

英文要旨

A Study of Subordinate Clauses with Participles and Verbal Nouns in Uzbek

HIDAKA Shinsuke

1. Background and purpose

This thesis investigates participles and verbal nouns in Uzbek in order to clarify points of difference and commonalities between them. In the following, I present the necessary background.

Among complement clauses in Uzbek, a complement clause with the non-past participle *V-adigan* is not allowed; the verbal noun *V-(i)sh* is used instead. In (0.1), while a (with past participle *V-Gan*) and b (with present participle *V-(a)yotgan*) are allowed, c (with non-past participle *V-adigan*) is not; instead, (0.2) with the verbal noun *V-(i)sh* is used.

(0.1)a. *A B-ga [C olma-ni ye-gan-i-ni] ayt-di-ø.*
NAME NAME-DAT NAME apple-ACC eat-PTCP.PAST-3.POSS-ACC say-PAST-3SG
“A told B that C had eaten the apple.”

b. *A B-ga [C olma-ni ye-yotgan-i-ni] ayt-di-ø.*
NAME NAME-DAT NAME apple-ACC eat-PTCP.PRS-3.POSS-ACC say-PAST-3SG
“A told B that C ate the apple.”

c. **A B-ga [C olma-ni ye-ydigan-i-ni] ayt-di-ø.*
NAME NAME-DAT NAME apple-ACC eat-PTCP.NPST-3.POSS-ACC say-PAST-3SG
“A told B that C would eat the apple.”

(0.2)*A B-ga [C olma-ni yey-ish-i-ni] ayt-di-ø.*
NAME NAME-DAT NAME apple-ACC eat-VN-3.POSS-ACC say-PAST-3SG
“A told B that C would eat the apple.”

However, complement clauses with both participles and verbal nouns are commonly used to express the event that “C eats the apple.” Previous studies have emphasized different of the participial and verbal noun constructions, and they have not dealt with participles and verbal nouns on the same level. However, they also have some common features, as shown in the above examples.

Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to clarify not only the differences but also the commonalities between participles and verbal nouns in Uzbek through a description and comparison of their behavior.

2. Contents

This thesis consists of an Introduction, Part I (Chapters I–II), Part II (Chapters III–V), and Part III (Chapter VI). I outline each chapter below, but do not discuss the Introduction.

Part I

Part I consists of Chapter I (an outline of Uzbek) and Chapter II (a review of previous research).

In Chapter II, I summarize the descriptions in previous research from the viewpoints of their meanings and syntactic functions, and accordingly participles and verbal nouns are the subject of Part II. In particular, this thesis examines the following participles and verbal nouns: the past participle *V-gan*, present participle *V-(a)yotgan*, non-past participle *V-adigan*, future participle *V-(a)r* [NEG: *V-mas*], agent participle *V-(u)vchi*, verbal noun *V-(i)sh* [NEG: *V-maslik*].

Part II

This thesis analyzes participles and verbal nouns by type of subordinate clause (Chapter III: complement clause, Chapter IV: attributive clause, Chapter V: adverbial clause). First, they were analyzed by the syntactic function summarized in Part I, focusing on the matrix clauses and the meanings conveyed by the participles or verbal nouns, which had not been done for these forms in previous research. Second, I analyzed the embedded clauses with participles and verbal nouns from the following three viewpoints: 1. the constituents inside the clause (nominative subject, adverb, accusative object), 2. the derivational suffixes of the participles or verbal nouns (voice, negative), and 3. the temporal relations that the participles and verbal nouns in each clause express. Finally, based on these analyses, I compared the respective features of participles and verbal nouns. However, as the second analysis found almost no differences between participles and verbal nouns, the results are not presented here.

I shall now turn to an outline of each chapter. In Chapter III, I analyzed complement clauses with participles and verbal nouns, focusing on the matrix predicates. The results of analyses are shown in Table 1. Matrix predicates above the dotted line take complement clauses with both participles and verbal nouns. On the other hand, matrix predicates below the dotted line take only complement clauses formed by verbal nouns.

Table 1: Matrix predicates that take complement clauses by participles and verbal nouns

Semantic type of matrix predicate	Predicates in complement clauses		
	Participle		Verbal noun
	Past <i>V-gan</i>	Present <i>V-(a)yotgan</i>	<i>V-(i)sh</i> [NEG: <i>V-maslik</i>]
1. Utterance predicates	○	○	○
2. Propositional attitude predicates	○	○	○
4. Commentative predicates	○	○	○
5. Predicates of knowledge and acquisition of knowledge	○	○	○
6. Predicates of fearing	○	○	○
12. Immediate perception predicates	○	○	○
13. Negative predicates	○	○	○
3. Pretense predicates	×	×	○
7. Desiderative predicates	×	×	○
8. Manipulative predicates	×	×	○
9. Modal predicates	×	×	○
10. Achievement predicates	×	×	○
11. Phasal predicates	×	×	○

Matrix predicates above dotted line are more concerned with when the events expressed by their complement clauses are realized than are those below it. Therefore, I concluded that participial clauses involve a specification of the realization of events, whereas verbal nouns do not.

In Chapter IV, I analyzed the head nouns of attributive clauses in participles and verbal nouns. I show results of analyses for each participle and the verbal noun.

First, the analysis of participles shows that participles modify head noun directly. Three participles (past: *V-gan*, present: *V-(a)yotgan*, non-past: *V-adigan*) can take a much wider variety of head nouns than the other participles. The future participle *V-(a)r* [NEG: *V-mas*] takes a limited range of head nouns and is used only in fixed expression or special style. Thus, this participle has very low productivity. The agent participle *V-(u)vchi* takes only head nouns that are the subject of *V-(u)vchi*; however, its productivity is not as low as that of the future participle.

Now let us turn to the analysis of the verbal noun *V-(i)sh* [NEG: *V-maslik*]. Verbal nouns modify head nouns by forming a possessive compound. Basically, that is, this verbal noun has an “outer relation” (Teramura 1992) with the head noun. However, when this verbal noun has a syntactic relation with the head noun, the resulting attributive construct acts much like a unitary lexeme.

In chapter V, I analyzed participles and verbal nouns in three pairs of adverbial clauses, focusing on the meaning that each clause conveys.

First, I take up ‘after’ and ‘before’ clauses. In an ‘after’ clause, the event of the subordinate clause has been realized and completed when the event of the matrix clause occurs (Cristofaro 2003: 159). Only the past participle *V-gan* is used as a predicate of this clause, implying that the event expressed by *V-gan* precedes the event of matrix clause and is completed before it occurs. On the other hand, in

a ‘before’ clause, the event of subordinate clause may occur after the event of matrix clause, and is not realized when the event of matrix clause occurs (Cristofaro 2003: 159). Any of three deverbals (Negative future participle *V-mas*, verbal noun *V-(i)sh* [NEG: *V-maslik*]) may be used as a predicate of this clause. Therefore, the event expressed by the verbal noun *V-(i)sh* may take place after that of the matrix clause, and the verbal noun *V-(i)sh* does not specify the realization of events. As for negative forms (negative future participle *V-mas*, negative verbal noun *V-maslik*), they may be used because the event of the ‘before’ clause is not realized at the moment the event of matrix clause takes place.

Next, I consider purpose and reason clauses, which, according to Thompson, Longacre and Hwang (2007: 250), differ in that purpose clauses express a motivating event that must be unrealized at the time of the main event, while reason clauses express a motivating event that may be realized at the time of the main clause event. Accordingly, participles (past *V-gan* or present *V-(a)yotgan*) express an event that may be realized, and according to the examples, the past participle *V-gan* expresses an “already realized” event and the present participle *V-(a)yotgan* an event “being realized” at the time of the event of the matrix clause. On the other hand, the verbal noun *V-(i)sh* [NEG: *V-maslik*] is used as a predicate of both purpose and reason clauses and is thus neutral regarding whether or not the event is realized.

Finally, I take up temporal and conditional clauses, especially with the past participle *V-gan*. This thesis clarifies the use of temporal and conditional clauses *V-gan-da* [V-PTCP.PAST-LOC]: 1. They express temporal events, and 2. the event in *V-gan* precedes the matrix event. In addition, all examples correspond to the following three patterns: a. the case where the events of both the clause with *V-gan* and the matrix clause were actually realized, b. the case where the speaker supposes that both the events of the *V-gan* clause and the matrix clause may be realized, and c. the case where the clause with *V-gan* expresses a counterfactual event. Elicited data show that the predicate of such a clause that does not correspond to 1 and 2 above or that corresponds to 1 and 2 above but not to any case of a–c is formed with conditional form *V-sa*. Therefore, a past participle with locative case *V-gan-da* [V-PTCP.PAST-LOC] primarily is used in temporal clause.

Part III

Chapter VI presented a conclusion and discussed future issues. First, I show a conclusion. This thesis compared participles and verbal nouns, focusing on not only syntactic function but also verbness and the temporal relation with matrix clause. The past participle *V-gan*, present participle *V-(a)yotgan*, non-past participle *V-adigan*, and verbal noun *V-(i)sh* [NEG: *V-maslik*] have high verbness, that is, their behavior is almost the same as that of a finite verb. On the other hand, the future participle *V-(a)r* [NEG: *V-mas*] and agent participle *V-(u)vchi* have low verbness. In particular, *V-(a)r* [NEG: *V-mas*] does not have subject, adverb, or accusative object and does not take any voice or negative suffixes.

In addition, I focused on the temporal relation with the matrix clause. The survey conducted in

this thesis, as with the description in previous research, confirmed that participles (past *V-gan*, present *V-(a)yotgan*, and non-past *V-adigan*) express different temporal relations. However, the non-past participle *V-adigan*, future participle *V-(a)r*, agent participle *V-(u)vchi*, and verbal noun *V-(i)sh* [NEG: *V-maslik*] have the common feature of not expressing temporal relations. Therefore, this thesis concludes that participles and verbal nouns constitute a continuum and cannot be divided dichotomously.

Second, I consider three future issues: 1) methods of investigations, 2) a discussion of historical development, genetic origin, and areal spread, and 3) a discussion of the cross-linguistic features of “participles” and “verbal nouns.”