national specifics: Abstract of PhD. Voronezh: Voronezh University Press.

Fortunatov, F. F. (1956-1957). Izbrannye trudy. Moscow: n/a.

Gurevich, P. S. (1998). Cultural studies. Moscow: Gardariki.

Kajumova, D. F., Sadykova, A. G., Aleeva, G. K., Tuktarova, G. M., Khripkova, D. I., & Khairullina, N. R. (2022). STRUCTURAL MODELS WITH ALTERNANTS OF THE PAREMIOLOGICAL UNITS WITH THE COMPONENT OF MODALITY IN ENGLISH, SPANISH AND TATAR LANGUAGES. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(2), 5627-5630.

Kolshansky, G. V. (1961). On the question of the content of the language category of modality. Questions of Linguistics, 1, 106-112.

Lotman, Yu. M. (1987). Several thoughts on the typology of cultures. Languages of culture and problems of translatability: collection of scientific works. Moscow: Nauka.

Lyons, D. (1978). Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Moscow: Progress.

Maria, K. (2018). Androcentrism of English proverbs and anti-proverbs with gender components. Journal of Language and Education, 4(2 (14)), 68-77.

Nemov R. S. (2003). Psychology: book 1. Moscow: Humanit. ed. center Vlados.

Permyakov, G. L. (2001). Proverbs and sayings of the peoples of the East. Moscow: Labyrinth.

Petrov, N. E. (1982). About the content and scope of the language modality. Novosibirsk: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Sevilla Munoz, J. & Cantera Ortiz de Urbina, J. (2002). Pocas palabras bastan: vida e interculturalidad del refran. Salamanca: Diputacion de Salamanca, Centro de Cultura Tradicional.

Szerszunowicz, J. (2021). Reproducibility of multiword expressions in paremiological and linguo-cultural studies. In Międzynarodowa Konferencja Naukowa EUROPHRAS2018: Reproducibility from a phraseological perspective: Structural, functional and cultural aspects, Białystok 10-12 września 2018 (Vol. 10). University of Bialystok Publishing House.

Teliya, V. N. (1996). The role of figurative means of language in the cultural and national coloring of the worldview: Ethnopsycholinguistic aspects of teaching foreign languages. Moscow: I.M. Sechenov MMA; Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Wittgenstein, L. (1994). Philosophical works. Moscow: Publishing House «Gnosis».

Zolotova, G. A. (1962). On the modality of a sentence in Russian. Higher School, 4, 65-79.