

Infinitive Forms and Conditional Mood of Verbs as a Means of Expressing a Concretizing Relation

Ramilya Kamilovna Sagdieva^{1,*}, Damir Haydarovich Husnutdinov¹, Ramil Hamitovich Mirzagitov¹ and Gulnat Tokenovna Abikenova²

¹*Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University, Russia*

²*Philology of KAZGUU University in Kazakhstan, Kazakh Humanitarianjuridical Innovation University, Kazakhstan*

Abstract: A concretizing link is an expression of a specific relationship between concepts using a unique means of relation. Given that, affixes and forms of verbs have a particular place. This article considers the conditions of the infinitive (-ырғаа/-ергәә/-рғаа) and the conditional mood of the verb (-са/-сә). These affixes in Tatar grammars as part of a subordinate predicate clause are inflectional forms, that is, linking words. The authors study these verb forms to express a concretizing relation and analyze the shades of meanings. A more profound analysis shows that these affixes express different relations between phenomena and connect the verb with other words. They are added to all the verbs and some parts of speech when in speaking. It must be said that the affixes of the conditional mood and, to some extent, the infinitive perform the same functions for the verb as the cases do for the noun. The primary research method is descriptive-analytical with its main components: observation, generalization, and interpretation. For a detailed analysis of the linguistic features of speech, a comparative historical method is also used, which allows for the determination of some tendencies in the development of the grammatical system of the national literary language. In the studies, comparative-typological and statistical methods are also applied.

Keywords: Concretizing relation, conditional mood, infinitive, means of link, shades of meanings.

INTRODUCTION

In modern Tatar, the main types of subordinate connections are considered to be predictive, concretizing, and explanatory. The predicative relation is between the subject and the predicate and, as is generally known, is the reason for the formation of a two-member sentence. Concretizing and explanatory links play an essential role in its extension. According to R. K. Sagdieva, grammars usually speak of the paramount role of the predicative relation in the formation of speech. But for the formation of speech, both a predictive link and a concretizing one are essential. In the speech, they play an equally important role. Meaningful speech results from the close interweaving of these relations (Khakimov *et al.* 2016; Husnutdinov *et al.*, 2019).

The use of only principal parts of the sentence in speech is not enough for full disclosure of information. Therefore, attributes, adverbial modifiers, and objects are used.

A concretizing connection is an expression of a specific relationship between concepts using a unique means of a link. The category of concretizing relations includes a vast range of connotations between

concepts; therefore, the means of expression are very diverse. In the Tatar language, the concretizing link is subjected to an analysis from two sides: 1) in analyzing phrases, 2) in the process of analyzing the subordinate parts of the sentence. The concretizing link is a link between an attributive and a determinate, between an object and a complemented element, between an adverbial modifier and its governing member (Coker, 2014; Fernandez, 2020). The forms of the infinitive (-ырғаа/-ергәә/-рғаа) and the conditional mood of the verb (-са/-сә) also require consideration in terms of functions. These affixes, as part of a predicative clause in Tatar grammars, are considered to be inflectional forms, that is, means of linking words (Khisamova, 2006; Tumasheva, 1964; Shakirova, *et al.*, 2016).

The term “clause” is not only applied to structures which comply with formal prerequisites, containing a subject and a predicate conveyed by a finite verb, but also to such structures which are analyzable into clause elements. The verbless clause is a structure containing no verb element at all (either finite or nonfinite), usually having a covert subject, but containing other expressions which can be identified as a part of predicate (subject complement or adverbial). The verbless subordinate clause is joined to its superordinate clause syndetically or asyndetically (a supplementive verbless clause), or by the prepositions with or without. As an optional clause element, it functions as an adverbial, expressing a range of

*Address correspondence to this author at the Institute of Philology and Intercultural Communication, Kazan Federal University, Russia; Tel: 89033066652; E-mail: s_98pub@mail.ru

semantic roles, usually suggested by the introductory conjunction, or as an "optional subject/object adjunct" (supplementive verbless clauses), conveying a twofold relationship: to the predication and, at the same time, to the subject or object of its superordinate clause. Considered one of the means of sentence condensation, it is mainly used in written language (Petrliková, 2013: 55).

The constructions with *-мак* are less communicatively comfortable for the spoken language, like the wide use of constructions with optative in the spoken language of several Turkic languages (Azerbaijani, Turkish, Uzbek) attest, a pattern of the constructions with optative instead of the expected infinitive is observed in the languages with which the Turkic languages had a contact. According to some versions, this model has been adopted by the Turkic languages from Persian, which registers similar constructions.

Long-term contacts with the Persian language led to rather productive assimilation of these constructions in spoken language, especially by Azerbaijanis and Turks, where they began to replace phrases with the infinitive successfully.

The studies show that the initial impulse to the development of these structures was given not so much from the Persian language as from the Arabic language, which, as you know, does not have an infinitive form and finite verb forms with direct subordination without conjunction correspond to the infinitive in the target constructions everywhere.

Confirmation of this assumption is that the constructions under consideration are widespread in rather early Turkic monuments. It is always curious that these constructions can often be found in documents in Polovets of the 16th century, reflecting Kypchak spoken languages (Yusupov, 2015).

Thus, the Arab-Persian impulse would not give such a change in the syntactic system if there were no weak links in this same system if there were no breeding ground for the assimilation of this model in the very Turkic languages.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous authors and researchers have studied the subject of this article from different angles. For example: Slade (2020) In his studies he deals with that The historical relation between verb-verb collocations

in different Asian languages is unclear. Even in geographically proximate language families such as Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, there is evidence of independent development of verb-verb collocations, with possible later convergence. Central Asian verb-verb collocations being very similar in morphosyntactic structure to South Asian verb-verb collocations, it is tempting to suppose that for these there is some contact-based cause, particularly since such collocations are much less prominent in Turkic and Iranian languages outside of Central Asia. The relation between South and Central Asian verb-verb collocations and Chinese verb-verb collocations is even more opaque, and there are greater linguistic differences here. In this connection, further study of verb-verb collocations in Asian languages geographically intermediate to Central and South Asia, including Thai, Vietnamese, and Burmese, is required.

Bacanli (2019) says: A more profound analysis shows that these affixes express different relationships between phenomena and thereby connect the verb with other words. They are added to all the verbs and some parts of speech, as may be necessary for speaking. It has to be said that the affixes of the conditional mood and, to some extent, the infinitive perform the same functions for the verb as the cases do for the noun. The conditional mood of the verb *-ca/-cə* is not a significant issue in linguistics. This verb has only one form, and conditional mood, in general, denotes a condition for action. Nevertheless, a thorough analysis proves that this form is a means of connection not only between the verbs but also between the verbs and the numerals. The form of the infinitive *ырга/-eprə/-pra* also expresses the concretizing relation. The infinitive in Turkic languages has a restrictive use. It can be found not in all modern and ancient Turkic languages. Therefore, it cannot be considered as an ancient grammatical form. This is emphasized in Comparative Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages: Morphology, "The infinitive is used in three forms: the affixes *-мак/-мәк*, *-ырга/-eprə*, *-a/-ə*; *-мак/-мәк* in Azerbaijani, Turkish; the form *-ырга/-eprə* in Tatar, Bashkir, Khakass, Altai, Yakut; the affix *-a/-ə* in Kazakh, Karakalpak languages. The Yakut language is only at the initial stage of the formation of the infinitive". Abdrakhmanova *et al.* (2016) say: Concretizing relations play an essential role in the formation of speech. Among other relations, it is the richest one according to means of communication and shades of meanings. The means of the link of the concretizing relation are the object of study in the

works by R. K. Sagdieva (Sagdieva, 2000). Affixes expressing this relation have been thoroughly studied in the works by the mentioned author. Each means is analyzed not only as a grammatical phenomenon, but it is also described with respect to the functional aspect. The very functional analysis of a particular linguistic phenomenon is also the focus of the researches of recent years. This has been mentioned more than once in scientific papers.

METHODS

The primary research method is descriptive-analytical with its main components: observation (Observation is a well-established methodology for exploring the social world, and should be considered in situations where detailed descriptions of a setting and the meanings and values of its inhabitants need to be explored. Observation needs to be approached in a rigorous and structured way, both in terms of the techniques used to gather data, and the methodological considerations of validity, reliability and the ethics of research. Some criticisms of ethnography challenge the possibility to provide accurate explanations of settings, and researchers need to be reflexive about their own activities as researchers and writers of observational studies (Fox, 1998: 25), generalization (In quantitative research, generalizability is considered a major criterion for evaluating the quality of a study (Kerlinger and Lee, 2000; Polit and Beck, 2008). Within the classic validity framework of Cook and Campbell (e.g., Shadish *et al.*, 2002), external validity—the degree to which inferences from a study can be generalized—has been a valued standard for decades. Yet, generalizability is a thorny, complex, and illusive issue even in studies that are considered to yield high-quality evidence (Kerlinger and Lee, 2000; Shadish *et al.*, 2002). Generalization, which is an act of reasoning that involves drawing broad inferences from particular observations, is widely-acknowledged as a quality standard in quantitative research, but is more controversial in qualitative research. The goal of most qualitative studies is not to generalize but rather to provide a rich, contextualized understanding of some aspect of human experience through the intensive study of particular cases. Yet, in an environment where evidence for improving practice is held in high esteem, generalization in relation to knowledge claims merits careful attention by both qualitative and quantitative researchers (Polit & Beck, 2010) and interpretation. For a detailed analysis of the linguistic features of speech, a comparative historical method is also used, which allows for the determination of some tendencies in the

development of the grammatical system of the national literary language. Comparative-typological and statistical methods are also applied in the studies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Infinitive is a linguistics term referring to certain verb forms existing in many languages, most often used as non-finite verbs. As with many linguistic concepts, there is not a single definition applicable to all languages. The word is derived from Late Latin [modus] infinitivus, a derivative of infinitus meaning "unlimited". In traditional descriptions of English, the infinitive is the basic dictionary form of a verb when used non-finitely, with or without the particle to. Thus to go is an infinitive, as is go in a sentence like "I must go there" (but not in "I go there", where it is a finite verb). The form without to is called the bare infinitive, and the form with to is called the full infinitive or to-infinitive. In many other languages the infinitive is a single word, often with a characteristic inflective ending, like morir ("(to) die") in Spanish, manger ("(to) eat") in French, portare ("(to) carry") in Latin, lieben ("(to) love") in German, читать (chitat', "(to) read") in Russian, etc. However, some languages have no infinitive forms. Many Native American languages, Arabic and some languages in Africa and Australia do not have direct equivalents to infinitives or verbal nouns. Instead, they use finite verb forms in ordinary clauses or various special constructions. Being a verb, an infinitive may take objects and other complements and modifiers to form a verb phrase (called an infinitive phrase). Like other non-finite verb forms (like participles, converbs, gerunds and gerundives), infinitives do not generally have an expressed subject; thus an infinitive verb phrase also constitutes a complete non-finite clause, called an infinitive (infinitival) clause. Such phrases or clauses may play a variety of roles within sentences, often being nouns (for example being the subject of a sentence or being a complement of another verb), and sometimes being adverbs or other types of modifier. Many verb forms known as infinitives differ from gerunds (verbal nouns) in that they do not inflect for case or occur in adpositional phrases. Instead, infinitives often originate in earlier inflectional forms of verbal nouns. Unlike finite verbs, infinitives are not usually inflected for tense, person, etc. either, although some degree of inflection sometimes occurs; for example Latin has distinct active and passive infinitives (Jussi, 2003: 185-237).

If the relation between the verbs is carried out by means of the affix *-ca/-cə*, then the dependent verb can

characterize the governing verb from different viewpoints.

If the conjunctions *эгэр*, *эгэр дэ* (if) take part in verbal relation, then they somewhat amplify the meaning of the affix *-ca/-cə*: *Эгэр укысам аңлар идем* (If you taught, you would understand).

The dependent component of such phrases can be the verbs of the definite past tense with the auxiliary word *исэ*: *Укыдым исэ аңлыым* (If I read, I will understand).

The verb of indicative mood can also express the conditional meaning with the interrogative particle or with the word *икэн*: *Эшлимме, жиренэ житкөрөл эшлим* (If I do, I will do it properly).

The dependent verb with the particle *-да/-дэ* expresses that the action indicated by the governing verb is not done notwithstanding the presence of the necessary conditions, or vice versa: *Укымасам да белэм* (I know if I haven't even taught).

Sometimes, intensifying the meaning of the particle *-да/-дэ*, the conjunction *гэрчэ* (though, although) can be used: *Гэрчэ укымасам да, имтиханда яхшы билгэ алдым* (Although he didn't learn, he got a good mark on the exam).

The verb, subordinate to the numeral by means of the affix of the conditional mood *-ca/-cə*, expresses the condition of an object in quantity indicated by the dominating component: *бирсэ биш* (if one gives five), *килсэ* (if four come).

The affix *-ca/-cə* and the relative words participate in the correlation of the verbs. However, in this case, it does not define the type of lexical-grammatical relationship. These relationships depend on the form of relative words. The relationship between the relative word and the dominant verb defines the relationship between the subordinate and governing verbs. Since the dependent verb is not directly subordinated to the governing verb but is subordinated to it by concretizing the relative word expressed by the demonstrative pronoun.

The verbs formally connected together by means of the affix *-ca/-cə* can be equal in the semantic sense. Consequently, this connection occupies an intermediate position between subordinating and coordinating relations: *Ул жырласа, мин дэ жырлыым* (If he sings, I will also sing).

An infinitive is a verbal, a verb form or construction that plays the role of a different part of speech in a sentence. Although infinitives contain verbs, they cannot function as verbs. They do not convey a sense of tense on their own, and sentences containing them must include at least one finite main verb. Infinitives are formed by placing *to* in front of the base form of a verb. They are negated by placing *not* in front of them. The infinitive has many functions. It can be helpful to identify what role an infinitive plays in a sentence: with the proper understanding of how an infinitive is used, writers can structure their sentences with clarity and precision. An infinitive can act as a noun, appearing as the subject or direct object of a sentence. It can also appear as a subject complement, which provides information about the subject, following a linking verb (such as *is*) in the predicate of a sentence. One way to test whether or not an infinitive is acting as a noun is by replacing the infinitive with the word *something*. Infinitives can also be placed after any noun in a sentence, acting as an adjective. Infinitives can also be adverbial, modifying any verb in a sentence. These infinitives tell the reader why the action is necessary. Note that the infinitive can either precede or follow the main clause of a sentence: it is movable. Infinitives can be combined with other words and phrases to provide additional information about the action expressed in the infinitive. When used with certain verbs, the word *to* is dropped from an infinitive. Bare infinitives are always used with the modal verbs *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *shall*, *should*, *will*, and *would*. These verbs combine with infinitives to express the conditional mood, which conveys a sense of necessity or possibility. The combination of a modal verb and a bare infinitive can take the place of the main verb of a sentence. The verbs *bid*, *let*, *watch*, *see*, *make*, *help*, and *hear* take bare infinitives. The constructs *had better* and *had rather* (an archaic form of "would rather," an expression of preference commonly used in British English) also take bare infinitives. Lastly, the verbs *dare* and *need* can take bare infinitives under certain circumstances. When a word or phrase appears between *to* and the verb in an infinitive, it is called a split infinitive. They are considered by some grammarians to be improper and should be avoided in formal writing. Revise split infinitives whenever they make the sentence difficult to understand. A split infinitive containing a single adverb is acceptable in informal contexts, especially when moving the adverb makes the sentence awkward or unclear. The infinitive has four other forms: the perfect infinitive, the

continuous infinitive, the perfect continuous infinitive, and the passive infinitive. These are formed by using several different verb tenses with auxiliary verbs after the to. Perfect infinitives are used with other verbs to convey the conditional mood. They are most often combined with modal verbs. Perfect infinitives are formed by changing the base form of a verb to its past participle and adding the auxiliary verb have. Continuous infinitives combine with other verbs to express a continuing action. They are formed by combining to be with the present participle of a verb. The perfect continuous infinitive is a combination of the perfect and continuous forms. It expresses a continuing action that is now complete. The perfect continuous infinitive is formed by combining to have been with the present participle of a verb. The passive infinitive is used with other verbs to express an action received by the subject of a sentence. It is formed by combining to be with the past participle of a verb (Sanchez, 2018:3-6).

The Tatar language (татар теле, tatar tele or татарча, tatarça) is a Turkic language spoken by Tatars mainly located in modern Tatarstan (European Russia), as well as Siberia. It should not be confused with the Crimean Tatar or Siberian Tatar which are closely related but belong to different subgroups of the Kipchak languages. The Tatar language is spoken in Russia (about 5.3 million people), Ukraine, China, Finland, Turkey, Uzbekistan, the United States of America, Romania, Azerbaijan, Israel, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Lithuania, Latvia and other countries. There are more than 7 million speakers of Tatar in the world. Tatar is also native for several thousand Maris. Mordva's Qaratay group also speak a variant of Kazan Tatar. In the 2010 census, 69% of Russian Tatars who responded to the question about language ability claimed a knowledge of the Tatar language (Benjamin, 2020). In Tatarstan, 93% of Tatars and 3.6% of Russians did so. In neighbouring Bashkortostan, 67% of Tatars, 27% of Bashkirs, and 1.3% of Russians did (Russian Census, 2010).

Tatar, along with Russian, is the official language of the Republic of Tatarstan. The official script of Tatar language is based on the Cyrillic script with some additional letters. The Republic of Tatarstan passed a law in 1999, which came into force in 2001, establishing an official Tatar Latin alphabet. A Russian federal law overrode it in 2002, making Cyrillic the sole official script in Tatarstan since. Unofficially, other

scripts are used as well, mostly Latin and Arabic. All official sources in Tatarstan must use Cyrillic on their websites and in publishing. In other cases, where Tatar has no official status, the use of a specific alphabet depends on the preference of the author. The Tatar language was made a de facto official language in Russia in 1917, but only within the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. Tatar is also considered to have been the official language in the short-lived Idel-Ural State, briefly formed during the Russian Civil War. The usage of Tatar declined from during the 20th century. By the 1980s, the study and teaching of Tatar in the public education system was limited to rural schools. However, Tatar-speaking pupils had little chance of entering university because higher education was available in Russian almost exclusively. As of 2001 Tatar was considered a potentially endangered language while Siberian Tatar received "endangered" and "seriously endangered" statuses, respectively (Unesco, 2001). Higher education in Tatar can only be found in Tatarstan, and is restricted to the humanities. In other regions Tatar is primarily a spoken language and the number of speakers as well as their proficiency tends to decrease. Tatar is popular as a written language only in Tatar-speaking areas where schools with Tatar language lessons are situated. On the other hand, Tatar is the only language in use in rural districts of Tatarstan. Since 2017, Tatar language classes are no longer mandatory in the schools of Tatarstan. According to the opponents of this change, it will further endanger the Tatar language and is a violation of the Tatarstan Constitution which stipulates the equality of Russian and Tatar languages in the republic. There are two main dialects of Tatar:

- Central or Middle (Kazan)
- Western (Mişär or Mishar)

All of these dialects also have subdivisions. Significant contributions to the study of the Tatar language and its dialects, were made by a scientist Gabdulkhay Akhatov, who is considered to be the founder of the modern Tatar dialectological school. Spoken idioms of Siberian Tatars, which differ significantly from the above two, are often considered as the third dialect group of Tatar by some, but as an independent language on its own by others. The Central or Middle dialectal group is spoken in Kazan and most of Tatarstan and is the basis of the standard literary Tatar language. In the Western (Mişär) dialect ç is pronounced [tɕ] (southern or Lambir Mişärs) and as

[ts] (northern Mişärs or Nizhgars). C is pronounced [dʒ]. There are no differences between v and w, q and k, g and ğ in the Mişär dialect. (The Cyrillic alphabet doesn't have special letters for q, ğ and w, so Mişär speakers have no difficulty reading Tatar written in Cyrillic). Two main isoglosses that characterize Siberian Tatar are ç as [ts] and c as [j], corresponding to standard [ç] and [ç]. There are also grammatical differences within the dialect, scattered across Siberia (Yusupov, 2015). Many linguists claim the origins of Siberian Tatar dialects are actually independent of Volga–Ural Tatar; these dialects are quite remote both from Standard Tatar and from each other, often preventing mutual comprehension. The claim that this language is part of the modern Tatar language is typically supported by linguists in Kazan, Moscow and by Siberian Tatars linguists and denounced by some Russian and Tatar ethnographers (Husnutdinov, *et al.*, 2019).

Over time, some of these dialects were given distinct names and recognized as separate languages (e.g. the Chulym language) after detailed linguistic study. However, the Chulym language was never classified as a dialect of Tatar language. Confusion arose because of the endoethnonym "Tatars" used by the Chulyms. The question of classifying the Chulym language as a dialect of the Khakass language was debatable. A brief linguistic analysis shows that many of these dialects exhibit features which are quite different from the Volga–Ural Tatar varieties, and should be classified as Turkic varieties belonging to several sub-groups of the Turkic languages, distinct from Kipchak languages to which Volga–Ural Tatar belongs (Yusupov, 2015). The form of the infinitive in -pra/-prə in its origin goes back to the means of relationship. In different dialects of the Tatar language, there are various forms of the infinitive: in Paranginsky dialect -мага/-мәгә, in the Upland – -ма/-мә, in the Eastern dialect --кале/-кәле, in the Upland and in the written monument --малы/-мәле, in the vernacular Tyulyachi-Mamadysh of the middle dialect --сы/-се, etc. (Tumasheva, 1986). Between subordinate and governing components, depending on their semantics, there can be various lexical and grammatical relations. In linguistics, subordination (abbreviated variously subord, sbrd, subr or sr) is a principle of the hierarchical organization of linguistic units. While the principle is applicable in semantics, syntax, morphology, and phonology, most work in linguistics employs the term "subordination" in the context of syntax, and that is the context in which it is considered

here. The syntactic units of sentences are often either subordinate or coordinate to each other. Hence an understanding of subordination is promoted by an understanding of coordination, and vice versa (Osborne, 2006: 65).

The dependent verb expresses the purpose of doing the action defined by the governing component. When the verbs of movement are the governing component, the relation of purpose is further strengthened: *укырга бару* (to go to study), *ашарга чакыру* (to call to eat).

In such word combinations, an additional means of the link may be the auxiliary word *дип* (speaking): *укырга дип бару* (to go studying), *ашарга дип чакыру* (call eating).

The dependent verb expresses the direct object of the process indicated by the governing verb of thinking, state, speech, and action (rather than movement): *чыгарга сорару* (to ask to leave), *сөйләргә рөхсәт итү* (to allow to tell), *жырларга ярату* (to like to sing).

In sporadic cases, the word *дип* can act as an additional means of link: *күрергә дип килү* (to come in order to see), *язарга дип утыру* (to sit down in order to write).

When all the verbs except the verbs of movement are the dependent component, they can also express an indirect object of the process indicated by the dominant verb: *укырга сүз бирү* (to give one's word to learn), *сөйләргә ирек бирмәү* (not to allow to tell).

The infinitive, subordinating to the adjective via its form, expresses the purpose of the attribute indicated by the governing component: *әйтәргә кыен* (embarrassing to say), *кияргә уңай* (convenient to put on).

The infinitive, subordinating to abstract nouns, expresses mainly the purpose of an object or a phenomenon designated by the governing noun: *укырга мөмкинлек* (opportunity to learn), *утыртырга орлык* (seeds for planting), *йокларга урын* (place to sleep).

SUMMARY

The conditional mood is a grammatical mood used in conditional sentences to express a proposition whose validity is dependent on some condition, possibly counterfactual. It may refer to a distinct verb

form that expresses the conditional set of circumstances proper in the dependent clause or protasis, or which expresses the hypothetical state of affairs or uncertain event contingent to it in the independent clause or apodosis, or both. Some languages distinguish more than one conditional mood; the East African language Hadza, for example, has a potential conditional expressing possibility, and a veridical conditional expressing certainty. Other languages do not have a conditional mood at all. In some informal contexts, such as language teaching, it may be called the "conditional tense". Some languages have verb forms called "conditional" although their use is not exclusive to conditional expression. Examples are the English or French conditionals, which are morphologically futures-in-the-past, and of which each has thus been referred to as a "so-called conditional" in modern and contemporary linguistics (Comrie, 1985: 75).

We can deduce that the conditional mood of the verb is a means of expressing a concretizing relationship between verbs, between verbs and numerals. In these situations, the affix of conditional mood *-ca/-cə* expresses a process the fulfillment or non-fulfillment of which is a condition for fulfillment or non-fulfillment of the process indicated by the governing verb and expresses the condition for the existence of the object in quantity indicated by the governing component.

The form of the infinitive is a means of expressing the concretizing relationship between verbs, between verbs and nouns, between verbs and adverbs. In these concretizing relations, the form of the infinitive expresses the purpose of the process indicated by the governing component, the direct and indirect object of the process. It expresses the purpose of a feature, the purpose of an object or a phenomenon.

CONCLUSIONS

In this survey, particular verb forms to express a concretizing relation, as well as shades of meanings, have been accurately analyzed. The analysis's outcome demonstrates that these affixes express different connections between phenomena and connect the verb with other words.

The forms of the infinitive (*-ырга/-ергә/-рга*) and the conditional mood of the verb (*-ca/-cə*) are the means of expressing the concretizing relation. A more profound analysis shows that these affixes express

various relations between phenomena and thereby connect the verb with the verb, with the noun, with the numeral, with the adverb. In comparison with other affixes of expressing the concretizing relation, these verb forms are not often used. However, when designating purposes and conditions, they are decisive and essential elements in speech.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

REFERENCES

- Abdrakhmanova, A.A., Galiullina, G.R., Aidarova, S.H., Giniyatullina, L.M., Gainullina, G.F. (2016). Aspects of Tatar Ethnic Oriented Teaching as a Foreign Language. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. Special Issue*, 181-184.
- Bacanli, E. (2019). Deviations from the generalized phonological rules in Turkic languages. *Asian and African Studies*, 28(2), 3-11.
- Benjamin, S. (2020). Verb Concatenation in Asian Linguistics, Published in: Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics.
- Coker, W. (2014). Beyond Self Containment: On the Politics of Culture and Identity in a Global Society. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*. 2(1), 53-62.
- Fernandez, J. (2020). Circularity in Searle's Social Ontology: With a Hegelian Reply. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*. 8(1), 18-24.
- Fox, N. (1998). How to Use Observations In a Research Project, Trent Focus for Research and Development in Primary Health Care How to Use Observations in a Research Project, Institute of General Practice, Northern General Hospital, Sheffield, Produced By: Trent Focus Group.
- Hudson, R. (1988). Coordination and grammatical relations. *Journal of Linguistics* 24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700011816>
- Husnutdinov, D.H., Sagdieva, R.K., Mirzagitov, R.H., & Karipzhanova, G.T. (2019). Predicative and Sound-Supporting Words as a Component of the Specific Relation | [Palabraspredictivas y que apoyan el sonido como un componente de la relación específica]. *Opcion*, 35(22), 549-560.
- Khakimov, B., Gataullin, R., and Gilmullin, R.I. (2016). Grammatical Disambiguation in the Tatar National Corpus. EPIC Series in Language and Linguistics. 1(2), 228-231 <https://doi.org/10.29007/ikgl>
- Khisamova, F.M. (2006). Tatar Morphology. – *Kazan: Magarif*, 335 p.
- Osborne, T. (2006). Parallel conjuncts. *Studia Linguistica* 60, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9582.2006.00133.x>
- Sagdieva, R.K. (2000). Affixes as the Means of Expressing Concretizing Relations in the Tatar Language: Dissertation for Candidate of Sciences in Philology. Kazan, 164 p.
- Sanchez E.L (2018). Infinitives, San José State University Writing Center, www.sjsu.edu/writingcenter.
- Shakirova, G.R., Kharisova, C.M., & Kharisov F.F. (2016). The Development of Language Competence of Students in the Study of Native Language Morphology. *Journal of Language and Literature, ISSN:2078-0303*, 7(1), 227-230.
- Tumasheva, D.G. (1964). *The Morphology of Modern Tatar*. – Kazan: The KSU Press, 300 p.

Tumasheva, D.G. (1986). *The Tatar Verb*. – Kazan: *The KSU Press*, 181 p.

Ylikoski, Jussi (2003), "Defining non-finites: action nominals, converbs and infinitives" (PDF). *SKY Journal of Linguistics*. 16.

Yusupov, A.F. (2015). Specifics of Sufi and Islamic Terminology Use in the Poetry of the 19th Century. *European Journal of Science and Theology*, 11(5), 275-284.

Received on 02-11-2020

Accepted on 08-12-2020

Published on 29-12-2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.285>

© 2020 Sagdieva *et al.*; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.