

On the Use and Familiarity of Copular Clauses in English and Turkish

İngilizce ve Türkçedeki Bağlayıcı Cümleciklerin Kullanım ve Bilinirlikleri Üzerine

Mehmet ALTAY*

Abstract

A striking feature in human languages that is commonly investigated in contrastive analyses is the use of copular elements. They are used as linking verbs in certain languages while inflectional morphemes can function in the same vein in others such as the enclitic languages. Based upon their syntactic order, the clauses in which the main verb is a copula refer to a variety of meanings and are categorized in four distinct types in English as: (1) predicational, (2) specificational, (3) equative, and (4) identificational. Contrary to English, Turkish is an enclitic language, and thus it is not only the order of words in clauses that determines the type of copular clauses, but also the order of modification in post-copular elements. The initial concern of this current study is to review the use of copular clauses existing in English and their availability in Turkish. A secondary aim is to see how familiar the native speakers of Turkish are towards copular clauses both in their mother tongue and in English as a foreign language. The results indicated that the four types of copular clauses in English are true in Turkish as well. It is also observed that certain morphosyntactic structures in Turkish are subject to cause semantic ambiguity.

Keywords: Copula, copular clauses, Contrastive Analysis, Turkish, EFL learning

Öz

İnsan dillerinin, karşılaştırmalı analizlere yaygın olarak konu olmuş özelliklerinden birisi de birleştirici unsurlardır. Bu unsurlar kimi dillerde bağlayıcı eylem olarak kullanılırken, enklitik diller gibi diğer bazı dillerde ise çekim ekleri aynı işlevdedir. İngilizce’de temel eylemi olarak bağlayıcı eylem kullanılan tümceler, sözdizimsel sıralarına bağlı olarak farklı anlamlara karşılık gelmektedirler ve dört türe ayrılırlar: (1) yüklemel, (2) belirtme, (3) eşleyici, (4) tanıtsal. İngilizcenin aksine, Türkçe enklitik bir dil olup bağlayıcı eylem tümcelerinin türlerini belirleyen yalnızca bu tümcelerdeki kelimelerin sıraları değildir, aynı zamanda eylemden sonra gelen unsurların çekim eklerinin sıralanmasıdır. Bu çalışmanın öncelikli amacı İngilizcedeki bağlayıcı eylem tümce türlerinin kullanımlarını ve Türkçede de aynı türlerin bulunup bulunmadıklarını incelemektir. İkincil bir amaç ise anadili Türkçe olanların, hem kendi dillerinde hem de yabancı dil olarak öğrendikleri İngilizcede bağlayıcı eylem tümcelerine ne derece aşina olduklarını görmektir. Bulgulara göre, İngilizcede varolan her dört bağlayıcı eylem tümcesi de Türkçede mevcuttur. Türkçedeki belli biçim-sözdizimsel yapıların anlamsal karmaşasına sebep olabildiği de ayrıca gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Bağlayıcı eylem, bağlayıcı eylem tümceleri, Karşılaştırmalı Analiz, Türkçe, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenimi

Introduction

Regardless of the positions that they occupy both in the S-structures and D-structures, grammatical units in the meaning of *be* is a core element in the syntax of all natural languages, and play a key role in cross-linguistic studies. It can appear in the form of a reduced auxiliary and thus is enclitic, or as a separate morpholexical unit -but is still clitic-(Anderson, 2008) as in most Indo-European Languages. There can be variations in the position of copular *be* even amongst the languages of the same language family. For instance, it can precede its complements as in English and French, or follow them in certain syntactic patterns as in Persian (Persian Online, 2018), resulting from its relatively being more of a Head-final language (Rahmani, Alizadeh, & Hamidi, 2014; Ghorbanpour, 2016).

The position of copula corresponds not only to the head parameter, it also addresses the Pro-drop parameter. It functions as a transition unit between subject and its predicate when in lexical form on the one hand, and works as an inflectional morpheme to fix a subject marker to the predicate of the sentence without any further need to a subject at lexical level on the other. Therefore, there remains no need for copula as an auxiliary verb except from a purposeful use like in stress for the agent of the action in clause. Most Ural-Altai languages such as Turkish

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü, mehmet.altay@kocaeli.edu.tr

and Mongolian can count as examples for the latter since it is common to see the predicative personal inflection of nouns by enclitic personal markers of pronominal origins (Janhunen, 2010, p. 168).

When the issue is Turkish language, the etymological roots of its contemporary use of copula *be* is twofold: its *personal inflection* and *the enclitic* that attribute its lexical meaning. To illustrate the former, the infinitive verb *ermek* is seen in the early manuscripts such as *Divanü Lûgat-it Türk*, which is the earliest known dictionary and grammar reference written in the 11th century A.D., to refer to the meanings of *reach, develop, grow, access, touch, exist* and the like. It would be used as a clitic auxiliary verb and so was never stated autonomously (Ediskun, 2003, p. 187). It has never been atrophied in Turkish, but has first been reduced into its vestigial form by dropping its *r*, and then been derived into *-imek* by transforming the initial *e* sound to *i*. Today, *-mek / -mak* inflectional suffixes with verbs are used as infinitive with *to*. But the remaining *i* is used in personal inflection with the interaction of some additional sounds or morphemes.

Personal endings, at this point, either precede or follow a second type of inflectional morpheme, which contributes to the head of the phrase in terms of meaning. It is another enclitic which used to exist as a verbal predicate *tur-ur/dur-ur* with a verbal stem of *-tur* (Karakoç, 2014, p. 224), and stands for copula *be* in meaning. This enclitic appears in modern Turkish as *-dir/-dir*. It is often assumed to be as an infinitive marker just like *to* in English, but it is defined in *Divanü Lûgat-it-Türk*, the first grammar reference and dictionary of Turkish ever, as a bare infinitive verb itself without a specific infinitive marker (Atalay, 1986, p. 658). Although the latter enclitic is often assumed to be only a variation of the former, they are neither etymologically nor semantically of the parts of a hyperonymy-troponymy relation, but can only be considered as highly interactive companies. Considering their etymological irrelevancy, Ediskun (2003, p. 188) outlines that the two should not be used together as inflectional morphemes. If done so, it refers to some other special use within copular clauses.

A Comparison of Copular Clauses in English and Turkish

As Mikkelsen defines (2011, p.1805), a copular clause is a minor sentence type in which the contentful predicate is not a verb, but some other category like an adjective phrase (AP), noun phrase (NP), or a prepositional phrase (PP). While there needs to be a verbal copula joining the subject and the non-verbal element in some languages, there are also some others in which there is no verbal element at all in these clauses. In either case, copula is just like a link between the subject and the rest of the clause.

In English, Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik (1987, p. 54) highlights that the term *copula* primarily refers to the verb *be*, and *copular* verbs are those verbs (including *be* and *become*) which are functionally equivalent to the copula. They are variously called *copulative, equative, intensive, or linking verbs*. Copular clauses are used for a variety of semantic purposes in most languages, and their syntactic formations may differ from one language to another in accordance with these purposes. Generally speaking, they are often clustered into four main groups as *predicational, specificational, equative, and identificational* (Higgins, 1979).

Predicational clauses typically have a referential NP in subject position, though quantificational expressions are also allowed (Mikkelsen, 2011, p. 1808). The subject is ascribed by a property and in this respect they are similar to non-copular sentences. However, this property in predicational copular sentences such as an AP, NP, or a PP is expressed by a post-copular element only in contradistinction to non-copular clauses (Bondaruk, 2012, p. 8). The following are three examples in English with an AP, NP, and a PP as predicates.

- (1) Mr Johnson is a teacher.
Subject copula predicate (NP)
- (2) Mr Johnson is clever.
Subject copula predicate (AP)
- (3) Mr Johnson is at school.
Subject copula predicate (PP)

The position of copula is fixed in English predicational copular clauses; they precede the predicate. They are also modified depending on the tense and singularity/plurality of subject. The very same type of clause also exists in Turkish, whereas the inflectional morpheme that stands for copula *be* should drop away in most cases as in the examples below:

- (4) Johnson bir öğretmen+**dir** / \emptyset .
Subject predicate (NP)+copula
- (5) Johnson zeki+**dir** / \emptyset .
Subject predicate (AP)+copula
- (6) Johnson okulda+ \emptyset .
Subject predicate (PP)+copula

The inflectional morphemes that are used to complement the predicate of clauses can appear to be unpronounced as given in the use with third person singular above. This omission does not refer to missing surface inflection, which is often observed in L2 or L1 child use of Turkish (see Haznedar, 2003; Kornflit, 1990; Sundquist, 2005). Rather, there exists a copula but is silent in surface structure. When the predicate is inflected by either a personal ending or tense, it is clear that this kind of inflection is predicational as in the following examples:

- (7) Ben (bir) öğretmen+**im**.
1st Person Singular predicate (NP)+copula
- (8) Sen zeki+**sin(+dir)**.
2nd Person Singular predicate (NP)+copula
- (9) Biz(ler) okulda+**yız**.
1st Person Plural predicate (NP)+copula
- (10) Siz(ler) yorgun+**sunuz**.
2nd Person Plural predicate (NP)+copula
- (11) Onlar okulda+(**dir** / \emptyset)+**lar**.
3rd Person Plural predicate (NP)+copula

The personal endings of the sentences above are all the derivations of *i*, which is the remaining part from the former copula *ermek*. As seen, it is not observed in the predicates of the sentences (4), (5), and (6), in which the subject is third person singular. Furthermore, *-dir/-dir* can be used as an inflection with a copular function when the subject is third person singular

as in (4) and (5); there usually exists no other inflectional morphemes such as a preposition to the predicate in this case as in (6).

The use of *dir/-dir* is relatively less common in predicational clause type since it usually functions as an inflectional suffix that indicates a possibility or probability. For example, it can well indicate either as a possibility or a predicational judgement if used in examples (4), (5), (8), and (11) (see Ediskun, 2003, p. 189), often leading into an ambiguity even in L1 setting. Another issue which may result in ambiguity is the types and semantic features of adjectives used as predicates in different sentences. In such circumstances, further semiotic means may have an indication as in the following:

- (12) Öğrencim, bilgisayar kullanımında tecrübelidir.
Ali is experienced in using computer.
- (13) Öğrencim, bilgisayar kullanımında **herhalde** tecrübelidir.
*Ali is **possibly** experienced in using computer.*

It is even more complicated when the subject of a predicational clause is third person plural and its predicate is inflected by *-dir/-dir* as the order of inflections is not easy to determine not only by L2 users or young native speakers, but also by most L1 users. That is to say, the referential meaning of a sentence with this respect is mostly determined by the order of inflections. When a predicate is inflected initially by *-dir/-dir* followed by *-ler /-lar* (the personal ending for third person plural) as in (14), the subject of the sentence bears the quality stated in the predicate of it and implies a judgement. On the other hand, it has a speculative or hypothetical meaning when the order of the inflections is vice versa as in (15).

- (14) Öğrencilerim, bilgisayar kullanımında tecrübelidirler.
My students are experienced in using computer.
- (15) Öğrencilerim, bilgisayar kullanımında **herhalde** tecrübelilerdir.
*My students are **possibly** experienced in using computer.*

It is not only in predicational clauses where inflectional morphemes cause ambiguity in terms of their order of fixation. Specificational clauses are also subject to it and this is not coincidental, though they are relatively less problematic since they specify a subject and can scarcely mean to indicate a possibility. This second clause type is basically the reversed version of a predicational clause in which a certain predicate can fill the subject slot in the syntax of a specificational clause as long as it is a noun or noun phrase, including the *wh-* and *how* structures in pseudo-cleft sentences. By doing so, the aim is to “specify, say, who (or what) someone (or something) is, rather than to say anything about that person (or entity)” (Mikkelsen, 2011, p.1809). To illustrate:

- (16) Rıfat Ilgaz en sevdiğim yazardır.
Rıfat Ilgaz is my favourite writer.
- (17) En sevdiğim yazar Rıfat Ilgaz’dır.
My favourite writer is Rıfat Ilgaz.

There is given a specific person in the subject position of (16) and a property is ascribed to it. On the contrary, sentence (17) specifies who my favourite writer is. Higgins (1979, p. 203) formulates a predicational clause as having a subject which is *referential* subject while a

specificational clause having a *superscriptional* one. A further elicitation of the variation in meaning of these two clause types is their interrogative forms: the former is an answer for “*Who is Rıfat Ilgaz?*” while the latter is for “*Who is your favourite writer?*”

A third set of copular clauses is equatives. The expressions flanking the copula of an equative clause neither predicates a property to the subject of the sentence, nor specifies it. Rather, the expressions on both wings of copula refer to the same concept, usually a person, and these NPs are mostly proper nouns. Such clauses are known as *true equatives* (Heycock & Kroch, 1999). Still, a more common use of equatives are when either the subject or the post-copular element is a pronoun while the other element is again a proper name. Concisely, the logic behind this structure is to reveal “*Who is who?*” and to identify the referent by name or sight (Bondaruk, 2012, p. 10; Mikkelsen, 2011, p. 1808).

- (18) Stepne, Rıfat Ilgaz’dır.
Stepne is Rıfat Ilgaz.

The word *stepne* in the example above literally means *spare tyre* in Turkish, but was used as pseudonym by Rıfat Ilgaz, one of the most influential writers of Turkish literature. In the example sentence above, therefore, the NP following the copula equates the NP in the subject position. Beside equative copular clauses, a fourth and final category of copular clauses, namely the *identificational*, is used “for teaching the names of people or of things” (Higgins, 1979, p. 237). There usually is a demonstrative subject to be identified by an NP following the copula. One can occasionally see a demonstrative phrase as a predicate, yet not every use of demonstratives necessarily mean to be for identification as in (Bondaruk, 2012, p. 15). That is to say, whether a demonstrative structure is used to name a referential concept or not determines the type of the clause in such cases. To illustrate, the following sentences (19) and (20) cannot be regarded as identificational when used to identify, for instance, a man in a blurred photo:

- (19) Bu adam Rıfat Ilgaz.
This man is Rıfat Ilgaz.

- (20) Rıfat Ilgaz bu adam.
Rıfat Ilgaz is this man.

Unlike the previous order, say, the writer was introduced beforehand as, “*One of his novels called Hababam Sinifi, which was later adapted into cinema as well, is a compilation of many short stories he indited in a periodical literary magazine with this pen name*”. Supposing (21) follows it, now this statement can well count as an identificational copular clause.

- (21) Bu yazar Rıfat Ilgaz’dır.
This writer is Rıfat Ilgaz.

As seen so far, all four types of copular clause in English has a corresponding or adjacent form in Turkish. Nevertheless, Turkish is an enclitic language and thus the inflections, which are mostly suffixes, and their order of modification has a significant role in determining the meaning of clauses, which often results in either a semantic ambiguity, or ill-formed morpholexical and morphosyntactic patterns. It is also evident that these concerns do not cover a certain group of language users of Turkish, but is quite common a complication. Therefore, this study mainly aims to conduct a crosslinguistic review towards the availability and use of copular clauses in both English and Turkish. A second aim is to analyze how familiar the native users of Turkish language are with these uses in both languages.

Methodology

Participants

The data of this current study comes from 38 EFL teacher candidates due to their competency both in English, which is supposed to be their future profession, and Turkish as their mother tongue. They were assumed to be a relevant population to analyze the familiarity of Turkish native speakers towards the use and order of enclitic copula with other inflections and suffixes, and their awareness to different types of copular clauses in both languages. The participants were required to take a two-way translation survey and were split into two groups; one to translate survey items from Turkish to English only, while the other vice versa.

Data collection tools and procedure

The surveys were supplied to the participants through Google Forms for the practicality of time and availability of the participants. There were nine survey items in total for each group and every question was based upon a unique sentence. The sentences were obtained through the literature review as given in the previous section of this paper, and was subject to a validity analysis through three experts in both languages. The items provided to the other group were probable translations of them as well. In a nutshell, the groups were given semantically parallel sentences in two languages and both groups were expected to translate these sentences as accurately as possible so that the use of copula and the copular clauses would semantically remain to be the same. The following are the survey items that cover all four copular clauses common in both languages as well as some stand for having a potential to end up with a morphosyntactic ambiguity in Turkish. Their layout in the survey was randomly distributed in order not to interfere to participants' interpretations, and the each translation is but a suggestion.

Predicational Clauses

The participants were directed two items to be translated in terms of predicational clauses. These items were as given in Table 1.

Table 1: Predicational clauses for translation

English → Turkish	Turkish → English
(22) Mark is my best friend.	Mark, benim en iyi arkadaşım.
(23) London is this city.	Londra, bu şehir.
(24) The wind is light, the weather is cold.	Rüzgâr hafif, hava soğuk.

It is common to see an indefinite predicate in predicational clauses. Nevertheless, items (22) and (23) both have a definite predicate as “predicational sentences in English can contain not only an indefinite, but also a definite post-copular DP” (Bondaruk, 2012, p. 9). The latter may sound somewhat more challenging since it has a demonstrative adjective before the noun, which may be confused with an identificational clause. However, DPs in identificational clauses almost always appear in subject position. Therefore, *my best friend* in (22) and *this city* in (23) do nothing but basically ascribe a property to their subjects. As for their Turkish translations, all three can possibly adopt *-dir / -dır*, but sound unnatural and ambiguous. Their being so is due to the interference of a meaning of possibility as it was addressed earlier in the previous section.

Specificational Clauses

Another couple of items were to represent the specificational clauses. Table 2 includes these clauses.

Table 2: Specificational clauses for translation

English → Turkish	Turkish → English
(25) My best friend is Mark.	Benim en iyi arkadaşım Mark'tır.
(26) They are probably the thieves who stole the money.	Onlar, muhtemelen parayı çalan hırsızlardır.

Item (25) is relatively simpler than (26) as the post-copular element to specify the subject is solely a proper noun. *The thieves* in following statement, on the other hand, does not only specifies the subject but also is identified with a relative clause, though it does not obstruct its role. As it specifies the subject, the inflectional morpheme *-dır* in its Turkish translation precedes the third person plural ending *-lar*. The very same order is also true in predicational clauses as in (13).

Equative Clauses

Amongst the other three types of copular clauses, equatives may seem to be a clear-cut category, but even so, it embodies some peculiar traits. The following two items are two diverging examples for these clauses:

Table 3: Equative clauses for translation

English → Turkish	Turkish → English
(27) Samuel Clemens is Mark Twain.	Samuel Clemens Mark Twain'dir.
(28) A thief is a thief.	Hırsız hırsızdır.

The subject and the post-copular element in (27) are both proper nouns and refer to the same person, and thus it is quite an evident statement for being an equative. Concerning (28), the post-copular element is the exact repetition of the subject. Hence, it is an example for tautology, which Heycock and Kroch (1999: p. 375) consider as a form of equatives.

Identificational Clauses

It was previously highlighted that the subject of an identificational clause is naturally a demonstrative subject, and the purpose of such a clause is to teach the name of a person or a thing. Table 4 includes the statements with this respect.

Table 4: Identificational clauses for translation

English → Turkish	Turkish → English
(29) That is Ayşe.	O, Ayşe.
(30) Those who steal money are thieves.	Parayı çalanlar, hırsızdırlar.

The subject position of an identificational clause can well be any sort of demonstrative phrase, “but it is also possible for a sole demonstrative pronoun” (Bondaruk, 2012, p. 11) as seen in (29). The subject of (30) is also a demonstrative pronoun that was followed by a CP. It may sound like an equative or an identificational too, whereas it is more of an identificational in that the subject is a DP identified as *thieves*.

Findings

The translations given in the previous section were said to be only advisory. With this in mind, a variety of responses was obtained in each item. Since the scope of this survey covers mainly the use of copula and the familiarity of language users in regard, further lexical or syntactic alterations which has nothing serious to do with the clause types or the morphosyntactic nature of the language are either excluded at all, or stated in parentheses.

Translations of English Copular Clauses to Turkish

The first set of findings analyzed below is the ones from English into Turkish. Table 5 below is on the analysis towards the use of predicational clauses in English to Turkish translation.

Table 5: Alterations of copula in predicational clauses

	English → Turkish	Turkish → English	%
Predicational	(22) Mark is my best friend.	a. Mark, (benim) en iyi arkadaşım.	29.2
		b. (Benim) en iyi arkadaşım Mark.	70.8
	(23) London is this city.	a. Londra bu şehirdir.	11.8
		b. Londra (işte) bu şehir.	29.2
		c. Bu şehir Londra'dır.	35.4
		d. Bu şehir Londra.	23.6
	(24) The wind is light, the weather is cold.	a. Rüzgar hafif, hava soğuk.	70.8
		b. Rüzgar hafif(tir), hava soğuktur.	29.2

It is seen that despite its predicational nature, (22) was translated significantly as a specificational clause in Turkish. Moreover, its accurate translation includes Turkish inflectional morpheme *-dir*, whereas no specificational translation includes this inflectional suffix. Specificational translations are overwhelming also in the next predicational clause (23). Contrary to the previous item, the predicates in the predicational translations of this item are mostly without the inflectional morpheme *-dir* while the specificational translations are relatively inflected with it. There were numerous different translations for the final item, yet

they are categorized in accordance with their relevancy as in the table. The ones without the inflectional morpheme outnumber the others. In sum, it is clear that the use of *-dir / -dır* as an inflectional morpheme is quite uncommon in predicational clauses of Turkish.

Table 6: Alterations of copula in specificational clauses

	English → Turkish	Turkish → English	%
Specificational	(25) My best friend is Mark.	a. Mark, (benim) en iyi arkadaşımdır.	18
		b. (Benim) en iyi arkadaşım Mark.	29.2
		c. (Benim) en iyi arkadaşım Mark'tır.	53.8
	(26) They are probably the thieves who stole the money.	a. Onlar, muhtemelen parayı çalan hırsızlar.	23.6
		b. Onlar, muhtemelen parayı çalan hırsızdır.	11.8
		c. Onlar, muhtemelen parayı çalan hırsızdırlar.	11.8
		d. Onlar, muhtemelen parayı çalan hırsızlardır.	47.2
		e. Onlar, muhtemelen parayı çalan hırsız.	5.6

It is evident in Table 6 that the use of *-dir / -dır* is more popular in specificational clauses when compared to predicational clauses. Since Turkish is mostly a pro-drop language, there are minor differences in (25). The confusion between predicational and specificational clauses appears here as well, though not as alarming in predicational clauses. The translations over item (26) are distributed into five main morphosyntactic order, but only (26a) and (26d) are authentic usages. To be more specific, (26b) misses pluralisation, (26c) is anomalous, and finally (26e) is missing both the compulsory plural *-lar*, and optional but still functional *-dir*.

Table 7: Alterations of copula in equative clauses

	English → Turkish	Turkish → English	%
Equative	(27) Samuel Clemens is Mark Twain.	a. Samuel Clemens, Mark Twain'dir.	76.4
		b. Samuel Clemens aslında Mark Twain.	5.9
		c. Mark Twain aslında Samuel Clemens.	11.8
		d. Mark Twain, Samuel Clemens'tir.	5.9
	(28) A thief is a thief.	a. Hırsız hırsızdır.	100

It can be observed in item (27) that the NPs flanking the copula in English are more or less subject to exchange their positions in Turkish. Another point worth mentioning is the high frequency of the copular morpheme use as an inflectional suffix, most probably the highest in

all three types of copular clauses. Item (28), which is a tautology as indicated beforehand, justifies this commonality too.

Table 8: Alterations of copula in identificational clauses

	English → Turkish	Turkish → English	%
Identificational	(29) That is Ayşe.	a. O, Ayşe'dir.	38.2
		b. O, Ayşe.	38.2
		c. Şu kız Ayşe.	5.9
		d. İşte Ayşe bu.	11.8
		e. İşte o Ayşe.	5.9
	(30) Those who steal money are thieves.	a. Parayı çalanlar hırsızdır.	11.8
		b. Parayı çalanlar hırsızdırlar.	11.8
		c. Parayı çalanlar hırsızlar.	32.8
		d. Parayı çalanlar hırsızlardır.	37.7
		e. Parayı çalanlar hırsız.	5.9

The last type is the identificational and item (29) is well distributed into several different translations. (29a) and (29b) are literal translations, whereas the participants incorporated further means of interpretation in the other three statements. Due to the deictic structure of the sentence, the participant(s) seem to have uttered (29c) with an inclusion of *kız* referring to *girl*. Furthermore, (29d) is more like *That's what Ayşe is* instead, and (29e) sounds in the meaning of *There Ayşe is*. The variation is true for the other identificational item (30). In fact, it is often regarded to be acceptable when the plural inflection to the post-copular element drops in such identificational clauses in Turkish. Therefore, (30a) is not uncommon. (30b) stands for the ultimate accuracy in the morphological order in this case. On the contrary, (30c) misses identification, rather is pointing at *who stole the money*. (30d) is parallel to (30c) with additional stress over possibility. Finally, (30e) is missing plurality, though it is also weakly possible to see such a structure as a specificational clause.

Translations of Turkish Copular Clauses to English

The analyses of the items in Turkish henceforth are from the suggested semantic equivalents of the statements given in the previous part. Table 8 depicts variations in predicational clauses.

Table 9: Alterations of copular inflectional morphemes in predicational clauses

	Turkish → English	English → Turkish	%
Predicational	(22) Mark, benim en iyi arkadaşım.	a. Mark is my best friend.	4.76
		b. My best friend is Mark.	90.4
		c. It is Mark who is my best friend.	

			4.76
(23) Londra, bu şehir.	a. This city is London.		14.3
	b. London is this city.		85.68
(24) Rüzgâr hafif, hava soğuk.	a. The wind is weak, the weather is cold.		80.96
	b. Wind is weak, weather is cold.		14.2
	c. Weak is the wind, cold is the weather.		4.76

The first item in Table 8 has surprising results in that almost all of the participants replaced the subject with its predicate. This can most probably be due to the commonality and earlier exposure to the specificational pattern using the same lexical units. That is to say, *My best friend is Mark* may have sounded more natural and familiar to the participants as learners often see this use at the very early pedagogical stages of their learning. The case is also true in item (23) but not as striking as in the previous item. The last item in the table includes two clauses with two separate subjects, and both have an adjective as predicate. There is no extraordinary use of copula for this one, yet the omission of the determiners (24b) and the inverted structure as in (24c) are the alterations observed at this level.

Table 10: Alterations of copular inflectional morphemes in specificational clauses

	Turkish → English	English → Turkish	%
Specificational	(25) Benim en iyi arkadaşım Mark'tır.	a. Mark is my best friend.	4.76
		b. My best friend is Mark.	90.44
		c. It is Mark who is my best friend.	4.76
	(26) Onlar, muhtemelen parayı çalan hırsızlardır.	a. It were probably thieves who stole the money.	4.76
		b. The ones who have stolen the money are probably thieves.	14.28
		c. Who has stolen money are probably thieves.	4.76
		d. Thieves are the ones who probably stole the money.	9.52
		e. Those who have stolen the money are probably thieves.	19.04
		f. They are probably the thieves who stole the money	47.60

As clear in Item (25) of Table 9, the participant language users regard the specificational structure in the same way as they do in predicational. In other words, there seems to be a very weak population who notice the variation between these two types of copular clauses as in examples (22) and (25). The confusion appears even worse in longer clauses such as (26). Because there is a number of a possibility to translate certain forms like pronominal structures, there are several preferences in this case. (26f) includes the most accurate syntactic pattern that indicates a possibility in meaning. Almost a half of the whole population could infer this meaning.

Table 11: Alterations of copular inflectional morphemes in equative clauses

	Turkish → English	English → Turkish	%
Equative	(27) Samuel Clemens, Mark Twain'dir.	a. Samuel Clemens is Mark Twain.	90.44
		b. Samuel Clemens, he is Mark Twain.	4.76
c. The one we know as Mark Twain is Samuel Clemens.		4.76	
	(28) Hırsız hırsızdır.	a. A thief is a thief.	100

The participants mostly compromise on equative copular clauses here again. Only (27c) underlies a point towards the malfunction. To be more specific, the former proper name and the latter in this use would replace even if the rest of the sentence were reasonable. As a result, it indicates confusion in the use of copula. As for Item (28), the tautology leads into a definite syntactic agreement here as well.

Table 12: Alterations of copular inflectional morphemes in identificational clauses

	Turkish → English	English → Turkish	%
Identificational	(29) O, Ayşe.	a. She is Ayşe.	66.68
		b. That is Ayşe.	28.56
c. Ayşe is that girl.		4.76	
	(30) Parayı çalanlar, hırsızdırlar.	a. The ones who have stolen the money are thieves.	68.75
b. The thieves are the ones who steal the money.		26.49	
c. Whoever steal money are the thieves.		4.76	

The identificational clause in (26) varied when translated from English to Turkish in Table 7. Conversely, there seems to be an agreement on its translation from Turkish to English. (26a) and (27b) are semantically parallel, but varies lexically as the former has a personal

subject pronoun while the latter has a demonstrative pronoun instead. (29c), on the other hand, is more of an example of a predicational. In (30), there is identification over the ones who have stolen the money, and thus (30a) sounds authentic. (30c) also resembles identification, but *whoever* as a relative pronoun does not address specific persons. Nevertheless, the inflectional suffix $(y)\iota$ that marks *para* (money) functions both as a preposition and a determiner, and thus it is not *any money* that has been stolen. In comparison with (30a), (30b) identifies not those who have stolen the money but the thieves, which is owing to the replacement of the subject and the post-copular element in an erroneous way.

Conclusion

This paper has initially investigated copular clauses in English and Turkish as a contrastive analysis. While doing so, the historical evolution of copular elements in language use has been addressed, four basic copular clauses in English are compared with those in Turkish to see if they exist also there. Further copular clauses that have the potential to cause ambiguity in Turkish are given account as well. With this respect, the review part of this research highlighted the importance of the order of word endings that are added as inflectional suffix from a semantic perspective.

More precisely, the markedness and unmarkedness of post-copular elements determine the variation in meaning of copular clauses. Furthermore, the order of the markers also alters the types of clauses as well as the meaning. To illustrate, not only *-dir/-dir* and their alternative forms, but also $-i(m)/-(s)i(n)$ and the like can be added to a post-copular element such as an NP, AP, or PP. Whereas, the clause has a meaning of possibility if $-i(m)/-(s)i(n)$ precedes *-dir/-dir*. When predicating or specifying a subject, on the other hand, it is common to see only $-i(m)/-(s)i(n)$ especially if the agent of the clause is first or second person singular. It is also not very often to see *-dir/-dir* marking with the other subject forms, as it is mostly preferred in other copular clause types, or to stress a possibility.

A second concern of this study was to investigate how familiar the native speakers of Turkish are with the copular clauses in both Turkish and English. The purpose of having both languages to be tested was to see how the situation was in mother tongue, and whether this is true in or might have interference to their competence in a foreign language. The participants were prospective teachers of EFL, and thus are expected to be competent in both languages. The evidence from a survey based on translation from one language to another intimates that the participants are precise with certain clause types as the equatives and relatively simpler examples of other types. However, more complex morphosyntactic structures such as pseudo-cleft sentences or the ones with a relative clause apparently throw them into confusion. The findings also indicate that there is occasionally inconsistency between the use of predicational and specificational clauses in that the subject and the post-copular element are replaced erroneously. A further inconsistency is towards the use and position of *-dir/-dir* in translations. It is often omitted when authentic flow of language requires it, and sometimes used when it disturbs the meaning by causing ambiguity in meaning. The order of the copular inflectional morphemes appeared to be challenging for the participants too, which often results in errors in translations.

Implication and Recommendations

Copular clauses constitute the backbone of most syntactic frameworks, and they have the potential to lead into ambiguities in language use (Higgins 1979, p. 189). As in the nature of contrastive analysis, the present findings in this study might have important implications for considering the various uses of copular clauses, and thus the familiarization of language users.

Further contrastive research can be conducted over the analysis of copular clauses through using eye-tracking to pinpoint which specific elements, if any, has the potential to cause ambiguity in between these languages.

References

- Agnieszka, L.-S. (2008). Non-native or non-expert? The use of connectors in native and foreign language learners' texts. *Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère* , pp. 91-108.
- Anderson, S. R. (2008). English reduced auxiliaries really are simple clitics. In S. Scalise, & G. Graffi, *Le lingue e il linguaggio. Introduzione alla linguistica* (pp. 169-186). Italy: Il Mulino.
- Atalay, B. (1986). *DİVANÜ LUGAT-İT-TÜRK DİZİNİ*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Ediskun, H. (2003). *Türk Dilbilgisi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ghorbanpour, A. (2016). Head Position Parameter in Persian: An Optimality-Theoretic Approach. *Elm-e Zaban* , 2 (3), pp. 129-144.
- Haznedar, B. (2003). Missing Surface Inflection in Adult and Child L2 Acquisition. *Proceedings of the 6th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference* (pp. 140-149). Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Heycock, C., & Kroch, A. (1999). Pseudocleft Connectedness: Implications for the LF Interface Level. *Linguistic Inquiry* , 30 (3), pp.365-397.
- Higgins, R. F. (1979). *The Pseudo-cleft Construction in English*. New York: Garland.
- Janhunen, J. (2010). Enclitic zero verbs in some Euroasian languages. In L. Johanson, & M. Robbeets, *Transeuroasian verbal morphology in a comparative perspective: genealogy, contact, chance* (pp. 165-183). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Karakoç, B. (2014). Non-past copular markers in Turkish. In S. Pirkko, & W. Lindsay J., *On Diversity and Complexity of Languages Spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia* (pp. 221-250). Stockholm: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kornflit, J. (1990). Turkish and the Turkic languages. In B. Comrie, *The world' major languages*. Oxford: OUP.
- Mikkelsen, L. (2011). Copular clauses. In C. Maienborn, K. von Heusinger, & P. Portner, *Semantics* (pp. 1805-1829). Berkeley: de Gruyter.
- Persian Online. (n.d.). Retrieved October 2018, from The University of Texas at Austin: https://sites.la.utexas.edu/persian_online_resources/verbs/long-copulas-1/
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1987). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Rahmani, Z., Alizadeh, A., & Hamidi, H. (2014). Match or Mismatch of the Head Parameters and Comprehension of EFL Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 127-137.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. Malaysia: Pearson.
- Sundquist, J. D. (2005). The Mapping Problem and Missing Surface Inflection in Turkish-German Interlanguage. *Proceedings of the 7th Generative Approaches to Second*

Language Acquisition Conference (s. 238-250). Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
