



8-1-1994

## Relative Clauses in Southern Uzbek

Benjamin Unseth

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

Unseth, Benjamin, "Relative Clauses in Southern Uzbek" (1994). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3836.  
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3836>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

RELATIVL CLAUSES IN SOUTHERN UZBEK

by

Benjamin Unseth

Bachelor of Arts, Crown College, 1986

Certificate, University of Peshawar  
Area Study Centre (Central Asia), 1988

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August

1994

This thesis, submitted by Benjamin Unseth in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota, has been read by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done and is hereby approved.

Stephenson A. Mallett  
(Chairperson)

J. Albert Bickford

Robert A. Dooley

This thesis meets the standards for appearance, conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

Harvey Knell  
Dean of the Graduate School  
July 20, 1994

**PERMISSION**

Title           Relative Clauses in Southern Uzbek

Department   Linguistics

Degree        Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the chairperson of the department or the dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature Benjamin J. Ulseth

Date July 12, 1994



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vi
ABSTRACT .....	vii
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Background Information on Southern Uzbek .....	1
1.1.1 "Standard" Uzbek (Uzbekistan).....	3
1.1.2 Southern Uzbek (Northern Afghanistan).....	7
1.2. Explanation of Texts and Transcription .....	10
1.3. Relative Clauses in Natural Language .....	11
2. FINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES .....	15
2.1. Internal relative clauses .....	17
2.2. The Relativized Noun .....	23
2.3. Extraposition of the Relative Clause .....	32
2.4. Marking the Relative Clause .....	33
2.4.1 The complementizer.....	33
2.4.2 <i>ki</i> with complement and adjunct clauses...	36
2.5. Position of the Determiner .....	40
2.6. Relativizability and Grammatical Relations .....	41
2.7. Head Noun Constraints with Relative Clauses .....	42
2.7.1 Subject heads.....	42
2.7.2 Oblique heads.....	45
3. NONFINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES .....	49
3.1. Other Constructions with <i>-gan</i> .....	50
3.2. External vs Internal Head .....	53
3.3. Restrictive vs Nonrestrictive .....	56
3.4. The Relativized Noun .....	57
3.4.1 Gap.....	58
3.4.2 Proform.....	59
3.5. Position of the Determiner .....	60
3.6. Extraposition of the Relative Clause .....	62
3.7. Relativizability and Grammatical Relations .....	63
REFERENCES .....	72

## ABBREVIATIONS

1PL.....	first person plural
1SG.....	first person singular
2FRM.....	second person formal
2INF.....	second person informal
3.....	third person
ABIL.....	ability
ABL.....	ablative
ACC.....	accusative
CAUS.....	causative
COMP.....	complementizer
COP.....	copula
DAT.....	dative
DEM.....	demonstrative
GEN.....	genitive
HD.....	head
IRR.....	irrealis
ÉZ.....	ézâfét
LOC.....	locative
N>V.....	denominal verbalizer
NEG.....	negative
NPST.....	nonpast tense
PASS.....	passive
PL.....	plural
PQ.....	polar question
PRT.....	participle
PSS.....	possessor agreement marker
PST.....	past tense
RECPR....	reciprocal

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

What merit this paper possesses is due to the counsel of Steve Marlett, Albert Bickford, and Bob Dooley, my advisory committee members. The shortcomings here are certainly mine and not theirs.

My Uzbek instructors and friends have helped me immeasurably. Thank you Muhammad Khan, Muallem Shamsuddin, Mohammad Amin Dahi, Tokhta, Khodai Berdi, Saber Fazli, Ghaisuddin Nasafi and your family. You have changed my life.

For your linguistic and social collaboration, thank you Chuck Speck, Des Derbyshire, Cal Rensch, Ruth Mary Alexander, Laura Nelson, Dave Young, Chris and Eileen Mincey, Andy Eatough, Lisa Dent, Lindsay Whaley, and Lois Varenkamp. You, and many others, kept me going.

Thank you to my dear friends in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin, for your unwavering confidence. Thank you Rosemary Turner, Ray Tallman, Ray Badgero, and Dorothy Blaha.

Thank you to my Nilo-Saharan linguist brother, Pete. Deep thanks to my parents, Einar and Luella Unseth and Dale and Darlene Quanbeck. Unfathomable thanks to Ellen, my partner in all things.

## ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the structure of both finite and nonfinite relative clauses in Southern Uzbek. As such, it represents the first linguistic analysis of a topic in Southern Uzbek published in English.<sup>1</sup> English research on Standard Uzbek establishes the existence of nonfinite relative clauses but does not examine them thoroughly, nor does it even sketch Standard Uzbek's uncommon finite relative clauses. In Southern Uzbek, finite relative clauses are more common than in Standard Uzbek. This research is based on texts collected from three men from Andkhuy, Afghanistan, and on elicited sentences.

A few characteristics of Southern Uzbek's relative clauses emerge which are unique cross-linguistically. Relativized nouns may be represented in finite relative clauses by their full lexical forms. There appear to be positional constraints for finite relative clauses depending on the grammatical relation of the head. In nonfinite relative clauses, subjects bear genitive case marking with relativized direct objects or relativized passive subjects.

---

<sup>1</sup> The author lacks knowledge of Russian and German to describe what may have been published in these languages.



## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

This study of relative clauses in Southern Uzbek examines Southern Uzbek's finite and nonfinite constructions for relative clauses. The nonfinite relative clauses are prenominal relative clauses with participial verbs. The finite relative clauses are postnominal. These finite clauses employ a complementizer borrowed from Persian into various Turkic languages. Since the complementizer is used more in Southern Uzbek than it is in Standard Uzbek, in Section 1.1 I present some background information on these two dialects. Following that I make a brief explanation regarding the example sentences and then more formally introduce relative clauses and the outline of this study.

#### 1.1. Background Information on Southern Uzbek

Uzbek is a Turkic language spoken in Uzbekistan, its neighboring republics of the former Soviet Union, and Afghanistan. This thesis focuses on the dialect of Uzbek spoken in Afghanistan, which I refer to as Southern Uzbek, and the dialect spoken in Uzbekistan, which I refer to as Standard Uzbek.

The canonical order of Uzbek sentences is Subject-Object-Verb, but the order of the nominals varies freely. Nouns are marked for case: Accusative, *-ni* (if the noun is specific, unmarked otherwise); Genitive, *-ni* (*-ning* historically); Dative, *-ga* (for indirect objects and goal obliques); Locative, *-da*; Ablative, *-dan*; Nominative, unmarked. Pronominal subjects are optional. Modifiers precede their heads. 1 exemplifies a canonical transitive sentence, 2 an active intransitive sentence, and 3 a nonactive intransitive sentence. Uzbek, as is typical for Turkic languages, is strongly agglutinative, with heavy suffixation on the verb. The verb is obligatorily marked for person, tense, and number, and may also include suffixes for negation, mood, passive, ability, certainty, and temporal aspect. 4 illustrates Uzbek's agglutinative nature.

- (1) *kuchi-im shawGal-ni iz-i-dan yugur-d-i.*  
 dog-1SG jackal-ACC footprint-PSS-ABL run-PST-3  
 'My dog chased the jackal.'
- (2) *yaräG minan ät-d-im.*  
 gun with shoot-PST-1SG  
 'I shot [it] with a gun.'
- (3) *man-ni qol-im-da bir katta uzun tayäG bär*  
 I-GEN hand-1SG-LOC one big long branch existent  
*e-d-i.*  
 be-PST-3  
 'In my hand was a large, long staff.'

- (4) bir-la -ish -äl -mi -a -di-lar.  
 one-N>V-RECPR-ABIL-NEG-NPST-3 -PL  
 'They cannot be united.'

#### 1.1.1 "Standard" Uzbek (Uzbekistan)

Standard Uzbek is spoken by approximately 20 million people in the Commonwealth of Independent States, 17 million of them in Uzbekistan. Present-day Uzbekistan is a conglomeration of Russian Turkestan, the Bukharan Amirate, and the Khivan Khanate. With this diversity, at the beginning of this century there was no standard Uzbek language. "There was no agreement as to who 'Uzbeks' were or whether they should have a literary language distinct from other Turkic-speaking peoples" (Fierman 1983:205). When the Bolsheviki seized power in 1917, the people now called Uzbeks spoke dialects so different from each other, they were actually speaking different languages (Fierman 1983:206). For example, some of these Uzbek "dialects" had nine vowels with a typical Turkic system of vowel harmony, while others had lost vowel harmony through contact with Persian languages and had only six vowels.

Even after the Bolshevik takeover, Uzbek in Uzbekistan was written with the Arabic alphabet until 1926; then a switch was made to the Latin alphabet. This decision by the 1926 All-Union Turcological Congress in Baku, USSR, followed a recommendation by the 1921 Uzbek Language and Orthography Congress. Other Turkic languages in the Soviet Union were similarly adopting a Latin alphabet (Fierman



1983:210). This Arabic-to-Latin orthographic switch aided in Marxism's de-Islamicization of Uzbek culture.

In 1934 representation of vowel harmony was dropped from Uzbek spelling. "Two of the nine vowel symbols used in Uzbek since the adoption of the Latin alphabet were entirely eliminated, and a third was relegated to use only for distinguishing otherwise identically spelled words" (Fierman 1983:215). It is unclear whether this was done to promote the urban dialects (which lacked vowel harmony) over their rural counterparts, or whether this was done to isolate the Uzbeks from their Turkic neighbors, who maintained vowel harmony in their orthographies.

The Uzbek language apparently prospered during this post-Arabic orthography period as the Turkic linguist Gunnar Jarring wrote in 1937, "The literary Uzbek language of Russian Turkestan [Uzbekistan] is now normalized and possesses a flourishing literature in Latin script" (Jarring 1937:5).

The Russian language was made a compulsory subject throughout the USSR in 1938. To enhance Russian study, Cyrillic was instituted as the new official Uzbek alphabet in 1940 (Fierman 1983:214-215). This also served to isolate Uzbeks from anti-Communist influence in Turkish literature, which was accessible to them because of Turkish's Latin alphabet and its great similarity to Uzbek -- Uzbeks say they can converse in Turkish after two weeks in Turkey. In

addition the exiled Uzbek intelligentsia in Turkey was hindered in its publishing for Uzbekistan when the Cyrillic alphabet was introduced.

Despite Russianization of the Uzbek alphabet and lexicon, Russian media, Russian government, and Russian higher education, Russian never became the first language of Uzbekistan in particular or of the central Asian republics of the USSR. Tatars and Kazakhs, the most Russianized of the USSR's Muslim nationalities, were the only Muslim groups in which most people were fluent in Russian. Because they knew so little Russian, Muslim applicants for teacher-training institutes were often denied enrollment (Olcott and Fierman, 1987:66, 79).

Uzbek orthography stabilized after the establishment of the Cyrillic standard. With the collapse of the USSR, a movement to change back to the Arabic alphabet has gained considerable strength. Some books were being transliterated from Cyrillic to Arabic script even by 1990. Uzbekistan declared in November in 1993 that it is adopting a Latin-based Turkic alphabet. There is intense lobbying from Turkey to adopt this alphabet in the other central Asian republics of the Commonwealth of Independent States. All these central Asian republics of the CIS are Turkic except Tajikistan. With Tajikistan's Persian dialect of Tajik, its leaders feel a strong affinity toward Iran and Afghanistan

and their Arabic alphabet, and a distrust of their Turkic neighbors.

There has been considerable Russian research in Standard Uzbek, including grammars, Russian-Uzbek and Uzbek-Russian dictionaries. Four English-Uzbek/Uzbek-English dictionaries are available. J.B. Buronov led one team of compilers in producing an English-Uzbek dictionary in 1977. Earlier he coordinated an Uzbek-English dictionary (1968) and a school edition of that volume (1969). Natalie Waterson published an Uzbek-English dictionary in 1980. An expatriate with two decades of experience with Southern Uzbek and its speakers rates Waterson's dictionary as only 60-70 percent accurate for Southern Uzbek, because of the Russianization of Standard Uzbek and other lexical dissimilarity.

The first Uzbek grammar in English was written by Charles E. Bidwell and published in 1955. Andrée F. Sjoberg's Uzbek grammar appeared in 1963 from Indiana University. Indiana, the U.S. school with the longest-running Uzbek language program, has also published other English works on Uzbek, such as Poppe's *Uzbek Newspaper Reader* (1962) and Laude-Cirtautas's *Chrestomathy* (1980). Ten years ago Indiana University was the only school in the U.S. teaching Uzbek. Today students may enroll in Uzbek classes at Indiana University, Columbia University, University of California at Los Angeles,



University of Washington, or University of Wisconsin-Madison. All of these resources and study programs are for Standard Uzbek. There is no study program and almost no research for Southern Uzbek.

### 1.1.2 Southern Uzbek (Northern Afghanistan)

Uzbekistan's southern border is shared by Afghanistan. Although Afghanistan's largest language groups are Pushtu and Dari (Afghan Farsi), there are at least one million Southern Uzbek speakers in northern Afghanistan. They live between the southern border of Uzbekistan (the Amu River) and Afghanistan's Hindu Kush mountain range.

Many of these Uzbeks in Afghanistan are the descendants of 1920s immigrants, who fled Soviet Uzbekistan following the Bolshevik Revolution. Those immigrants mingled with Uzbeks who had been their "countrymen" off and on from the early 1600s through the mid to late 1800s. There is written record of an Uzbek ruling Maimana, Afghanistan, in 1611. Uzbek amirs from north of the Amu River gained power in northern Afghanistan throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Lee 1987:109). After Afghanistan was united in 1748, the Uzbek amirs were continually challenged for their lands south of the Amu, now northern Afghanistan.

Power changed hands slowly. Currency from the Uzbek Bukharan Khanate was still in general use in the town of Maimana in 1828 (Lee 1987:111). The Amir of Bukhara

maintained claim over northern Afghanistan into the 1850s, but the Afghans conquered most of this territory by 1860. The amir repeatedly threatened the Afghan government to respect his trans-Amu territorial claims and advanced armies to the Amu. But he never sent an army across the river to defend his trans-Amu vassals. He "thereby made it inevitable that the Uzbek Khanates of Turkistan would fall one-by-one to the Afghans.... [B]y 1860 Shibarghan, Andkhoi and Sar-i-Pul, though still nominally ruled by their Uzbek Mirs, were in fact under the control of Afghan governors backed with a garrison" (Lee 1987:114-115). One Uzbek city in Afghanistan, Maimana, was not ultimately conquered by the Afghans until 1892 (Lee 1987:119-120).

Thus, this Afghan appendage of formerly Uzbek territory birthed its own dialect of Uzbek, known as Southern Uzbek or Uzbeki. Several factors have contributed to the development of the dialect of Southern Uzbek. The Amu River isolated Southern Uzbek speakers geographically from their Uzbek neighbors to the north. These Southern Uzbeks interacted socially and economically primarily with Dari and Pashto speakers. Even their education has been in Dari and Pashto. Both of these languages are descended from Old Persian, and lack the vowel harmony common to Turkic languages. This interaction, then, has led to a gradual elimination of vowel harmony which is almost complete in Southern Uzbek. (My data show some variation in this

respect.) In addition, lexical borrowing from Dari has been prolific.

I examine lexical and syntactic borrowing from Persian into Southern Uzbek, as I consider constructions used in relativization. Although Uzbek's traditional relativization pattern is prenominal, Southern Uzbek also makes frequent use of a Persian complementizer and its Persian postnominal constituent order.

The Afghan government's promotion of the national languages, Dari and Pashto (prior to the Soviet Union's occupation), disallowed research among the country's other languages (e.g., Southern Uzbek, Aimaq, Hazaragi, Nuristani). Instruction in indigenous languages has been almost solely in Dari and Pashto. I am not aware of any other language instruction except in Arabic, and some European languages in a few Kabul schools: English, French, German, and Russian.

The steps heretofore in research of Southern Uzbek have been small, one volume of texts and an unused primer. Jarring wrote in 1937:5, "The Uzbek dialects spoken in Russian and Afghan Turkestan, are to a considerable extent unknown". This appeared in the introduction to his study of a Soviet Uzbek dialect. A year later he published Uzbek Texts from Afghan Turkestan. He introduced this work by lamenting, "We lack all knowledge of the Turk dialects of Afghanistan. I hope, however, with this work of mine to



have begun the task and that others will soon continue" (Jarring 1938:iii). The next step was the publication of an Uzbek primer in the 1970s, before Afghanistan's communist takeover and subsequent Soviet occupation. It is unknown whether the primer was ever used. Weston wrote an English text on conversational Southern Uzbek in the 1980s which was never published. Other research is currently underway in Southern Uzbek, including the compiling of a dictionary, but nothing has been published yet.

### **1.2. Explanation of Texts and Transcription**

Some of the examples in this thesis come from original texts I recorded with two school teachers from Andkhuy, Afghanistan, in 1988 and 1989. These are given without citation of source since they are not published. Some examples were elicited from these and other Uzbeks. Many texts are from a book of texts published by Swedish linguist, Gunnar Jarring, in 1938. These examples include reference to the original page and sentence number. For example J37.143 would signify page 37 and sentence 143 in Jarring 1938. Jarring's texts were also provided by a native of Andkhuy.

Since Uzbek is quite complex morphologically, I have not identified affixes separately where they are irrelevant to the discussion. I have done this to keep example sentences from taking even more space than they already do



and to reduce distraction from the questions under discussion.

In the example sentences I use the six vowel phonemes of Uzbek shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 1. Vowels**

<b>a</b>	(open central unrounded)	<b>man</b>	'I'
<b>ä</b>	(open back unrounded)	<b>bäla</b> <b>balä</b>	'son' 'danger'
<b>e</b>	(raised open-mid front unrounded)	<b>kel</b>	'come'
<b>i</b>	(lowered close front unrounded)	<b>qiz</b>	'daughter'
<b>o</b>	(raised close-mid rounded)	<b>oGul</b>	'son'
<b>u</b>	(close back rounded)	<b>kuchi</b>	'dog'

Consonant symbols are predominantly taken from the International Phonetic Alphabet: p, t, k, b, d, g, f, s, z, x, l, m, n, w. Voiceless stops are unaspirated. The nonlabial, anterior sounds (e.g., [t] and [l]) are dental. The symbols which do not have their standard IPA interpretations are given in 5.

- (5)
- ch = voiceless palatoalveolar affricate
  - j = voiced palatoalveolar affricate
  - sh = voiceless palatoalveolar fricative
  - ng = voiced velar nasal
  - r = alveolar flap
  - ʒ = voiced velar fricative
  - y = voiced palatal glide

### 1.3. Relative Clauses in Natural Language

I consider a relative clause to be a subordinate clause which modifies a noun coreferential with one of its

own member nouns. Terminology regarding relative clauses varies. In this study the noun being modified is called the "head". The noun with which the head is coreferential is called the "relativized noun".

(6)            HEAD    RELATIVE CLAUSE  
The man [who saw you] ran away.

For this paper the head may be considered outside the relative clause for all external relative clauses, following Perlmutter and Soames 1979:261 and Nichols 1984:524. Others posit such heads within any relative clause.<sup>1</sup> Among internal head relative clauses, the head is clearly part of the relative clause since it relates syntactically to the relative clause rather than the matrix clause.

Relative clauses have been described cross-linguistically on the basis of several parameters. These parameters are briefly recounted here:<sup>2</sup>

\* A relative clause may be finite or nonfinite, depending on the status of the verb (see sections 2 and 3).

\* The head may be external or internal to the relative clause. An external head displays the syntax

<sup>1</sup> "A relative clause then consists necessarily of a head and a restricting clause" (Comrie 1981a:136-137). "The term RC is used to apply to the collocation of the head NP and the restricting clause" (Keenan and Comrie 1977:63-64).

<sup>2</sup> The following sources were especially helpful in listing these parameters: Keenan 1985:141-170, Nichols 1984:524, Downing 1978, Schwartz 1971:142.

appropriate to the main clause, and an internal head relates syntactically to the relative clause (see sections 2.1 and 3.2).<sup>3</sup>

\* A relative clause with an external head may follow or precede the head. The order of the head and the relative clause generally correlates with the basic word order in a language: prenominal relative clauses with OV, postnominal relative clauses with VO (see section 3.2).

\* A relative clause may restrict the domain of the head noun or it may communicate further information about a specified head (see sections 2 and 3.3).

\* There are five options for designating the relativized noun: relative pronoun (demonstrative or interrogative pronoun), clitic pronoun, personal pronoun or proform, full lexical form, or gap (see sections 2.2 and 3.4).

\* A relative clause may be extraposed from its head (see sections 2.3 and 3.6).

\* A relative clause may be set off from the main clause in four different ways: with a complementizer, a relative pronoun, an affix on the verb, or without any

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Internal head' relative clauses (Andrews 1975:125-127) are also known as 'internal' (Keenan 1985:161-163), 'headless' (Downing 1978:397, 398), and 'replacive' (Downing 1978:382, 397-399). Andrews 1975:8 uses both 'internal head' and 'headless', but it is unclear whether or not he means them to be synonymous.



morpheme. Only the affix on the verb occurs in internal relative clauses (see sections 2.4 and 3).

\* A head's determiner may be adjacent to the head, or with a prenominal relative clause it may occur even before the relative clause (see sections 2.5 and 3.5).

\* Many languages allow relativization of noun phrases with only certain grammatical relations (see sections 2.6 and 3.7).

\* A relativized noun's grammatical relation may correlate with how the relativized noun is designated (see section 2.2).

In typologies of relative clauses the grammatical relation of the head noun has been left out as insignificant. The data from Southern Uzbek, however, indicates that there may be constraints on the matrix clause position of a head noun of a finite relative clause based on the head noun's grammatical relation. The position in a sentence of a relative clause head and its accompanying finite relative clause correlates with the grammatical relation of the head noun. I therefore introduce another topic for examination in relative clauses.

\* Word order may be constrained based on the grammatical relation of the head noun within the matrix clause (see section 2.7).

## CHAPTER 2

### FINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES

Southern Uzbek has both finite and nonfinite relative clauses. Finite clauses are the subject of this chapter, and nonfinite clauses are presented in chapter 3. A finite relative clause is distinguished from its nonfinite counterpart by the finite state of its verb, as illustrated by the English examples 7 and 8. The auxiliary in 7 marks person, number, and tense. 8 lacks any such marking.

- (7) Finite Relative Clause  
Projects [which are finished early] receive more funding.
- (8) Nonfinite Relative Clause  
Projects [finished early] receive more funding.

9 and 10 illustrate finite relative clauses in Southern Uzbek. The relative clauses in 9 and 10 are introduced by the clause-initial complementizer *ki*. This is true of all finite relative clauses in Southern Uzbek.

- (9) aziz osha ikki asirlar-ni [ki mazar-dan qächib  
Aziz DEM two prisoners-ACC COMP Mazar-ABL fleeing  
ket-gan edi] qaytib tutti.  
go-PRT they.did repeating he.grabbed  
'Aziz caught those two prisoners who escaped from  
Mazar-i-Sharif.'

(10) bāla-ni [ki ali toting-ni sät̄ti] man  
 boy-ACC COMP Ali your.parrot-ACC he.sold 1SG

tānayman.  
 I.know

'I know the boy Ali sold your parrot to.'

In both 9 and 10 the relative clause occurs immediately following the head noun. The head noun is outside the relative clause.

Neither of these characteristics is true of all relative clauses in Southern Uzbek. I discuss the possible variations on these typical characteristics in the remaining sections of this chapter: section 2.1 examines internal relative clauses, section 2.2 discusses the form of the relativized noun, and section 2.3 discusses extraposition of the relative clause. Certain characteristics are common to all finite relative clauses: section 2.4 presents the use of the complementizer *ki* to introduce relative clauses and other subordinate clauses, and section 2.5 presents the location of the determiner. Finally, sections 2.6 and 2.7 consider constraints that are stateable in terms of the grammatical relation of the relativized noun and the head noun, respectively.

Since all finite relative clauses in Southern Uzbek are restrictive, I have not discussed that feature of relative clauses in this section. That issue is relevant for nonfinite relative clauses and appears in section 3.3.



### 2.1. Internal Relative Clauses<sup>1</sup>

In Southern Uzbek only direct and indirect objects relativize in internal relative clauses. 11 and 12 exhibit an internal relative clause. They both relativize direct objects.

(11) [gosht-ni ki u yedi] ächiG edi.  
 meat-ACC COMP DEM he.ate spicy it.was  
 'The meat he ate was spicy.'

(12) [u uzbek ädam-ni ki siz shugun kordingiz] shu  
 DEM Uzbek man-ACC COMP 2FRM today you.saw DEM  
 qolban-ni tozatdi.  
 plow-ACC he.repaired  
 'The Uzbek man that you saw today repaired this  
 plough.'

The head noun in 11 and 12 bears accusative case, which is consistent with its being an internal head. If it were an external head, we would have expected nominative case.

The absence of accusative case marking does not always exclude a nominal from being accusative, but it does make the externality or internality of a relative clause difficult to determine, as in 13.

---

<sup>1</sup> In an internal relative clause the head noun syntactically relates to the relative clause, and the matrix clause grammatical relation of the head noun is occupied by the relative clause as a whole.



- (13) har nersa ki siz ishitingan bolsangiz siz ham  
 each thing COMP 2FRM hear-PRT you.may 2FRM too

ayting.

Tell!

'Whatever you have heard, tell me!' (J54.291-292)

A relativized indirect object occurs internally in

14.

- (14) Internal  
 [bäla-ga ki ali toting-ni sätiti] man  
 boy-DAT COMP ALI your.parrot-ACC he.sold 1SG

tänayman.

I.know

'I know the boy Ali sold your parrot to.'

Internalization of the head is optional as seen by comparing 10 and 14. 10 and 14 demonstrate external and internal relative clauses with the same matrix clause. The accusative case marking on *bäla* 'boy' in 10 indicates that *bäla* is the direct object of the matrix clause and therefore, outside the relative clause where it would be the indirect object. The dative marking on *bäla* 'boy' in 14 shows that here *bäla* is the indirect object of the relative clause, and thus internal.

The same external-internal optionality is apparent in 15 and 16, with a relativized direct object.

- (15) External  
 u oGri-gə [ki san ätting] man hech gap  
 DEM thief-DAT COMP 2INF you.shot 1SG none word  
 aytmadim.  
 I.didn't.say

'I didn't say anything to the thief you shot.'

- (16) Internal  
 [u oGri-ni ki san ätting] man hech gap  
 DEM thief-ACC COMP 2INF you.shot 1SG none word  
 aytmadim.  
 I.didn't.say

'I didn't say anything to the thief you shot.'

I have one counterexample to the generalization that the only noun phrases relativized in internal relative clauses are objects. In 17 the subject of the relative clause is an internal head, clear by the absence of the accusative suffix. The case suffix should be there if *dostim* 'my friend' is accusative, for two reasons, (1) *dostim* 'my friend' is specific, and (2) *dostim* 'my friend' does not occur next to the verb. (This sentence was elicited by Andrew Saperstein 1993:personal communication.)

- (17) [dostim ki kitäb-ni oqiyapdi] man urdim.  
 my.friend COMP book-ACC he.is.reading 1SG I.hit  
 'I hit my friend who is reading a book.'

In the data I have elicited personally, internal relativized subjects are ungrammatical, compare 18 and 19.

- (18) External  
 aziz osha ikki asirlar-ni [ki mazar-dan qächib  
 Aziz DEM two prisoners-ACC COMP Mazar-ABL fleeing

ket-gan edi] gaytib tutti.  
 go-PRT they.did repeating he.grabbed

'Aziz caught those two prisoners who escaped from  
 Mazar-i-Sharif.'

- (19) Internal  
 \*aziz [osha ikki asirlar ki mazar-dan qächib  
 Aziz DEM two prisoners COMP Mazar-ABL fleeing

ket-gan edi] gaytib tutti.  
 go-PRT they.did repeating he.grabbed

'Aziz caught those two prisoners who escaped from  
 Mazar-i-Sharif.'

If objects but not subjects may relativize internally, then this facet of Southern Uzbek grammar would not follow Keenan's 1985:154 Accessibility Hierarchy, which states that there is a hierarchy among noun phrases in regard to their eligibility to be relativized by a given strategy. Subjects, at the top of the hierarchy, are most easily relativized. Whatever noun phrase is found relativized every noun phrase above it on the hierarchy may also be relativized.

All internal relative clauses in my data occur with the relativized noun phrase at the beginning of the relative clause. This is unusual for an SOV language. This unique characteristic could be taken as evidence that none of the examples cited have internal clauses. Since the head noun is in fact outside the clause, in the same position as



in external relative clauses, perhaps the head is case-marked according to the grammatical relation of the coreferential grammaticalized noun. For lack of evidence confirming either analysis, I will assume that the internal-head analysis is correct and will refer to this construction as an internal relative throughout the thesis.

Another construction in which *ki* appears could be hypothesized to be a type of internal relative clause, but it is more reasonable that this *ki* is a homophone of the complementizer. A few examples illustrate this other construction: 20-26. If this morpheme *ki* is a homophone of the complementizer, then this *ki* is probably an *ézâfét* construction designating a relationship, though not necessarily possession, between two nominals.<sup>2</sup>

(20) bu bāla usha jilGa-da ki bay-ni chulpani  
 DEM boy DEM valley-LOC ÉZ ruler-GEN his.shepherd

edi.  
 he.was

'This boy was the chief of the valley's shepherd.'  
 (J21.138)

---

<sup>2</sup> Mace 1971:19-20 describes how *ézâfé* in Modern Persian can mean "belonging to" (e.g., the man's horse), can "join a noun to an adjective qualifying that noun" (e.g., the Iranian man), or can show that the words before and after the *ézâfé* are in apposition to one another" (e.g., the man, my friend).

- (21) u ir-ni-dan tur-ib yambäsh-**da** ki bir  
DEM place-GEN-ABL rise-CONJ side-LOC ÉZ one  
bacha-ni urdi.  
boy-ACC he.hit  
'Rising from his place, he hit the boy beside him.'
- (22) harun buGra xän har yer-**da** ki askarlari-ni  
Harun Bughra Khan each place-LOC ÉZ his.soldiers-ACC  
jamlib toqsan ming askar-ni yubardi.  
collecting ninety thousand soldier-ACC he.sent  
'Harun Bughra Khan, collecting his soldiers who were  
in all places, sent ninety thousand soldiers.'  
(J153.286)
- (23) qoyuni-**da** ki charsusi-ni älib iskar  
his.bosom-LOC ÉZ her.shawl-ACC taking he.smells  
edi.  
he.was  
'Taking out her shawl which was in his bosom he  
smelled it.' (J58.65)
- (24) kabul-**da** ki äshnalarim mujahed.  
kabul-LOC ÉZ my.friends mujahed  
'My friends in Kabul are mujahedin.'
- (25) past-**da** ki qoläGi es-ni ingichka beradi.  
bottom-LOC ÉZ its.ear sound-ACC thin it.gives  
'The ear on the bottom gives a high sound.'
- (26) pädshäsi saksan toqsan-**da** ki qari chal edi.  
his.king eighty ninety-LOC ÉZ old old.man he.was  
'His king was an old man, who was at eighty or  
ninety.' (J90.90)

If *ki* in 20-26 is the complementizer, then the relativized noun in each is a subject which is modified by a locative nonactive complement.

There is one other environment in which this *ki* appears, following another oblique, *bugun* 'today', in 27.

- (27) *bugun ki ishi-ni yerta-ga qäymeng!*  
 today ÉZ its.work-ACC tomorrow-DAT Don't.you.put!  
 Lit. 'Work that is today's don't put off to  
 tomorrow.'  
 'Don't put off till tomorrow what you can do today!'

## 2.2. The Relativized Noun

In external relative clauses there are five different options cross-linguistically for the relativized noun of a relative clause. It may be replaced by (1) a relative pronoun, (2) a clitic pronoun, or (3) a personal pronoun or proform. It may appear as (4) a full lexical form. Or it may be (5) absent, leaving a gap.<sup>3</sup> Three out of these five occur in Southern Uzbek.

Southern Uzbek does not utilize relative pronouns or clitic pronouns for presenting relativized nouns. It does use gaps, proforms, and full lexical forms.

A gapped relative clause has no word or morpheme which expresses the relativized noun, as in 28.

- (28) I saw the car [he drove away in].

29-31 illustrate gapping for various grammatical relations. 29 gaps a subject, 30 a direct object, and 31 an indirect object.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Keenan 1985:146, Schwartz 1971:142, Andrews 1975:155, 156. Downing 1978:383-391



- (29) man-ni amsäyim [ki xabar-yüzuchi  
1SG-GEN my.neighbor COMP [my.neighbor] news-writer

edi] uldiriludi.  
was was-killed

'My neighbor who was a journalist was murdered.'

- (30) u oGri-ga [ki san ätting] man hech  
DEM thief-DAT COMP 2INF [thief] you.shot 1SG NEG

gapirmadim.  
I.didn't.say

'I didn't say anything to the thief you shot.'

- (31) bälä-ni [ki ali toting-ni sätti] man  
boy-ACC COMP ALI your.parrot-ACC [boy] he.sold 1SG

tänayman.  
I.know

'I know the boy Ali sold your parrot to.'

According to Keenan's Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy,<sup>4</sup> a relativized subject is the most likely to be gapped and "at the bottom of the Hierarchy we find that possessors are very rarely relativized by gapping" (Keenan 1985:154). Uzbek follows the universal tendency here. Neither genitives, instrumentals, locatives, nor datives may be relativized by gapping.

Southern Uzbek does not have relative pronouns as such, but its demonstrative pronouns serve this function. They are not, however, true relative pronouns since they occur in the typical clausal position of the relativized

---

<sup>4</sup> See section 2.6.



noun rather than clause-initially. (Cross-linguistically, Downing 1978:385 and Keenan 1985:149 note that it is common for demonstrative pronouns to be used as relative pronouns; the facts in Southern Uzbek are a simple variation on this pattern.) They occur in the typical clausal position of the noun being replaced rather than clause-initially as a relative pronoun. Southern Uzbek has six demonstrative pronouns: *bu* 'this', *mu* 'this (belonging to someone)', *shu* 'this (nearby)', *u* 'that', *osha* 'that (emphatic)'. Each of these may modify a noun or occur pronominally.

32 and 33 provide two examples of demonstratives representing the relativized noun in a relative clause. In 32 the relativized noun is a direct object and in 33 the relativized noun is a subject.

(32) *u kitäb-ni [ki man oqiatman shu-ni]*  
 DEM book-ACC COMP 1SG I.am.reading DEM-ACC

*man-ni xätinim man-ga berdi.*  
 1SG-GEN my.wife 1SG-DAT she.gave

'My wife gave me the book which I am reading.'

- (33) turkestan-da jadiaw yä jaduchi ismili kishilar  
 Turkestan-LOC magician or magician by.name people
- boladi [ki bu-lar oz uylari-da bir raqam-da  
 they.are COMP DEM-PLUR self their.houses one way-LOC
- eski nersalar-ni yiGib suyak eski latta ät  
 old things-ACC gathering bone old rags horse
- ishak tizekleri-ni yiGib bir eski latta-ga ur-ib  
 donkey dung-ACC gathering one old rag-DAT wrap
- kichikkene kichikkene chigib aftäb-da qurutib  
 small.pieces small.pieces tying sun-LOC drying
- qoyadilar].  
 they.put

'In Turkestan, there are people called magicians who gather old things in their homes -- bones, old rags, horse and donkey manure -- wrap it in an old rag, tie it up in small pieces, and dry it in the sun.'  
 (J162.19-24)

The retention of the relativized noun as a proform in 32 and 33 is not that uncommon universally. "Many languages delete Rel NP (the relativized noun) in some positions and retain a proform in other positions, obligatorily or optionally" (Downing 1978:385).

In 34-42 the relativized noun in the relative clause is expressed by its full lexical form. This presentation option of the relativized noun has only recently been acknowledged -- and even then only partially, writes Keenan 1985:146, 152-53.

34 and 35 have relativized genitives, genitives modifying subjects. 36-40 have relativized obliques: 36-38 locatives, 39 an instrumental, 40 a goal. 41 has a relativized direct object and 42 a relativized subject.

Their head nouns display as little pattern as their relativized nouns: a genitive, an accompaniment, four direct objects, and three goals.

- (34) amlaq bir qiz bilan toy qilätdi  
 Amlaq one girl with wedding he.will.do
- [ki u qiz-ni qatäg amlaq-ga razaiat-i yoq].  
 COMP DEM girl-GEN never Amlaq-DAT affection-HD NEG
- Lit. 'Amlaq is doing a wedding with a girl that this girl's affection to Amlaq is not at all.'
- 'Amlaq is marrying a girl who has no affection for him at all.'
- (35) tifäqan bir shahar-ga keldilar [ki u  
 it.so.happened one town-DAT they.came COMP DEM
- shahar-ni ädami kub nädän esipast kishilar  
 town-GEN man very ignorant stupid people
- ekan].  
 they.were
- 'It so happened that they came to a town that this town's people were very ignorant and stupid people.'  
 (J111.3-4)
- (36) tifäqan bir kata shahar-ga kirdi [ki u  
 it.so.happened one big town-DAT he.entered COMP DEM
- shahar-da pädshä najärlar-ni yiGip bir katta  
 town-LOC king carpenters-ACC gathering one big
- täm yasash-ni buyuripdi].  
 building making-ACC he.ordered.
- 'He happened to enter a big town that in this town, the king, assembling the carpenters, ordered them to build a huge building.' (J57.23-24)



- (37) amakisi harun buGra xän **bir kun chuch** kordi [ki  
his.uncle Harun BuGra Khan one day dream he.saw Comp

**chuch-i-da** bir kishi qarnini yärip  
dream-HD-LOC one man his.stomach-ACC slitting

tashladi].  
he.threw

'His uncle Harun Bughra Khan one day saw a dream, in which dream someone slit up his stomach.' (J149.171-172)

- (38) kunlar-dan **bir kun tush** kordi [ki **tush-i-da**  
days-ABL one day dream he.saw COMP dream-HD-LOC

ukasi-ga bir hädisa bolibdi].  
his.younger.brother-DAT one disaster it.happened

'One day he saw a dream, in which dream a disaster happened to his younger brother.' (J112.26-27)

- (39) agarda san unasang **bir yol** korsataman  
if 2INF you.may.agree one road I.will.show

san-ga [ki **osha yol** bilan kitsang kop kata  
you-DAT COMP DEM road with you.may.go very big

kishi bolasan].  
man you.will.be

'If you agree I shall show you a road that if you go on that road you will become a very great man.' (J147.119-122)

- (40) **bir yer-ga** yetdi [ki uch kishi **bir**  
one place-DAT he.reached COMP three people one

**yer-ga** yalangGäch bir yapinchaq-ni tagi-da  
place-DAT naked one mantle-GEN under-LOC

olturibdi].  
they.sat

'He reached a place at which place three people lay naked under a mantle.' (J134.5-6)

- (41) *endi* [*siz har nersa ki xälasaingiz*] *osha*  
 now 2FRM any thing COMP you.may.want DEM

*nersa-ni* *biz* *tengringiz-dan sorap beraylik.*  
 thing-ACC 1PLUR your.GOD-ABL asking we.will.ask

'Now whatever thing you want, we will ask for that  
 thing from God.' (J17.28-29)

- (42) *har yer-da shunday bir kishilar-ni*  
 each place-LOC such one people-GEN

*äldi-da bol-gin [ki u kishilar*  
 their.fronts-LOC be-IMP COMP DEM people

*uzlari-ni tanisa].*  
 themselves-ACC they.may.know

Lit. 'At each place, be at such people's fronts that  
 these people know themselves.'

'Wherever you go, associate with people of wisdom.'  
 (J116.133-134)

The only other examples I can find of this phenomenon

(viz. a relativized noun in the relative clause expressed  
 by a lexical noun) are from Tibetan, Latin, and Marathi:<sup>5</sup>

- (43) Tibetan (Mazaudon 1976 from Keenan 1985:152)

*Peeme coqtsee waa-la kurka*  
 Peem(ERG) table(GEN) under-DAT cross(ABS)

*thii-pe coqtse the na noo-qi*  
 write-PART GEN(sic) table the(ABS) I(ABS) buy-PRES

*yin*  
*be*

'I will buy the table under which Peem made a cross'

---

<sup>5</sup> Albert Bickford (1994:personal communication) has  
 observed similar sentences in oral English.

(44) Latin (Greenough 1903 from Keenan 1985:153)

*Loci natura erat haec quem locum*  
of the ground nature was this which ground

*nostri delegerant*  
our (men) chose

'The nature of the ground which (ground) our men had chosen was this'

(45) Marathi (Andrews 1975:105)

*mī eka muli-la bheṭṭa, mā-la ji (mulgi) awaṛte*  
I:INST a girl-DA met I-DA wh girl like  
"I met a girl who I like"

These examples do not exhibit any clear pattern.

Tibetan has a prenominal relative clause. Latin has a postnominal relative clause. The Marathi example has a relative pronoun in addition to the full lexical representation of the relativized noun.

The Tibetan relativized noun is a genitive. The Latin and Marathi relativized nouns are direct objects. The Tibetan and Marathi head nouns are direct objects, and the Latin head noun is a genitive.

The Uzbek examples 34-42 and Latin 44, with their postnominal relative clauses, violate a proposed universal: "The relative NP in a postnominal restrictive relative clause may not be a full lexical NP. It may be retained as a relative pronoun ... or as an unstressed personal pronoun or both, or it may be omitted" (Downing 1978:390). Another possible analysis, which would preserve Downing's universal



as far as the Uzbek examples go, would be to analyze 34-42 as correlatives.<sup>6</sup>

In both the Latin and Uzbek examples the relative clause is extraposed from the head. Is the repeated noun pragmatically motivated, then, to overcome the discontinuity of the head and the relative clause? This redundancy would avoid ambiguity as the head is not adjacent to the relative clause. Alternatively, is the full lexical form conditioned by the grammatical relation of the head?

In Southern Uzbek the choice of which form will be used to present a relativized noun has a pattern. A full lexical form of the relativized noun occurs in my data for each grammatical relation except temporal. Gaps occur for grammatical relations that have no case marking -- subject, nonactive complement, and temporal -- and for direct and indirect objects. Proforms occur only for subjects and objects.

---

<sup>6</sup> Typical characteristics of correlatives are not true of these Southern Uzbek sentences. In correlatives: (1) the relative clause precedes the matrix clause; (2) a special morpheme presents the relativized noun; (3) the relativized and/or head noun may be omitted in correlatives. (4) No language with correlatives has prenominal relative clauses (Downing 1978:399-405). 'Correlatives' (Downing 1978:382, 399-409; Andrews 1975:109) is also spelled 'corelatives' (Keenan 1985:163-168). 'Co-relatives' are relative clauses adjoined to the main clause (Andrews 1975:8, 9, 83-123), (Hale 1974), and (Downing 1978:382, 405-410).

### 2.3. Extraposition of the Relative Clause

External relative clauses have the possibility of occurring extraposed from the head -- either postposed or preposed. In almost all Southern Uzbek sentences the verb is the last word in the sentence. There are three common exceptions: (1) complement clauses, as in 46, (2) occasionally a nominal argument of an imperative verb, as in 47, and (3) postposed relative clauses in which the relativized noun appears as a full lexical form. Since these relative clauses are presented in 2.2, I include only one here, 48.

- (46) COMPLEMENT CLAUSE  
 kordi [ki bāshi-da satuq buGra xān turibdi].  
 he.saw COMP his.head-LOC Satuq Bughra Khan he.stood  
 'He saw that Satuq Bughra Khan stood by his head.'  
 (J154.315-316)

- (47) NOMINAL ARGUMENT OF IMPERATIVE VERB  
 bir but-xāna yasa-gin uz-ing-ga.  
 one idol-house build-IMP self-2SGINF-DAT  
 'Build an idol temple for yourself.' (J150.223)

- (48) RELATIVE CLAUSE  
 agarda san unasang bir yol korsataman  
 if 2INF you.may.agree one road I.will.show  
  
 san-ga [ki osha yol bilan kitsang kop kata  
 you-DAT COMP DEM road with you.may.go very big  
  
 kishi bolasan].  
 man you.will.be  
  
 'If you agree I shall show you a road that if you go  
 on that road you will become a very great man.'  
 (J147.119-122)<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> It is unclear why *san-ga* 'you-DAT' occurs after the verb.

If a finite relative clause is not postposed to a position after the verb it occurs immediately following its head. The one exception to this in my data preposes a full lexical form of the relativized noun, as seen in 49.

(49) *endi [siz har nersa ki xälasaingiz] osha*  
 now 2FRM any thing COMP you.may.want DEM

*nersa-ni biz tengringiz-dan sorap beraylik.*  
 thing-ACC 1PLUR your.GOD-ABL asking we.will.ask

'Now whatever thing you want, we will ask for that thing from God.' (J17.28-29)

## 2.4. Marking the Relative Clause

### 2.4.1 The complementizer

Southern Uzbek makes frequent use of the complementizer *ki*, although it is rare in Standard Uzbek. *ki* is borrowed from Persian (Poppe 1965:169) and used in a variety of constructions in Southern Uzbek. Lexical borrowing is much more commonly attested and described than syntactic borrowing, but the borrowing of relativization constructions is attested in other languages as well (Nichols 1984:531-32).

Following Keenan's (1985:149) definition of relative pronoun, I do not treat *ki* as a relative pronoun, but as a complementizer; it lacks a typical relative pronoun's "nominal properties such as gender, number, and case" and unlike most relative pronouns, it is not "the same as, or



morphologically related to, the demonstrative pronouns or the interrogative pronouns in the language" (1985:149).<sup>8</sup>

Neither of the two Uzbek grammars in English (Bidwell 1955 and Sjoberg 1963) nor the standard English text (Raun 1969) discusses finite relative clauses or their complementizer *ki*. Raun 1969:186 simply says that *ki* is not used often. The two Uzbek grammars in English give it similar attention: Sjoberg 1963 gives five example sentences with *ki*, all of them with complement clauses, none with relative clauses. Bidwell 1955 does not discuss *ki* at all.

The complementizer *ki* perhaps occurs seldom in Uzbek in Uzbekistan. Most Southern Uzbek speakers, however, know Dari, and the relative clause with *ki* is the primary relativization device used in Dari. Comrie 1981b:85 observes a parallel borrowing of Russian relativization devices into Standard Uzbek.<sup>9</sup>

Downing 1978, building on Schwartz 1971:142, offers seven basic models for the internal structure of a postnominal relative clause. The three characteristics

<sup>8</sup> In Farsi *ke* (borrowed as *ki* into Turkic languages according to Andrews 1975:56) may be related to the interrogative pronoun, but it is not related to the Uzbek interrogative.

<sup>9</sup> The Turkish linguist Slobin 1986:288 observes a "large collection of conjoining and subordinating particles borrowed or copied from Arabic, Iranian, and Slavic" into Turkish. Slobin and Zimmer 1986:4 refer to the Turkic tendency for borrowing relativization devices as historical remodeling.

considered in these models are the presence versus absence of a complementizer (that), relative pronoun (WH), and a nonrelative pronoun (0 or PRO). 50 comes verbatim from Downing 1978:384.

- |      |      |                      |                        |
|------|------|----------------------|------------------------|
| (50) | i.   | N [S...0...]         | DYIRBAL                |
|      | ii.  | N that [S...0...]    | VIETNAMESE, HAUSA      |
|      | iii. | N that [S...PRO...]  | HEBREW, ARABIC, AKAN   |
|      | iv.  | N [S WH....]         | LATIN and derivatives  |
|      | v.   | N that [S WH....]    | INDONESIAN, HUNGARIAN  |
|      | vi.  | N WH that [S...0...] | OLD and MIDDLE ENGLISH |
|      | vii. | N [S WH...PRO...]    | RUMANIAN               |

Since the postnominal relative clauses of Southern Uzbek all occur with the complementizer *ki* and never with a relative pronoun, only (ii) and (iii) are possible for Southern Uzbek. They both occur as I have shown in the examples with gapping and with proforms. An eighth model is required by Southern Uzbek (LEX signifying a full lexical form of the relativized noun):

- |      |       |                     |                |
|------|-------|---------------------|----------------|
| (51) | viii. | N that [S...LEX...] | SOUTHERN UZBEK |
|------|-------|---------------------|----------------|

#### 2.4.2 *ki* with complement and adjunct clauses

The complementizer for Southern Uzbek is *ki*. Since the complementizer has been examined so little in the literature, I offer a brief sketch of its usage in Southern Uzbek complement clauses and adjunct, or oblique, clauses.

Although Uzbek constituent order is SOV, and the verb is sentence-final with high consistency, complement clauses regularly follow the verb as in 52. Uzbek complement clauses occur as direct objects.

- (52) koradi [ki bir chirhaylik yigit yarati bul-gan  
she.sees COMP one beautiful youth wounded become-PRT  
yiqilib yätibdi].  
falling he.lay  
‘She sees that a beautiful youth has been wounded and  
lies where he fell.’

As I have stated earlier, *ki* is a loan form of Persian *ke*. *ke* occurs following Persian *goft* ‘say’ with indirect quotations, as in 53.

- (53) wahid goft [ke behzad raft]  
Wahid he.said COMP Behzad he.went  
‘Wahid said that Behzad left.’

Uzbek has two speech verbs which commonly introduce direct quotations: *ayt* ‘said’ and *de* ‘said’. The verb *ayt* typically occurs immediately preceding a direct quotation, and *de* immediately following. The complementizer is not obligatory with the complements of these verbs.



- (54) mulla nasruddin un-ga aytdi [man-ni gapim-ga  
 mullah Nasruddin 3-DAT he.said 1SG-GEN word-DAT  
 ishanasiz mi yä ishak-ni gapi-ga ishanasiz  
 you.believe PQ or donkey-GEN word-DAT you.believe  
 mi?]  
 PQ

'Mullah Nasruddin said to him, "Do you believe my word or the donkey's word?''

- (55) amläq aytdi [ki yoq]  
 Amlaq he.said COMP NEG  
 'Amlaq said, "No."'

- (56) mohammad [amläq arGamchi-ni yubargin] dedi.  
 Mohammad Amlaq rope-ACC you.send he.said  
 'Mohammad said, "Amlaq, send down the rope."'

Another speech verb, *sora* 'ask', optionally occurs with *ki*. *ki* is obligatory with *jawab ber* 'give answer'. Both precede the quotation.

- (57) pädsäh soraydi kata xätini-dan [ki mana kichigina  
 king he.asks big wife-ABL REL well little  
 xätinim oGul toGdi mi qiz?]  
 my.wife son she.bore PQ daughter

'The king asks his first wife, "Well now, did my second wife bear a son or a daughter?''

- (58) hazrat ali bir ädam-dan soraydilar [bu ir-da  
 Hazrat Ali one man-ABL he.asks DEM place-LOC

nima gap bär?]  
 what word existent]

'Hazrat Ali asks a man, "What's happening here?''

u ädam jawäb beradi [ki bu keca amläq-ni  
 DEM man answer he.gives COMP DEM night Amlaq-GEN

toy dur].  
 wedding COP

'The man answers, "Tonight is Amlaq's wedding."'

The complementizer *ki* also frequently introduces unspoken thoughts, as in 59.

- (59) wa kob oylaydi [ki qandäg bu bacha-ni  
 and much she.thinks COMP how DEM boy-ACC

uldirirsam?]  
 I.may.cause.kill

'And she thought much, "How can I make him murder this boy?''

The complementizer *ki* may introduce a direct quotation without a speech verb.

- (60) deolar-ni makani-ga bol-gan-da korsatdi  
 monsters-GEN house-DAT become-PRT-LOC he.showed

[ki mana shu quduq dur].  
 COMP here DEM well COP

Lit. 'At becoming to the monsters' house, he showed it to him, "Here is the well."'

'When they got to the monsters' house, he showed it to him, saying, "Here is the well."'

The complementizer *ki* is also used to form Uzbek adjunct, or oblique, clauses linking cause and effect (sometimes subdivided as condition and reason), goal and means, adverb and modifier, and to express adversatives. *ki* occurs in the clause which expresses the cause, goal, and modifier. It also links clauses with certain temporal relationships, translated with words like "until", "since", and "while".

- (61) mohammad oqi-dan tor-sa [ki qiz yanbäshi-da  
 Mohammad sleep-ABL stand-IRR COMP girl his.side-LOC  
 yoq].  
 NEG

'Mohammad woke from his sleep because his girl wasn't there.'

- (62) inäGalar qoläg tut-ing-lar [ki man sizlar-ga  
 brothers ear grab-IMP-PLUR COMP 1SG you-DAT  
 shäGal-ni kel-gan-i-ni qisa-si-ni ayt-ub  
 jackal-GEN come-SP-HD-GEN story-HD-ACC say-CONJ  
 beraman].  
 I.will.give

Lit. 'Brothers, grab your ear, that I will say and give to you the jackal's coming's story.'

'Brothers, listen to me, that I may tell you the story of the coming of the jackal.'

- (63) arqan-ni boynum-ga salar edilar [ki siz  
 rope-ACC my.neck-DAT they.place they.were COMP 2FRM  
 yetib keldingiz].  
 arriving you.came

'They were putting the rope around my neck when you arrived.' (J115.120-121)



## 2.5. Position of the Determiner

In Southern Uzbek the position of the determiner in relation to its head in a finite relative clause is invariant. It always occurs in its normal position, introducing the noun phrase, whether the head is internal or external. Noun phrases are constructed as follows, with each element optional except the noun: determiner + quantifier + adjective + noun. Our example sentences, 64-66, show external and internal relative clauses with different types of determiners and in different proximities to the head.

- (64) kocha-da bir tul-xätin-ni kordi [ki uz-i  
 street-LOC a widow-woman-ACC he.saw COMP self-HD  
 su kotarip kitip turipdi].  
 water lifting going she.stood  
 'In the street he saw a widow who was carrying water  
 herself.' (J78.288-289)
- (65) u kitäb-ni [ki man oqiatman shu-ni]  
 DEM book-ACC COMP 1SG I.am.reading DEM-ACC  
 man-ni xätinim man-ga berdi.  
 1SG-GEN my.wife 1SG-DAT she.gave  
 'My wife gave me the book which I am reading.'
- (66) u uch inägalar-ni [ki yusuf pul berdi] man  
 DEM three brothers-ACC COMP Yusuf money he.gave 1SG  
 kordim.  
 I.saw  
 'I saw the three brothers Yusuf gave the money to.'

## 2.6. Relativizability and Grammatical Relations

Keenan 1985:154 has stated that there is a hierarchy among noun phrases in regard to their eligibility to be relativized by a given strategy. Subjects, at the top of the hierarchy, are most easily relativized. Then come objects, obliques, and lastly genitives. Whatever noun phrase is found relativized every noun phrase above it on the hierarchy may also be relativized. (See Keenan and Comrie 1977 for a more detailed statement.)

A noun phrase of any grammatical relation in Southern Uzbek may be relativized by a finite relative clause, as the examples in this chapter illustrate: a relativized subject, 75; direct object, 65; indirect object, 66; goal, 40; locative, 37; instrumental, 48; temporal, 82-85; and genitive, 35.

There is a pattern related to the relativized noun. The manifestation of a relativized goal, locative, instrumental, or genitive in my data is the full lexical form of the noun, rather than a proform or a gap. A full lexical form may also occur with noun phrases of other relativized grammatical relations, but it is the sole presentation form I have discovered for these grammatical relations.

## 2.7. Head Noun Constraints with Relative Clauses

### 2.7.1 Subject heads

The position in a sentence of a relative clause head and its accompanying finite relative clause can be determined by the grammatical relation of the head noun.<sup>10</sup> Subject heads occur before the other major nominals.

The canonical order of Uzbek sentences is S DO IO V, as shown in 67 and 68.

- (67) SUBJ DO IO  
 bek qoli-ni chiGriq-ni äGzi-ga  
 ruler his.hand-ACC roller.gin-GEN its.mouth-DAT

qoyib berdi.  
 putting he.gave

'The ruler put his hand into the mouth of the roller gin.' (J81.383)

- (68) SUBJ DO IO  
 bir-dan xätin bek-ni qoli-ni mashine-ga  
 one-ABL woman ruler-GEN his.hand-ACC machine-DAT

yedirdi.  
 she.fed

'At once the woman fed the ruler's hand to the machine.' (J81.384)

Constituency order, however, is quite flexible. The subject may occur anywhere before the verb: after DO, 69;

---

<sup>10</sup> The data for complement and adjunct clauses with the same complementizer point to sentence-order constraints for these structures also. These patterns are mentioned in 2.4.2.



after IO, 70; between DO and IO, 71; or after DO and IO, 72.

(69) DO SUBJ  
hatta bāshi-ni ham mashine tärtip äldi.  
and.so his.head-ACC too machine pulling it.took  
'And so the machine also took his head.' (J84.385)

(70) IO SUBJ  
kozi-ga bir quyan korindi.  
his.eye-DAT one hare it.appeared  
'A hare came in sight.' (J143:25)

(71) DO SUBJ IO  
bu otug-ni tulki man-ga ki-giz-gan e-kan  
Det boot-ACC fox 1SG-DAT wear-Caus-PRT it.is  
'The fox has caused me to wear this boot.' (J5.95)

(72) DO IO SUBJ  
bu otug-ni man-ga shir shah-im ki-giz-ip  
Det boot-ACC 1SG-DAT lion king-my causing.to.wear  
goydi.  
he.put

'My king the lion has caused me to wear this boot.'  
(J4.90)

Going against this flexibility, if a subject is the head of a finite relative clause, it occurs as the first major nominal (S, DO, IO) in the main clause, as seen in 73-76, whether it is internal or external.

(73) osha zargar [ki man-ni ukam  
DEM jeweler COMP 1SG-GEN younger.brother  
uzuking-ni täpshirdi] toGri kishi dur.  
your.ring-ACC he.handed true man COP

'The jeweler my little brother handed your ring to is an honest man.'

- (74) bu **nersa** [ki man arqasi-dan qowib yurib-man]  
 DEM thing COMP 1SG behind-ABL pursuing walking  
 bu aw ku emas.  
 DEM hunt certainly it.is.not  
 'This thing that I am pursuing certainly has nothing  
 to do with hunting.' (J144.32-33)

- (75) har **kishi** [ki shu shahar-da bär] ekki  
 each person COMP DEM city-LOC existent two  
 qoli-ni shapaqlap otsun.  
 his.hands-ACC clapping let.pass  
 'Every one in this town shall pass by [me], clapping  
 his two hands together.' (J86.506-607)

- (76) man-ni **amsäyim** [ki xabar-yüzuchi edi]  
 1SG-GEN my.neighbor COMP news-writer was  
 uldiriludi.  
 was-killed  
 'My neighbor who was a journalist was murdered.'

Thus, a subject modified by a relative clause does not move to an alternate position in the sentence. It only occurs in its standard SOV position. This is true not only for finite external relative clauses such as 75 and 76, but also holds true for finite **internal** relative clauses, as in 77 and 78.

- (77) [u hamasi-dan kata **baliq-ni ki** man tutib äldim]  
 DEM of.all-ABL big fish-ACC COMP 1SG catching I.took  
 daryä-ga qaytib tushdi.  
 river-DAT returning it.jumped  
 'The biggest fish I caught jumped back in the river.'

- (78) [gosht-ni ki u yedi] ächiG edi.  
 meat-ACC REL DEM he.ate spicy it.was  
 'The meat he ate was spicy.'

This obligatory sentence-initial position of the subject may be a result of its weight as a relativized nominal rather than its grammatical relation.

### 2.7.2 Oblique heads

The other head grammatical relation which I explore is oblique.

A time oblique typically occurs sentence-initially, as in 79 and 80.

- (79) bir necha daqa ilgari u hamsäyim ishakim-ni  
 one some minute before DEM my.neighbor my.donkey-ACC  
 älib kitdi.  
 taking he.went

'A few minutes ago this other neighbor of mine took my donkey.'

- (80) u-dan nare u bacha yiGladi.  
 DEM-ABL after DEM boy he.cried  
 'After that the boy cried.'

Most types of obliques, as the goal oblique in 81, occur after the subject. Locatives occur frequently after and before the subject. There is a sentence-initial locative in 81.

- (81) yarim yul-da bir yamän buri ildaim-ga keldi.  
 half way-LOC one bad wolf my.front-DAT it.came  
 'Halfway a dangerous wolf came in front of me.'



Obliques of time may occur either clause-finally or clause-initially. The examples I have extracted from texts, including 82-84, all occur sentence-initially. Elicitation produced a grammatical sentence-final time oblique, 85.

(82) **osha** waxt-i<sup>11</sup> [ki man andxuy-da edim] bir kecha  
 DEM time-HD COMP 1SG Andxuy-LOC I.was one night

qishi-ni kechasi-da yärim kecha hawa kub  
 winter-GEN night-LOC half night weather very

qäränGi edi.  
 dark it.was

'During the time which I was at Andkhuy, one night, a winter's night, at midnight it was very dark.'

---

<sup>11</sup> The relative clauses with waxt 'time' are not adjunct clauses like their English counterparts translated with "when" and "while" clauses. waxt is marked clearly as a noun. The suffix -i which occurs with waxt 'time' attaches only to nouns. -i and its post-vocalic allomorph -si mark the head noun of any noun phrase with a head noun and either an overt or an implied modifier. The modifier noun is marked with genitive case, -ni, as in (i).

(i) MODIFIER HEAD  
 dutar-ni dasta-si aytadilar.  
 guitar-GEN neck-HD they.call.it  
 'They call it the dutar's neck.'

Additional evidence for waxt being a noun, and therefore, these clauses being taken as true relative clauses is the co-occurrence of the demonstrative osha with waxt in 82 and 83.

- (83) osha waxt-i [ki man onlanchi sinf-da organuchi  
DEM time-HD COMP 1SG tenth class-LOC student

edim] bir kun qish-ni kuni-da yerteng minan man  
I.was one day winter-GEN day-LOC morning with 1SG

sääti sayqiz-da maktab tamäni-ga kitätudim.  
hour eight-LOC school direction-DAT I.was.going

'During the time that I was a student in the tenth grade, one winter morning I was going to school at 8:00.'

- (84) waxt-i [ki mohammad quduq-ga tushsa] zaynul arab  
time-HD COMP NAME well-DAT descending Zaynul Arab

bir konj-da yiGlib ultir-gan.  
one corner-LOC crying she.sat-SP

'When Mohammad went into the well, Zaynul Arab was sitting in a corner, crying.'

- (85) yätib bilasiz mi u waxt-i [ki kuchi hawhaw  
sleep you.can PQ DEM time-HD COMP dog bowwow

qelsa]?  
if.it.does

'Can you sleep when a dog barks?'

Relative clauses with oblique heads usually occur at the beginning or end of the clause. When moved to the end, they are not moved to the position immediately preceding the verb, as one would expect with Uzbek's verb-final constraint. They are placed after the verb.

Our discussion here affirms Noonan's observation that "Uzbek seldom postposes oblique arguments" (1985:86). He also states that postposing is more common than preposing in SOV languages and that extraposing usually affects oblique arguments (1985:86). My data, involving relative

clauses, shows much more preposing than postposing of oblique arguments, particularly with direct objects and time obliques.

In summary, I have looked at how the grammatical relation of the head noun controls the position of the relative clause in Southern Uzbek. A subject head occurs clause-initially and is followed immediately by the relative clause. Time oblique heads move to the beginning or the end of the sentence with their respective relative clauses, typically to the beginning, as is normal for time obliques in Southern Uzbek.



### CHAPTER 3

#### NONFINITE RELATIVE CLAUSES

In addition to the finite relative clauses discussed in chapter 2, Southern Uzbek also uses nonfinite relative clauses. Its nonfinite relative clauses occur more frequently in fact than their finite counterparts. These nonfinite relative clauses are exemplified by 86-88.

(86) mana [toG-gan] bachaing.  
here bear-PRT your.son

san bir koçek-bacha toG-d-ing.  
2INF one doll-son bear-PST-2INF

'Here is the child you bore. You bore a doll [not a child].'

(87) shu [där-ga äs-il-gan] kishi ädamlar-ni  
DEM gallows-DAT hang-PASS-PRT man men-GEN

kozi-ga [qinlanib ol-gan] kishi  
their.eyes-DAT is.being.tortured die-PRT man

boladi.  
he.is

'This man who has been hanged on the gallows will in the eyes of men be one who has died in torture.'  
(J114.69)

- (88) shuning bilan [adam surati-da bolip murud  
 DEM with men form-LOC becoming disciples  
 bol-gan] jinlar bu ishan-ni bāshlaip...  
 become-PRT spirits DEM teacher-ACC they.conducted  
 'With that the spirits, who had disguised themselves  
 as men and become disciples, conducted this  
 teacher...' (J127.78)

Nonfinite relative clauses in Southern Uzbek occur with the participial suffix *-gan*. There are three uses of the participial suffix *-gan*: relative clause marker, aspect suffix, and nominalizer. (The relative clauses with *-gan* may indeed represent a functional subcategory of its identity as a nominalizer.) This paper focuses on *-gan* as a marker of relative clauses. Before I discuss *-gan* further with regard to relative clauses, it might be helpful to observe it as a suffix which substitutes for ordinary finite verb morphology and as a nominalizer.

### 3.1. Other Constructions with *-gan*

*-gan* may occur as a verb suffix expressing only perfective aspect,<sup>1</sup> as in 89.

- (89) uchinchi-ga yāz-il-gan bār-sa kelmas.  
 third-DAT write-PASS-PRT go-IRR he.will.not.come  
 'On the third was written, "If one goes this way, he  
 will not return."'

---

<sup>1</sup> Alo Raun 1969:111 writes in his *Basic Course in Uzbek*, "Semantically, since it indicates the result of an action, *-gan*, *-kan* may refer to any point of time."

The second sentence in 86 has *toG* 'to bear' with finite verb suffixation. This sentence would remain grammatical if the participial suffix *-gan* occurred instead of the verb's tense and number affixation -- see 90. The meaning would alter in that the time of the action would be de-emphasized.

(90) san bir koçek-bacha *toG-d-ing*.  
 2INF one doll-son bear-PST-2INF  
 'You bore a doll [not a child].'

san bir koçek-bacha *toG-gan*.  
 2INF one doll-son bear-PRT  
 'You have born a doll [not a child].'

91 also contrasts *-gan* with the typical tense and number suffixation.

(91) man bu kitäb-ni *bit-d-im*.  
 1SG DEM book-ACC write-PST-1SG  
 'I wrote this book.'

man bu kitäb-ni *bit-gan*.  
 1SG DEM book-ACC write-PRT  
 'I wrote this book.'  
 or 'I have written this book.'  
 (The first sentence implies a recent time reference.)

Rarely, tense and number suffixes occur simultaneously with *-gan* in a relative clause, as in 92 and 93:



- (92) [ätasi-ga           yâq-a-di-gan]           ishlar-ni kop  
her.father-DAT please-NPST-3-PRT works-ACC much

yaxshi bilar           edi.  
good she.knows she.did

'She knew very well the works which pleased her father.' (J34.205)

- (93) u [shaytän-ga sawuG ber-a-di-gan] ädam  
3 [Satan-DAT lessons give-NPST-3-PRT man  
Lit. 'He is a man who gives lessons to Satan.'  
'He is a man who is very clever.'

A verb with this participial suffix may also be nominalized, as seen in 94, where *-gan* occurs with a first-person possessor agreement marker, ablative case marking, and a postposition.<sup>2</sup>

- (94) [tala-dan qayt-ib kel-gan-im-dan kiin]  
field-ABL repeat-CONJ come-PRT-1SG-ABL after

korsam...  
when.I.see

'When I looked [into it] after my coming back from the field...' (J10.38)

These verbs and their clauses may occur as complement clauses. This construction with *-gan* is illustrated in 95.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Participles are used as the third person singular form of finite verbs. Otherwise, they function like nouns and adjectives" (Raun 1969:163).

- (95) tezlik bilan [bu kishi-ni ayt-gan-lar-i-ni] täptirip  
 haste with DEM man-GEN say-PRT-PL-PSS-ACC  
 approving

berdi.  
 he.gave.

'He quickly approved what this man said.'

In 95 the verb, ayt 'say', is not modifying a noun, as it would in a relative clause. It has been nominalized. This is evidenced by the suffixation following -gan: -lar 'PLURAL', -i 'THIRD PERSON POSSESSOR AGREEMENT', and -ni 'ACCUSATIVE'. In addition to being possessed by kishi 'man', ayt 'say' is emphasized by bu 'DEMONSTRATIVE (NEAR)'.

Complement clauses based on -gan are mutually substitutable with nonverbal nominals as seen in 96. The two bracketed noun phrases occur with the same case marker, -dan 'ABLATIVE', and the same postposition säGra 'after'.

- (96) [onbesh onälti daqa-dan]<sub>NP</sub> säGra u-ni alaw-ni  
 15 16 minute-ABL after DEM-ACC fire-GEN  
 usti-dan älinglar... [dami chiG-gan-dan]<sub>NP</sub> säGra  
 its.top-ABL Take.it! steam exit-PRT-ABL after  
 asta ächinglar.  
 slowly Open.it!

'After 15 or 16 minutes take it off the fire... After the steam stops, slowly open it.'

### 3.2. External vs Internal Head

Virtually all of Southern Uzbek's nonfinite relative clauses have an external head, as 97 and 98.

- (97) täGin u [ayäGi-dan äs-il-gan] kishi-ga garaib  
 then DEM his.feet-ABL hang-PASS-PRT] man-DAT  
 looking

aytdi...  
 she.said

'Then she said to the man who was hanged by his feet...' (J107.305)

- (98) [shu qiz-ni muhäfizeti-da toxta-gan] askarlar-ni  
 DEM girl-ACC guarding-loc stop-PRT soldiers-GEN

aldi-da bir äz waxt boldi.  
 their.front-LOC one little time he.became

Lit. 'He stayed a little at the soldiers' fronts who remained on this girl's guard.'

'He stayed for a little while with these soldiers who kept on with their protection of the girl.' (J85.470)

In 97 the head bears the dative case marking appropriate to the matrix clause, but inappropriate for its grammatical relation within the relative clause where it is a passive subject. Similarly, in 98, the genitive case marking on the head is correct for the matrix, but wrong for the relative clause where it is a subject.

All nonfinite external relative clauses are prenominal,<sup>3</sup> as shown in 97 and 98.

Southern Uzbek, which is SOV, follows the tendency of verb-final languages to favor prenominal relative clauses (Downing 1978:391), since nonfinite relative clauses are normally prenominal, and they are more common than finite

<sup>3</sup> Keenan 1985:160 notes a strong correlation between prenominal relative clauses and their verbs being nonfinite.



relative clauses. However, as noted in chapter 2, finite relative clauses normally occur postnominally.

Internal nonfinite relative clauses seem to occur occasionally in Uzbek, as in 105 and 100.

- (99) *tifāqan osha bay-ni ishiki-da ki*  
 by.chance DEM rich.man-GEN his.door-LOC ÉZ  
 [*xidmetkari bälasi-ni soy-gan*] hamda kor  
 his.servant his.child-ACC kill-PRT also blind  
 bolup qäl-gan edi.  
 becoming he.remained he.was

'By chance the servant in the house of the rich man,  
 who had killed the child, also had become blind.'  
 (J106.288)

- (100) [*bu ishlar-ni ayt-gan wa itar-gan*] siz-ni katta  
 DEM works-ACC say-PRT and push-PRT 2FRM-GEN big  
 xätiniz dur.  
 your.wife COP

'These things which were said and done belong to your  
 first wife.'

All other nonfinite relative clauses in my study have the head at the end of the relative clause. If *xidmetkari* is an external head, then it is an exception to this rule. Thus, based on word order, I instead hypothesize that *xidmetkari* is the relativized noun, and this is an internal relative clause. It may be that the multi-nominal noun phrase with *-da ki* prevents the nonfinite relative clause's head from taking its normal postclausal position.

100 provides additional evidence for this analysis from case marking. The case marking on *ishlar* 'works' in



A complementary pair of a nonrestrictive and a restrictive relative clause, respectively, appear in one text, 103.

(103) [oltur-gan] bek bilmastan qäldi.  
 sit-PRT ruler he.did.not.know he.remained  
 'The ruler, who sat there, did not know this.'  
 (J78.287)

bir-dan osha [qulaG burnisi-ni kes-gan] bek  
 one-ABL DEM ear his.nose-ACC cut-PRT ruler

bir-dan kelib qäldi.  
 one-ABL coming he.remained

'That ruler who had his ears and nose cut off  
 suddenly came.' (J79.308)

The relative clause in the first sentence of 103 is not restrictive. The mentioned ruler is the sole ruler in the town, similar to a mayor. Therefore, *olturgan* 'seated', does not differentiate between rulers, but provides additional information about the already specified ruler. The second sentence in 103 is clearly restrictive. It identifies which ruler 'suddenly came'. Despite his being the only ruler in the town, the restrictive element is important here because the cut-off ears and nose in the relative clause were the result of a crime in another city in the story. This ruler is thus distinguished from all others in that he is the injured one from earlier in the story.



### 3.4. The Relativized Noun

In nonfinite relative clauses, relativized nouns are either absent or occasionally represented by proforms. In contrast to finite relative clauses, they may not appear as full lexical nouns.

#### 3.4.1 Gap

In most nonfinite relative clauses the relativized noun is absent, leaving a gap, as in 104 and 105. In 104 *musafer* 'traveler' is clearly the head, since it is marked with dative case according to its relation in the matrix clause, rather than being unmarked as the subject of the relative clause. Similar considerations apply to 105.

- (104) siz [                    uzäG jäy-dan    kel-gan] musäfer-ga  
 2FRM [traveler] far    place-ABL come-PRT traveler-DAT

oxshaysiz.  
 you.seem

'You look like a traveler who has come from a distant place.' (J62.175)

- (105) [                    koz-i    äGri-gan] kor  
 [blind.person] eye-PSS ache-PRT    blind.person  
  
 [                    quläG-i äGri-gan] kishilar ham kelib  
 [people] ear-PSS ache-PRT    people    too coming

bäshladi.  
 they.began

'Blind people whose eyes ached and people whose ears ached also began to come.' (J105.275)

### 3.4.2 Proform

Infrequently Southern Uzbek allows a relativized noun to appear in a nonfinite relative clause as a proform. This is in addition to the head noun outside the relative clause, as seen in 106 and 107.

(106) [payGamber-ni bu ayt-gan] sozi yāqin kelibdi.  
 prophet-GEN DEM say-PRT his.word near it.came  
 'These words spoken by the prophet were approaching  
 [their fulfillment].' (J143.10)

(107) [san-ni bu yur-gan] yollaring xatä dur.  
 2INF-GEN DEM walk-PRT your.road mistake COP  
 'This road which you have walked is wrong.' (J144.49)

All my examples of the relativized noun appearing as a proform have the relativized noun as a direct object or a passive subject. I am not certain if other grammatical relations may appear as proforms when relativized, or whether all other grammatical relations must be gapped.

Downing 1978:394 asserts that relativized non-obliques, as in 106 and 107, cannot appear in their relative clauses. To accommodate that hypothesis one would have to analyze the proforms as demonstratives rather than as relativized nouns. Instead of being proforms of the relativized nouns, the proforms would be undeleted demonstratives from the relativized nouns' noun phrases: 'these words' in 106 and 'this road' in 107.

### 3.5. Position of the Determiner

A determiner in Southern Uzbek, either *bir* 'one' or any of the demonstratives, occurs first in a noun phrase, as illustrated by 108-112.

- (108) man-ni qol-im-da [bir katta uzun tayäG] bär  
 I-GEN hand-1SG-LOC one big long branch existent  
 e-d-i.  
 be-PST-3

'In my hand was a large, long staff.'

- (109) bugun [bir necha kun] boladi ki osha oGri-ni  
 today one some day it.becomes COMP DEM thief-ACC  
 qol-ga tushurdilar.  
 hand-DAT they.forced.him.down

'Today it is a few days since they caught that thief.' (J115.95-96)

- (110) u uzbek ädam...  
 DEM Uzbek man  
 'The Uzbek man...'

- (111) shu qolban...  
 DEM plow  
 'The plow...'

- (112) osha ikki asir-lar...  
 DEM two prisoner-PL  
 'The two prisoners...'

113 and 114 give typical examples of determiner placement in regard to a head with an accompanying relative clause: Determiner + Relative Clause + Head.



- (113) ekkinchi-da siz-ga osha [eringiz-ga bujur-gan]  
second-LOC 2FRM-DAT DEM your.man-DAT order-PRT

täm-inaret-im-ni baGishlayman.  
building-edifice-1SG-ACC I.give

'And secondly I will give you the building I have ordered your husband to build.' (J65.241)

- (114) bir [qän-ga buya-il-gan] pichaq täpildi.  
one blood-DAT dye-PASS-PRT knife it.was.found  
'A knife dyed with blood was found.' (J100.122)

The determiner very rarely appears between the relative clause and the head, as in 115.

- (115) [goli-ga bir bäshi-ga yäpinadi-gan] bir  
his.hand-DAT one his.head-DAT he.wraps-PRT one

charsu-ni berdi.  
shawl-ACC she.gave.

'She gave him a shawl which he wraps around his head.' (J56.18)

The other position in which a determiner occurs is seen in 116, the only example of this determiner position in my data.

- (116) dutar [uzbeklar-ni bir yaxshi chola-il-at-gan]  
guitar Uzbeks-GEN one good play-PASS-CAUS-PRT

söz-i dir.  
instrument-3 COP

'The dutar (two-stringed guitar) is a musical instrument played well by the Uzbeks.'

*bir* 'one' in 115 and 116 might be a proform representation of the relativized noun.

### 3.6. Extraposition of the Relative Clause

There are possible examples of both preposed and postposed nonfinite relative clauses in my data for Southern Uzbek. The evidence for preposed relative clauses lies in the position of the determiner, so I will begin with the preposed relative clause. There is evidence for prepositioning of the relative clause in the position of the determiner in 115.

The difference in position of the determiner from 113 and 114 to its position in 115 indicates a preposed relative clause in 115.

There may be a postposed relative clause in the nonfinite relative clause in 117, if the relative clause is external.

- (117) tifäqan osha bay-ni ishiki-da ki  
 by.chance DEM rich.man-GEN his.door-LOC ÉZ  
 [xidmetkäri bälasi-ni soy-gan] hamda kor  
 his.servant his.child-ACC kill-PRT also blind  
 bolup qäl-gan edi.  
 becoming he.remained he.was

'By chance the servant in the house of the rich man,  
 who had killed the child, also had become blind.'  
 (J106.288)

The head appears at the beginning of the relative clause. If the relative clause is internal (as I proposed in section 3.2), then it is merely postnominal, not postposed.

### 3.7. Relativizability and Grammatical Relations

In this section I present the various grammatical relations which can be relativized in a nonfinite relative clause. I begin with the most easily relativized grammatical relation according to the Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy, the subject, and work down the Hierarchy from there. 118 exhibits a relativized subject and 119 a relativized passive subject. The *ki* clause in 118 is irrelevant as it is not a finite relative clause, but a direct object complement clause.

- (118) bir äz waxt-dan song [qiz-ni älib ket-gan]  
 one little time-ABL after girl-ACC taking go-PRT
- kishilar yol-da kordilar [ki ät-ni usti-da  
 men road-LOC they.saw COMP horse-GEN his.top-LOC
- bir tongGiz olturibdi].  
 one pig it.sat

'After a short time these men who had taken and gone with the girl saw on the road a pig sitting on top of a horse.' (J137.84-85)

- (119) tifäqan osha [yol-da ayäGi-dan äs-il-gan]  
 by.chance DEM road-LOC his.foot-ABL hang-PASS-PRT
- kishi-ni kozi kor bolib qäl-gan edi.  
 man-GEN his.eyes blind becoming remain-PRT it.was

'By chance the eyes of that man who was hanged by his feet beside the road had become blind.' (J106.294)

The following sentence, 120, shows two nonfinite relative clauses. Each has a relativized direct object.



(120) ...asta [ying ichisi-dan bekit-gan]  
 ...slowly sleeve its.inside-ABL fasten-PRT

jädu-si-ni [qäz-gan] jäy-i-ga tashlap...  
 charm-3-ACC dig-PRT place-3-DAT throwing...

'...slowly throwing the charm that he has fastened on the inside of his sleeve into the place which he has dug...' (J163.39)

Note the special morphological pattern that occurs when the direct object is relativized. The head noun is marked with a possessor agreement marker which corresponds to the person of the relative clause subject. When the relative clause subject is third person, as in 120, the possessor agreement suffix on the head is *-(s)i*.<sup>4</sup> In Southern Uzbek relativized direct objects in nonfinite relative clauses almost always occur with *-i* or one of the other possessor agreement suffixes on the head. In 121 the agreement suffix is *-im*, corresponding to the first person subject of the relative clause.

(121) ekkinchi-da siz-ga osha [eringiz-ga bu'ur gan]  
 second-LOC 2FRM-DAT DEM your.man-DAT order-PRT

täm-imaret-im-ni baGishlayman.  
 building-edifice-1SG-ACC I.give

'And secondly I will give you the building I have ordered your husband to build.' (J65.241)

If the subject of the relative clause appears, it bears a genitive case suffix, as in 122 and 123. The suffix

---

<sup>4</sup> [-si] occurs following vowels, [-i] following consonants, including glides.

is expected because the head bears the possessor agreement suffix which indicates a genitive case earlier in the sentence. In 122 we find the second person informal possessor agreement marker with the head.

- (122) mana [san-ni toG-gan] bacha-ing.  
 here 2INF-GEN bear~PRT son-2INF  
 'Here is the child you bore!'

- (123) bir-dan esi-ga [kata piri-ni ber-gan]  
 one-ABL his.mind-DAT big his.teacher-GEN give-PRT]  
 wazifa-si kelib qäldi.  
 duty-3 coming it.stayed.

'At once the duty that his great teacher had given him came into his mind.' (J128.81)

A similar pattern is found in Turkish, a close relative of Southern Uzbek. In Turkish relative clauses with relativized nonsubjects, the subject bears genitive case marking, and the head has a possessor agreement suffix that refers to the subject.<sup>5</sup> The participle used for relativizing subjects in Turkish is *-En*, a cognate of Southern Uzbek *gan*. Turkish uses a distinct participle for relativizing nonsubjects, but as just stated, uses the same pattern of marking as does Southern Uzbek.

A similar pattern of marking occurs when relativizing the subject of a passive clause. The possessor agreement marker occurs on the head, referring to the passive agent,

---

<sup>5</sup> Underhill 1972, Hankamer and Knecht 1976, Knecht 1979, Dede 1987.

and the genitive case suffix occurs on the passive agent. This occurrence of a possessor agreement marker and the genitive suffix follows the previously established direct object-subject pattern if one views a passive subject as equivalent to a direct object at another level and the nonsubject agent as the subject at another level. A relativized passive subject and passive agent occur in 124.

- (124) ducar [uzbeklar-**ni** bir yaxshi chola-**il-at-gan**]  
guitar Uzbeks-GEN one good play-PASS-CAUS-PRT

söz-i dir.  
instrument-3 COP

'The two-stringed guitar is a good musical instrument played by the Uzbeks.'

125 is the same except that the possessor agreement suffix is absent. There appears to be a semantic anomaly in describing a *täg* 'mountain' as being owned by a person.

- (125) alqissa [uluGi-**ni** osha ayt-**il-gan**]  
at.last their.ruler-GEN DEM say-PASS-PRT

täg-ni argasi-ga yetkizib tashladilar.  
mountain-GEN its.bak-DAT bringing they.threw.her

'At last, bringing her behind the mountain which was told them by their ruler, they threw her [corpse] away.' (J98.60)

A passive subject gets the possessive marker only if the agent (former subject) appears in the relative clause. The possessor agreement marker occurred in 124. In this sentence's relative clause the agent appeared. The



possessive marker is absent in 126 where the agent is only implied.

- (126) bir [qän-ga buya-il-gan] pichaq täpildi.  
 one blood-DAT dye-PASS-PRT knife it.was.found  
 'A knife dyed with blood was found.' (J100.122)

The head of a relativized direct object, however, carries the possessive marker even without the subject appearing in the relative clause, as in 127.

- (127) [älib bar-gan] murudlar-i jinlar albastilar  
 taking go-PRT disciples-3 demons chief.demons  
 edilar.  
 they.were

'The disciples he brought were demons and chief demons.' (J126.42)

Thus, when the direct object is relativized, the head consistently appears with a possessor agreement suffix, whether or not the subject of the relative clause (in genitive case) appears overtly. When a passive subject is relativized, the head bears a possessor agreement suffix only if the clause contains an overt agent (again, in genitive case).

I have only one example of an exception to this; in 128 the relative clause subject occurs as a nominative rather than as a genitive.

- (128) xätin [bay ber-gan] kiimlar-ni älib...  
 woman merchant give-PRT clothes-ACC taking  
 'The woman, taking the clothes which the merchant gave...' (J101.143).

Indirect objects are marked by the dative suffix *-ga*, as in 129.

- (129) san bir ming afGäni-ni muhäjir-ga berding.  
 2INF one thousand afghani-ACC refugee-DAT you.gave  
 'You gave one thousand afghanis (unit of currency) to the refugee.'

130 and 131 provide good examples of relativized indirect objects in nonfinite relative clauses.

- (130) [san bir ming afGäni-ni ber-gan] muhäjir  
 2INF one thousand afghani-ACC give-PRT refugee

bilan man ham gaplashdim.  
 with 1SG too I talked

'I too talked with the refugee you gave 1,000 afghanis to.'

- (131) man [ali toting-ni sät-gan] bälä-ni tänayman.  
 1SG Ali your.parrot-ACC sell-PRT boy-ACC I.know  
 'I know the boy Ali sold your parrot to.'

A paraphrase of 131 using a pronoun to represent the relativized noun, 132, is marginally grammatical.

- (132) ?[ali toting-ni u-ga sät-gan] bälä-ni man  
 Ali your.parrot-ACC 3-DAT sell-PRT boy-ACC 1SG

tänayman.  
 I.know

'I know the boy Ali sold your parrot to.'

Besides marking indirect objects, the dative also marks goal obliques as in 133.

- (133) songra san-ni **jäying-ga** yubaraman.  
 after 2INF-ACC your.place-DAT I.will.send  
 'Later I will send you to your house.' (J99.96)

A goal oblique may be relativized as seen in 134 and 135.

- (134) necha waxtlar [toxta-gan] **tämi-ni** tagi-ni  
 some time stay-PRT house-GEN its.bottom-ACC

qazip...  
 digging

'After some time he dug under the house where he was staying... ' (J74.162)

- (135) shu-ni bilan bu kishi [xizr-ni **tur-gan**] xilvat  
 DEM-GEN with DEM person Khizr-GEN stay-PRT hidden

**yeri-ga** barib...  
 his.place-DAT going

'With that, this man going to the hidden place where Khizr was living... ' (J131.26)

The relativized noun in 141 is a goal with dative case rather than a locative because of its ungrammaticality as a locative when not relativized -- see 136 and 137.<sup>6</sup>

- (136) xizr xilvat yeri-ga turadi.  
 Khizr hidden his.place-DAT he.stays  
 'Khizr lives in a hidden place.'

- (137) \*xizr xilvat yeri-da turadi.  
 Khizr hidden his.place-LOC he.stays  
 'Khizr lives in a hidden place.'

Locative obliques are also relativizable as in 138.

---

<sup>6</sup> The grammaticality of 136 and 137 reverses in Standard Uzbek. In Standard Uzbek the locative would be grammatical and the dative ungrammatical.



- (138) shu soz bilan osha [oltur-gan] orni-da  
 DEM word with DEM sit-PRT his.place-LOC

olturib qäldi.  
 sitting he.remained

'With these words it remained sitting at the place  
 where it sat.' (J2.36)

The more common relativized locative oblique  
 expresses a block of time as in 139.

- (139) [buri shir-ga tulki-ni cäq-gan] waxt-da...  
 wolf lion-DAT fox-ACC slander-PRT time-LOC  
 'In the time which the wolf slandered the the fox to  
 the lion...' (J6.15)

The least relativizable grammatical relation  
 according to the Noun Phrase Hierarchy is the genitive.  
 Both 140 and 141 show relativized genitives; 141's  
 relativized genitive occurs with a genitive head.

- (140) [kozi äGri-gan] kor [quläGi äGri-gan]  
 their.eyes ache-PRT blind their.ears ache-PRT

kishilar ham kelib bëshladi.  
 people too coming they.began

'Blind people whose eyes ached and people whose ears  
 ached also began to come.' (J105.275)

- (141) bu tul-xätin usha [mullalar yul-da gojasi-ni  
 Det widow-woman Det mullahs way-LOC his.soup-ACC

ich-gan] chupän-bäla-ni änasi edi.  
 drink-PRT shepherd-boy-GEN his.mother she.was

'This widow was the mother of that shepherd boy,  
 whose soup those mullahs had eaten on the way.'  
 (J20.111)

It is plain to see that a wide range of grammatical relations can be relativized in Southern Uzbek by nonfinite relative clauses. This would seem to contradict Downing's (1978:395) Turkish-based suggestion that nonfinite, participial relative clauses can only relativize subjects.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, Avery Delano, III. 1975. Studies in the syntax of relative and comparative clauses. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Bidwell, Charles E. 1955. A structural analysis of Uzbek. n.p.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1955.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1981a. Language universals and linguistic typology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1981b. The languages of the Soviet Union. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Downing, Bruce T. 1978. Some universals of relative clause structure. Universals of human language, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, Syntax, vol. 4, 375-418. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Fierman, William. 1985. Language development in Soviet Uzbekistan. Sociolinguistic perspectives on Soviet national languages: their past, present and future, ed. by Isabelle T. Kreindler, 205-33. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jarring, Gunnar. 1937. The Uzbek dialect of Qilich (Russian Turkestan) with texts and glossary. Lund and Leipzig: Lunds Universitets Arsskrift.
- Jarring, Gunnar. 1938. Uzbek texts from Afghan Turkestan with glossary. Lund, Sweden: C.W.K. Gleerup.
- Hankamer, Jorge, and Laura Knecht. 1976. The role of the subject/non-subject distinction in determining the choice of relative clause participle in Turkish. Harvard studies in syntax and semantics, ed. by Judith Aissen and Jorge Hankamer, 2:197-219.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Relative clauses. Language typology and syntactic description, ed. by Timothy Schopen, vol. 2, 141-70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-100.
- Knecht, Laura. 1979. The role of the genitive suffix in relative clauses in Turkish: a reply to Dede. *Proceedings of the fifth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 180-97. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Laude-Cirtautas, Ilse. n.d. *Chrestomathy of modern literary Uzbek*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Lee, Jonathan L. 1987. The history of Maimana in Northwestern Afghanistan: 1731-1893. *Iran* 25:107-24.
- Mace, John. 1971. *Modern Persian*. 2nd edn. Sevenoaks, Kent: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1984. Another typology of relatives. *Proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 524-41. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Noonan, Michael. 1985. Complementation. *Language typology and syntactic description*, ed. by Timothy Schopen, vol. 2, 42-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olcott, Martha Brill, and William Fierman. 1987. The challenge of integration: Soviet nationality policy and the Muslim conscript. *Soviet Union* 14:65-101.
- Perlmutter, David, M. and Scott Soames. 1979. *Syntactic argumentation and the structure of English*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Poppe, Nicholas, Jr. 1962. *Uzbek newspaper reader (with glossary)*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Poppe, Nicholas, Jr. 1965. *Introduction to Altaic linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Raun, Alo. 1969. *Basic course in Uzbek*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Saperstein, Andrew. 1993. Personal communication.
- Schwartz, Arthur. 1971. General aspects of relative clause formation. *Stanford working papers on language universals* 6:139-71.

- Sjoberg, Andrée F. 1963. Uzbek structural grammar. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Publications.
- Slobin, Dan Isaac. 1986. The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkic and Indo-European languages. *Studies in Turkish linguistics*, ed. by Dan Isaac Slobin and Karl Zimmer, 273-94. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Slobin, Dan Isaac, and Karl Zimmer. 1986. Introduction. *Studies in Turkish linguistics*, ed. by Dan Isaac Slobin and Karl Zimmer, 1-6. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Underhill, Robert. 1972. Turkish participles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1:87-99.
- Waterson, Natalie. 1980. Uzbek-English dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weston, Rosemary. n.d. *Conversational Uzbeki*, ed. by Anne Lee. England. Revision of untitled text.
- Weston, Rosemary. n.d. Untitled text for conversational Uzbeki. Unpublished.