

SYNTACTIC CLASSIFICATION OF COPULAR CONSTRUCTIONS IN UZBEK LANGUAGE

Özbek Dilindeki Yardımcı Fiil Yapılarının Sözdizimsel Sınıflandırılması

Lola TÜRKER*

Öz: Bileşenler arasındaki dizimsel ilişkiler, farklı dillerde farklı şekillerde kodlanmış. Bu farklılıkları ortaya çıkarmak için çeşitli çalışmalar yapılmıştır. Belirli gramer yapılarını ifade etmek için kullanılan yöntemler dilin tipolojik özelliklerine bağlı olarak değişiklik ifade etmektedir. Bu çalışmada Özbekçe yardımcı fiil yapımı incelenerek, yardımcı fiil yapımında tercih edilen yöntemlere göre fiil sınıflandırması yapılmıştır. Çalışma, yardımcı fiil yapımında zaman, yön, olumluluk veya olumsuzluk gibi faktörlerin yöntem seçmede etkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Çapraz-dilbilimsel inceleme yardımcı yapıların türü ve işlevi bakımından diğer dillerle bazı benzerlikler gösterdiğini, Özbekçe fiillerin, tipolojik olarak farklı olan, İngilizce, Rusça ve İspanyolca arasındaki benzerlikler ve farklılıkları ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Özbekçe yardımcı fiil yapıları, açık ve açık olmayan fiil kodlama stratejileri

Abstract: Syntagmatic relationships between constituents are encoded in different ways in different languages. Numerous studies have been carried out to reveal those varieties. Strategies to express certain grammatical constructions vary depending on the typological features of a given language. This study analyzes copular constructions in Uzbek and classifies them according to the elaborated strategy choices for encoding them. The study shows that election of strategy for marking the copular constructions is constrained by various factors, such as tense, aspect and polarity. Uzbek copula constructions vary intralinguistically, exhibiting features of zero copula construction, particle copula construction, and verbal copula construction. Cross-linguistic analysis has revealed certain similarities and differences between Uzbek and typologically different languages such as, English, Russian, and Spanish in terms of the type and function of the copula constructions. Uzbek copular constructions share similarities with Spanish copular constructions in expressing aspectual features, and with Russian in encoding non-overt copula constructions in the present tense.

Keywords: Uzbek copula constructions, overt and non-overt copula, copula encoding strategies

* International Burch University Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

INTRODUCTION

Languages vary typologically and elaborate different strategies to denote certain syntactic features. However, there are accepted universals, such as all languages possess categories subject and predicate, and that there is a close syntagmatic relationship between them. Languages use different constructions to link the subject to its complement predicate, but mostly copular verbs, also called linking verbs, are used to connect the subject and the predicate. Some strategies used in different languages are inserting a pronominal, using a copular verb, or simply juxtaposing the subject and the predicate. Elaborated constructions vary not only cross-linguistically, but also within the same language. Grammatical factors such as tense and aspect, polarity, and expressed semantic relation may affect the choice of the construction (Curnow 2000).

In order to carry out the analysis cross-linguistically, a detailed explanation of the strategies that languages use to encode the copular constructions is required. With this purpose in mind, the present study aims to analyze the strategies that Uzbek language elaborates to encode the copular constructions. The full range of the copular constructions in Uzbek is studied to reach a complete analysis, as an analysis true for one construction may not be applicable to a different construction. Within the same line, cross-linguistic analysis is done to reveal similarities and differences between Uzbek, and typologically different languages English and Spanish.

Cross-linguistic classification of the copular constructions

Copular constructions serve to link the subject of the sentence to its predicate, and these constructions vary cross linguistically. There are languages that use overt copular constructions, yet many others use non-covert constructions, i.e. subject and the predicate are just juxtaposed. Numerous studies have revealed that there is a wide range of paradigmatic varieties between these two types of overt and non-overt constructions (Curnow 2000, Pustet 2003). Strategies to express the copula constructions vary depending on typological features of a given language. The election of the strategy for marking the copular construction is constrained by various factors (Curnow 2000).

“The choice of construction in these cases depends upon discourse and grammatical factors such as tense and aspect, polarity, the status of the clause as main or subordinate, the person of the Copula subject, and the semantic relation expressed” (Curnow 2000:2).

In some languages the copular constructions are overt (1), (2), while in some others they are non-overt (3), (4). (Overt copula constructions appear in bold).

1. *He **is** a student.* (English)

2. *El **es** estudiante.* (Spanish)

3. *On student.* (Russian)

he student NOM-SG

‘He is a student’.

4. *U talaba.* (Uzbek)

he student NOM-SG

‘He is a student’.

As seen in (3) and (4), in Russian and Uzbek languages there is no overt copular in the present tense. In lexical functional grammar, a variety of generative grammar (Bresnan 2001), the phrase structure rule of (3) and (4) appears as (5):

5. Phrase structure rule

$S \rightarrow NP \varepsilon NP \vee AP \vee PP$

$(\uparrow\text{SUBJ})=\downarrow (\uparrow\text{PRED})=\text{‘null-be<SUBJ,PREDLINK>’} (\uparrow\text{PREDLINK})=\downarrow$

$(\uparrow\text{TENSE})=\text{present}$

(Adapted from Dalrymple et al. 2004).

Typological differences may vary not only cross-linguistically, but also within the same language, as seen in (6) and (7).

6. *U talaba e-di.* (Uzbek)

He student.NOM-SG COP-PST-3SG.

‘He was a student’.

7. *On byl student-om.* (Russian)

He COP-PST-3SG student.NOM-SG-M

‘He was a student’.

As seen in (6) and (7) above, Uzbek and Russian use overt copular constructions, yet in the present tense the copula is null (3), (4). Further analysis is required to explain this variation and whether the copula-less constructions and overt copular constructions within the same language differ in syntax. However, tense based variation may be due to the fact that the copular is (partly) governed by tense (Dalrymple et al. 2004).

Uzbek copular constructions

Uzbek possesses two copula constructions, defective copula ‘*e-*’ and a copula verb ‘*bo’l*’ (be, become). These two copular constructions belong to two different

categories according to Curnow's (2000) classification. Curnow (2000) categorizes languages into four groups according to strategies they use to encode the copular constructions:

- a) Verbal copula construction- copular verb similar to English *be*.
- b) Particle copula construction – Copula subject + Copula complement + non verb additional word.
- c) 'Inflectional' copula construction – the Copula complement is treated as though it were a verb.
- d) 'Zero' copula constructions- the Copula subject and Copula complement are simply juxtaposed.

Curnow (2000), based on his findings from seventy languages, states that most of the languages possess only one of the copula constructions classified above.

As for Uzbek, it has three types of the copular constructions, zero copula construction, particle copula construction, and verbal copula construction(4), (6), and (13).

Particle Copula 'e-'

Uzbek particle copula 'e-' is attached to a simplex word in order to form a copular construction. It has five forms, which are used to form negation, conditional, perfect, past, and reportative (Straughn, 2011).

When copular 'e-' is attached to '-mas', the form 'e-ma's is obtained, which is used in negation (8):

8. *Yomon e-mas e-di.*

bad COP-NEG COP-PST-3SG.

'He was not bad'.

By attaching 'e-' to simplex '-sa', conditional 'e-sa' is formed (9):

9. *bor-ib e-sa*

go-CPST COP-COND

'If he has gone.'

In order to form the past tense, e- is attached to -di, a morpheme which used in other past tense constructions too (10):

10. *Kiz kel-gan e-di.*

girl come-PST.3 COP-PST

'The girl had come'.

The construction ‘*e-*’ and ‘*-kan*’, ‘*e-kan*’ is used with evidential meaning, i.e., to express non-firsthand information (11):

11. *Ko’shnining aytishicha besh kishi qazo bo’lgan ekan.*

Neighbor –GEN according. to five person-PL dead be-PRF EVID

‘According to the neighbor five people died’.

Copula ‘*e-mish*’, basically functions the same as ‘*ekan*’, which is used to express non-firsthand information. The slight difference between them is ‘*emish*’ expresses evidential reportative meaning, while ‘*ekan*’ general non-firsthand meaning (12):

12. *Mirzabek uylan- ayot- gan e-mish.*

Mirzabek marry- PROG-PRF COP-RPT

‘(Reportedly) Mirzabek is getting married’.

All five forms of the copular ‘*e-*’ are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Copular *e-* and its forms

Copula	Negation	Conditional	Non-confirmative	Past	Reportative
<i>e-</i>	<i>e- mas</i>	<i>e-sa</i>	<i>e-kan</i>	<i>e-di</i>	<i>e-mish</i>

Second copular morpheme in Uzbek is ‘*bol*’ (be, become), which unlike *e-* is a full verb (13).

13. *Issyq bo’l-ayap-ti.*

hot be- PROG-3SG.

‘It is becoming hot’.

The main difference between copula constructions ‘*e-*’ and ‘*bo’ l*’ is that the former denotes events, and the latter denotes states. Copular ‘*e-*’ constructions exhibit certain similarities with Spanish copula verb ‘*ser*’. The next section focuses on some similarities and differences of Uzbek and Spanish copula verbs.

Cross-linguistic comparison of Uzbek and Spanish copula constructions

In order to do a cross-linguistic comparison, a brief outline of the Spanish copular verbs will be provided. Spanish possesses two copular verbs '*ser*' and '*estar*' both of which are semantically equivalent to English 'to be'. Each of these verbs has its present, past and future forms. Both *ser* and '*estar*' can be used with qualitative adjectives, but they differ in terms of aspectual meaning. *Ser*+ adjective forms a characterizing predicate of the subject, while '*estar*' predicates a transitive state on subject. '*Estar*' is also used to describe where a person or thing is located (14), while *ser* is used with events (15).

14. *El restaurante esta en España.*

'The restaurant is in Spain'.

15. *Dónde es el concierto qué vemos?*

'Where is the concert we are seeing?'

Spanish copular '*ser*' has two forms in the past tense, '*fue*' and '*era*'. They differ in aspectual terms, the preterite form '*fue*' refers to actions that took place at a definite time in the past, while the imperfect form '*era*' refers to actions that happened repetitively or that did not end.

'*Era*' is most commonly used with inherent characteristics (16), while '*fue*' is used with events, which is typical of preterite form (17).

16. *Ella era joven.*

'She was young.'

17. *El seminario fue a las 9:00.*

'The meeting was yesterday'.

Uzbek uses past tense copula '*edi*' 'to express both varieties of the past tense Spanish copular '*era*' and '*fue*' (18), (19).

18. *U yosh edi.*

'She was young'

19. *Seminar soat 9:00 da edi.*

'The seminar was at 9:00'.

It is interesting to note that, the choice of strategy is the same in both languages Uzbek and Spanish in denoting copular constructions in the past. Spanish '*era/fue*' and Uzbek '*edi*' share similar features in terms of syntax and semantics.

CONCLUSION

It is difficult to make clear-cut definitions without analyzing the full range of copular constructions in a language. Only empirical studies can shed a light on these issues concerning the copular construction behavior within the language and cross-linguistically. Studying the copula construction in Uzbek revealed that there are three types of copula construction, zero copula construction, particle copula construction, and verbal copula construction. Certain similarities and differences between Uzbek and English, Russian, and Spanish languages have been observed, in terms of the type and function of the copula constructions. The Uzbek copular constructions are non-overt in the present, but overt in the past. They also share similarities with Spanish copular constructions in expressing aspectual features.

REFERENCES

- BRESNAN, J. (2001). *Lexical Functional Syntax*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- CURNOW, T. (2000). Towards a cross-linguistic typology of copula constructions. In *the 1999 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, ed. John Henderson, 1-9: Australian Linguistic Society.
- DALRYMPLE, Mary, Dyvik, Helge, and King, Tracy Halloway (2004). Copular Complements: Closed or Open? In *The LFG 04 Conference*, Christchurch, New Zealand, pp. 188-198.
- NUEVA GRAMÁTICA DE LA LENGUA ESPAÑOLA. (2010), Real Academia Espanola; Asociacion de Academicas Americanas, S.L.U. EspasaLibros
- PUSTET, R. (2003). *Copulas. Universals in the Categorization of the Lexicon*. New York: Oxford University
- STRAUGHN, C. (2011). *Evidentiality in Uzbek and Kazakh*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Chicago, Illinois.

