

A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF THE CATEGORY OF ANTERIORITY (ENGLISH, KURDISH AND ARABIC)

Rafik SULAIMAN¹

¹Associate Prof. Dr., Mardin Artuklu University, Turkey
Corresponding author: drsulaiman7@googlemail.com

Abstract

I did my best to investigate the influence of goal orientations on strategy use patterns and reading comprehension of multi-lingual readers. It was concluded that contrastive goal orientations contributed to significant differences in strategy use patterns and reading comprehension and to classify the equal and unequal equivalent forms in all three contrasted languages and how to teach students and readers the above mentioned languages. Moreover, this study is trying to create a real system for a correct translation among related and unrelated languages. Additionally, teachers might need to orient students in order to adopt a multi-lingual, rather than a single, achievement goal.

Keywords: *Multi-lingual, Contrastive, Category, Anteriority.*

1. NOMINAL FORMS IN ENGLISH, KURDISH AND ARABIC

Confronting the nominal forms in English, Kurdish and Romanian we discover identical systems on the emic level, with some slight differences, especially in the formal expression:

The English forms *to have written, to have been written* and *having written* correspond in Kurdish to structures by means of the auxiliary *to be* (*nivîstiyê, hatiye nivîsandin, nivîstiyê*) and not *to have* and the same situation occurs in Romanian.

The result in homonymy of grammatical forms. There is also a difference in usage: the perfect nominal forms in Kurdish are used very rarely in Romanian used and usually they are substituted by finite perfect forms: *mai mult ca perfectul simplu* and especially *perfectul compus*. (D.Melenciuc "Comparative Study of Grammatical, Lexical and - Lexical - Grammatical Categories" p. 44, Chisinau, 2012)

The English *present participle* is regularly translated into Romanian by means of *gerunziu*,

which historically took over the meaning of the *participiu present (present participle)*, which was ousted from the language.

The English *perfect nominal forms* have also been displaying a tendency to gradually get out of usage.

Thus, *perfect gerund, perfect participle* and, to a certain extent, *perfect infinitive* are practically used in formal bookish language.

In the colloquial speech the finite perfect forms are usually preferred.

Comparing the English nominal forms with the ones in the Arabic language and taking the English nominal system as an action, we discover practically the same picture seen in the case of Arab finite forms.

The simple nominal forms: *present participle, past participle* and the *gerund* correspond in Arabic to one form - *El-Masder*, the distinction being lexical, contextual and functional (the participle is closer in meaning to the adjective, while the gerund has much in common with the noun). (S.Brough und V. J.Docherty - *Praktische Grammatik*, pp. 34-35, Berlin/München 2001)

It is interesting to observe that in Arabic these simple nominal are rarely used in colloquial speech but they may be found in the formal, bookish registers.

As far as the *present infinitive (El-Hader El-basit in Arabic)* is concerned there are practically no difficulties and it regularly corresponds to the English perfect infinitive. (R. Sulaiman - *The category of Anteriority*, pp. 61-62, Chisinau, 1998)

Then we turn to the perfect nominal forms. Here the English perfect infinitive forms are regularly translated into Kurdish "Dema boriya teedayii", and into Arabic "El-Hader El-Tam", which practically coincides in form with the

equivalent of present perfect in Kurdish and of present perfect in Arabic (i.e. a finite form plus some lexical elements like “an”, “baada+wa+” and a logical stress in each case).

The perfect participle “I” corresponds to “El-masder Tam”, which is rarely used and is usually substituted by “present participle I”.

Again in this case the lexical element is prevailing: “qad”, and lexical means, “baada” plus the given form of the verb are used to express anteriority.

2. FINITE FORMS IN ENGLISH, KURDISH AND ARABIC

At the first sight we can conclude that the finite system in English is much richer in forms than in Kurdish, Romanian and Arabic.

Thus, when we compare the English, Kurdish, Romanian and Arabic systems we find much in common with occasional natural differences connected to the development of the language in different speaking communities.

It seems that in Kurdish and Romanian there are correspondent forms to the English *indefinite*, its function being carried out by *dema boriya teedayii* and *perfectul compus*, a form coinciding in form and partially in function with the English *present perfect*.

The grammatical tense, aspect and taxis system in Arabic consists of the *simple past (past indefinite)*, *present-future*, *simple future (future indefinite)*, *past continuous (past imperfective)*, *past perfect (in the meaning of past anteriority and finished action)* and *preliminary future*.

Affixation is very important in Arabic in order to form various tense, aspects and taxis forms, especially in the case of analytical forms: *past perfect*, *past continuous* and *preliminary future*. The combination of lexical elements with simple grammatical forms may help to express aspectual or anteriority categorial meaning lexico-grammatically.

In all the languages under consideration we find cases of grammatical and lexico-grammatical (in Kurdish) the equivalents of present perfect and past perfect practically are expressed by the same forms, and only due to the prosodic arrangement (logical stress, slow tempo,

increased loudness) we can successfully distinguish between them. But in Arabic we could distinguish between both forms: present perfect and past perfect be lexical means. (Christopher Beedham - *The Passive Aspect in English, German and Russian*, pp. 84-85, Germany 1982)

The same situation occurs in the case of the category of aspect in Kurdish and Arabic.

Examples of homonymy in English could be exemplified by the forms of gerund and participle “I” (in case of nominal forms), should plus infinitive (as modal verb plus infinitive, conditional mood, suppositional mood, future in the past), would plus infinitive (as modal verb plus infinitive, conditional, future in the past), the form of past perfect (as expressing an anteriority in the past, anteriority in future from a moment in the past, and expressing an unreal condition, desire or wish in the past in the Subjunctive II and in this case it does not express anteriority at all), present perfect (anteriority expressed to an action or moment in the present by an action or a period of time including an action; anteriority in the future, where it substitutes the future perfect in the clauses of time and condition expressing a future action from a present moment. In spite of the fact that the systems of categorial, grammatical and lexical-grammatical forms are different in the given language, the categorial meaning of the category of taxis as well as those of tense and aspect, could be easily expressed in each of the confronted languages using all possible linguistic means: grammatical, lexical-grammatical, lexical, contextual and prosodic).

3. PERFECT FORMS

A common tendency has been observed in all the confronted languages and examples are also adduced from the Romanian language where the category of taxis is gradually undergoing a change, but in Kurdish is more dominant.

It is in a process of transition from a mainly grammatical category into a lexical-grammatical or even lexical one.

In Russian, for example, a similar process of transition is practically over.

Examples of finite perfect forms can be found only in dialectal speech.

Examples of nominal perfect forms are still in usage: *past gerund* and *past participle*. The lexical category of taxis is now dominant in this language.

In English the same process is rapidly advancing. Thus, the grammatical categorial form of the future anteriority is practically in the same position, especially in the American variant of English where it is often substituted by simple forms in the spoken language.

As far as Kurdish as well as Romanian are concerned, *the future perfect here* (*Dema teküz di demapeş de*), (*viitorul anterior*) are rarely used even in the bookish and formal language.

The analytical past perfect practically is out of usage in Kurdish and in Romanian, the past perfect is also out of usage and the synthetic one is also undergoing a process of change (in the spoken language very often it is substituted by the present perfect in its second simple past meaning, anteriority being expressed lexically or contextually).

In case of Arabic we can say that the category of taxis is expressed grammatically, lexico-grammatically, lexically, contextually and prosodically, with the lexical-grammatical element prevailing in the formal, bookish language and the lexical and contextual element now actively becoming more prominent in the spoken language.

4. RESULTS

1. As a result of our research we can conclude that the grammatical category of anteriority (tax) in the confronted languages (Arabic, English and Kurdish) has a general tendency to be replaced by the non-perfect grammatical forms, especially in the spoken language.

In Kurdish: Anteriority meanings are often expressed grammatically and lexically.

In Arabic: Anteriority meanings are often expressed contextually and lexically and even the prosodic elements are used to distinguish between some anteriority and aspectual forms.

In English we can also observe a rapprochement of present perfect and past indefinite, especially in the American English, where the process is more advanced.

Identical forms in Romanian and Kurdish (Romanian: Perfectul compus "am muncit = I worked din limba romana echivalent cu present perfect al limbii engleze and Kurdish: Dema boriya têdayî, "Peresent perfect in English: "I have worked= Min kar kir" yeksanbar e/ beramberbar e), where there is not a simple past form like in English, practically express both anteriority and simple past meanings (depending on the context).

2. Another important aspect worth mentioning here is that the simplification of the system does not imply a loss of ability in expressing different meanings.

In an involved morphological system different meanings are expressed by the opposition of different forms, while in a system with a smaller number of different forms, like in Kurdish and Arabic, different meanings can be expressed by one and the same form in different contexts or by changing the lexical character of the verb.

The synchronic relationship must be considered as something that is in a state of flux.

Change is the main category of natural human languages, for they are historical categories, they develop or die out. By doing so they follow the fate of the speech community which has created them as the principle of communication.

3. In Kurdish the perfect is formed by suffixes directly to the last root of the bisyllabic base denoting person, number and gender. If the suffix-"bü" is added, it also denotes a completed action.

In Arabic: the perfect is formed by suffixes directly to the last root of the bisyllabic base also denoting person, number and gender.

If the article "qad" is added or without it too (by lexical means: "bada/bahda") it also denotes a completed action.

In the majority of cases there are some accompanying lexical elements in addition to the lexical-grammatical anteriority forms, like "piştî" (in Kurdish), but in Arabic also in the majority of cases there are some accompanying lexical elements in the sentence in addition to the grammatical or lexical-grammatical anteriority forms, like "Bada=bahda/ba'da", "qad" ..etc..

As far as the equivalents of past perfect and present perfect in Arabic are concerned they are expressed by the same form, the only difference

being that the form of the past perfect is made lexically.

Thus, “min nivîstiye/min nivîstibû” (hav written/had written) is differentiated by the morpho-grammatical suffix: “ye” and “bû”,.

But in Kurdish, the grammatical form of Present Perfect and Past tense is still in progress and both of them are convertible.

Thus, in Arabic “katabtû/qad katabtû” (have written/had written) is differentiated from the present perfect anteriority by lexical means, a logical stress on “ü” and the particle “qad”, high fall, slow tempo, wide range and increased loudness.

4. Translation tests have proved the fact that in the colloquial everyday speech perfect forms are used in Modern Kurdish but in Arabic non-perfect forms are used, anteriority in such cases by grammatical and lexical means.

In the official or bookish language the perfect anteriority forms are preferable.

The category of anteriority and the context of precedence in the case of the two events, following one another of anteriority and the context relationship.

The fact is that real anteriority may both find expression, or it remains unexpressed, in the way the appropriate forms are used.

Everything depends on the purport of the utterance.

One and the same actual situation may be categorically interpreted in completely different ways.

The choice of this or that interpretation will depend on the idiomatic character of this or that language, as well as the intention of the speaker.

The anteriority plane can now be regarded as a supercilious pedanticism.

More than that the grammatical anteriority is becoming peripheral and even facultative, for in situations of ordinary, everyday dialogue it is very easy to do without it.

Thus, the simultaneity-anteriority category (taxis) need not necessarily be expressed by elaborate morphological means.

References

- BEEDHAM, C. (1981) The Passive Aspect in English, German and Russian. *Journal of Linguistics*. 17(2). pp. 319-327.
- BROUGH S. & DOCHERTY V. J. (1998) *Langenscheidts Praktische Grammatik Englisch*. Berlin/München: Langenscheidt; p. 34-35.
- MELENCIUC, D., ONOFREICIUC, E. & SULAIMAN R. (1996) *The Category of Anteriority in English. Romanian and Arabic*. Chisinau:East West; p.61-62.
- MELENCIUC, D. (2012) *Comparative Study of Grammatical, Lexical and Lexical-Grammatical Categories*. Chisinau: Artpoligraf; p.44.
- YILDIRIM, K. (2012) *Kürtçe Dilbilgisi*. Mardin; p.148-150.