

論文の英文要旨

論文題目 : On the Tendency of Occurrence of the Tatar Person Markers: A Corpus-based Study

氏名 : Yuto Hishiyama

In Tatar (North-western branch of Turkic), when a personal pronoun appears in a noun phrase or clause, the corresponding person marker may or may not appear on the head (e.g. **bez-neŋ** awıl(-**ıbız**) [1PL.GEN village(-1PL.POSS)] "our village", **Min** tatar(-**mın**). [1SG Tatar(-1SG)] "I am a Tatar"). The purpose of this paper is to clarify the following two points by conducting a quantitative survey using corpora in Tatar and other major Turkic languages. 1) Clarify the tendency of occurrence of the Tatar person markers (Table 1). 2) Compare the tendency of occurrence of person markers in Tatar with that of other major Turkic languages. From the survey results, this paper mainly asserted the following two points. 1) The tendency of occurrence of the Tatar person markers differs due to multiple factors (Table 2). 2) The frequency of occurrence of the Tatar person markers is lower than that of other major Turkic languages, which may be the result of language contact.

Table 1: Person markers in Tatar

	Personal pronouns (nominative)	Person markers		
		Possessive suffixes	Predicative person markers	
			Pronominal type	Possessive type
1SG	<i>min</i>	<i>-(E)m</i>	<i>-m(En)</i>	<i>-m</i>
1PL	<i>bez</i>	<i>-(E)bEz</i>	<i>-bEz</i>	<i>-K</i>
2SG	<i>sin</i>	<i>-(E)ŋ</i>	<i>-sEŋ</i>	<i>-ŋ</i>
2PL	<i>sez</i>	<i>-(E)GEz</i>	<i>-sEz</i>	<i>-GEz</i>

Table 2: The tendency of occurrence of person markers and factors affecting them

Person markers	Factors	The tendency of occurrence
Possessive suffixes	Person and number	2SG > 1PL
	The type of head element	predicates > possessed nouns > auxiliary nouns
	The distance between dependent and head elements	non-adjacent > adjacent
Predicative person	The type of marker	possessive type > pronominal type
	The type of predicate	verbs > adjectives > nouns

markers	The type of clause	Non-verbal sentences: others > =mE clauses Verbal sentences: main clauses > quotational clauses
---------	--------------------	--

In the first part of this paper, I described the tendency of occurrence of the Tatar person markers. The description of previous studies on the tendency of occurrence of the Tatar person markers is insufficient. Furthermore, those descriptions are not based on quantitative research. Therefore, I thought that it was necessary to conduct a quantitative survey using a corpus to clarify the tendency of occurrence of the Tatar person markers.

In the survey, I first classified the domains where person markers could appear (the domains were classified into noun phrases and noun clauses. Noun phrases were further classified into possessive NPs and relative NPs). Next, the person marking structure was classified into integrated type (e.g. *awil-ibiz* [village-1PL.POSS] "our village"), analytical-integrated type (e.g. *bez-ney awil-ibiz* [1PL.GEN village-1PL.POSS] "our village"), and analytical type (e.g. *bez-ney awil* [1PL.GEN village] "our village"), and the survey targets were decided to be analytical-integrated type and analytical type.

The results of the survey on possessive suffixes revealed that the following factors influence the frequency of occurrence of possessive suffixes (excluding individual-specific factors that require possessive suffixes): 1) person-number, 2) types of head elements, and 3) distance between the dependent and the head elements. More specifically, the following three points were shown. 1) The frequency of occurrence of the first-person plural marker is significantly low, and the frequency of occurrence of the second-person singular marker is significantly high. 2) In postpositional phrases and noun phrases whose head is an auxiliary noun (e.g. *yan* "side", *art* "back"), the frequency of occurrence of possessive suffixes is significantly low. On the other hand, in noun clauses whose head is verbal nouns *-(U)w* and non-finite copula *ikänlek*, the frequency of occurrence of possessive suffixes is significantly high. 3) The frequency of occurrence of possessive suffixes is significantly low when the dependent and the head elements are adjacent to each other, and significantly high when the dependent and head elements are not adjacent to each other.

Based on these survey results, I asserted the following three points. 1) The tendency of occurrence by person and number (2SG > 1PL) does not follow the cross-linguistic tendency (1st > 2nd > 3rd) indicated by the person hierarchy (Siewierska 2004: 149). Factors such as the length of the suffix and the number of referents may be involved. 2) The tendency of occurrence by the type of head elements is in line with the cross-linguistic tendency (predicates > possessed nouns > adpositions) indicated by the predicate hierarchy (Siewierska 2004: 127). On the other hand, there was no tendency for possessive suffixes to appear more frequently on inalienable nouns than on alienable nouns. This is not in line with the linguistic tendency (inalienable > alienable) indicated by the possessed noun

hierarchy (Siewierska 2004: 138). 3) The tendency of occurrence depending on the distance between the dependent and the head elements can be explained by the fact that the greater the distance between the two elements, the more difficult it becomes to understand their relationship without the possessive suffix.

The results of the survey on predicative person markers revealed that the tendency of occurrence of predicate person markers mainly depends on 1) the type of marker, 2) the type of head (predicate), and 3) the type of clause. More specifically, the following three points were shown. 1) The frequency of occurrence of pronominal type markers is lower than that of possessive type markers. 2) The frequency of occurrence of person markers is significantly low when the predicate is a non-verbal predicate and significantly high when the predicate is verbal. In non-verbal sentences, the frequency of occurrence of predicative person markers on adjectival predicates is significantly higher than that on nominal predicates. In a verbal sentence, the frequency of occurrence of predicate person markers is significantly low when the verb is in an intentional form (*-mAKčE*), or perfect form (*-GAn*). 3) In non-verbal sentences, the frequency of occurrence of predicative person markers is particularly low in *=mE* interrogative sentences. In verbal sentences, the frequency of occurrence of predicative person markers in quotational clauses is significantly lower than that in main clauses.

Based on these survey results, I asserted the following three points. 1) The frequency of occurrence of pronominal type markers is lower than that of possessive type markers because possessive type markers have a higher degree of grammaticalization. 2) It can be said that the frequency of occurrence of predicative person markers according to the type of predicate is roughly "verbs > adjectives > nouns". This tendency is in line with the cross-linguistic tendency (event > property > class, locational) shown by the semantic predicate hierarchy (Siewierska 2004: 132). 3) The reason why predicate person markers appear less frequently in *=mE* interrogative sentences is that predicative person markers in the non-verbal sentence express the assertive modality, which is incompatible with the interrogative modality. In verbal sentences, predicative person markers appear less frequently in quotational clauses than in main clauses. This is because the viewpoint of the subject of the main clause is related.

In the second part of this paper, I tried to position Tatar in Turkic languages.

The description of previous studies on the tendency of occurrence of person markers in major Turkic languages is insufficient. Furthermore, those descriptions are not based on quantitative research. Therefore, I thought that it is necessary to conduct a quantitative survey using corpora, targeting major Turkic languages, and clarify the tendency of occurrence of person markers in each language.

The languages surveyed are Turkish (South-west branch), Uzbek (South-east branch), Kazakh (North-west branch), and Chuvash (Oghur branch), and the tendency of occurrence of the corresponding person markers in each language were investigated.

The results of the survey on possessive suffixes revealed the following four points. 1) The frequency

of possessive suffixes in Tatar is significantly lower than in Turkish, Uzbek, and Kazakh, and significantly higher than in Chuvash. 2) In Turkish, Uzbek, Kazakh, and Chuvash, the frequency of occurrence of possessive suffixes differ depending on the person and number. These languages also tend to have the lowest frequency of the first-person plural marker. 3) The tendency of the possessive suffix to appear less frequently when the head is an auxiliary noun is not seen in Turkish, Uzbek, and Kazakh. 4) In relative clauses and noun clauses in Turkish, Uzbek, and Kazakh, possessive suffixes almost always appear, unlike in Tatar.

Based on the description of the previous research and these survey results, I asserted the following four points. 1) In many Turkic languages, there may be a common tendency that the frequency of occurrence of the first-person plural marker is lower than that of others, and the frequency of occurrence of the second-person singular marker is high. 2) The low frequency of the first-person plural marker in the major Turkic languages, including Tatar, may be influenced by the characteristics of the first-person plural. 3) The following two facts may be related: the fact that in Yellow Uyghur, where the paradigm of possessive suffixes is the most declining of the Turkic languages, only the form that would originally represent the second-person singular *-(I)ŋ* remains, and the high frequency of the second-person singular possessive suffix in the five languages surveyed in this paper. 4) The tendency that the first-person plural marker appears the least and the second-person singular marker appears the most is also seen in Meadow Mari (a Finno-Ugric language).

The results of a survey on predicative person markers revealed that there are cases where predicative person markers do not appear in non-verbal sentences in Turkish and Kazakh, but such cases are significantly less than in Tatar and are less acceptable. Therefore, it can be said that the frequency of occurrence of the predicative person markers in non-verbal sentences of Tatar is lower than that of Turkish and Kazakh.

Based on the description of the previous research and these survey results, I asserted the following two points. 1) The degree of grammaticalization of predicative person markers by language may be related to the difference in the frequency of occurrence of predicative person markers by language. 2) Even if the degree of grammaticalization of the predicative person markers is the same, there is a difference in the frequency of occurrence of the predicative person markers between languages or within the same language.

Finally, in conclusion, it is suggested that the reason why the frequency of occurrence of person markers in Tatar was lower than that of the major Turkic languages belonging to Common Turkic may be due to language contact with neighboring languages such as Russian.