Werk

Titel: A hierarchical explanation against the distinction of nominal copular sentences i...

Autor: Uzun, Nadir Engin

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2006

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0010|LOG_0015

Kontakt/Contact

A hierarchical explanation against the distinction of nominal copular sentences in Turkish

Nadir Engin Uzun

A philosophically-based distinction which divides nominal copular sentences into two types, "attributives" and "equatives", and which has been considered in linguistics for a long time has never been studied in Turkish. Only Tura (1986) suggests that "equative-attributive" distinction is also observed in Turkish. In this paper, I will claim that this distinction is not valid for nominal copular sentences, at least in Turkish, and show that the inversion observed in such sentences is not subject to a distinction of sentence types, but to a semantic hierarchy among noun phrase types. Drawing on the data of personal pronouns in copular sentences from Turkish and various other languages, I will also show that the semantic hierarchy seems to be typologically formed.

Ankara University, DTCF Dilbilim Bölümü, Sıhhiye 06100 Ankara, Turkey.
uzun@humanity.ankara.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Various aspects of copular sentences in Turkish have received a great deal of attention over the last decade since the comprehensive work of Lees in 1972 (see Kornfilt 1996, Johanson 2000, Göksel 2001, Kelepir 2002). However, a philosophically-based distinction which divides nominal copular sentences into two types, "attributives" and "equatives", and which has been considered in linguistics for a long time has never been studied in Turkish, except by Tura (1986).

According to Tura (1986), the following examples support a distinction between attributive nominal copular sentences and equative ones:

(1) | *Bu* | *adam* | *bir* | *hırsız* |
|---|---|---|---|
| this | man | a | thief |
| */iyi* | *bir* | *doktor* | |
| good | a | doctor | |
| */çok* | *iyi* | *bir* | *doktor-(dur).* |
| very | good | a | doctor-(EMM)[1] |

'This man is a thief/a good doctor/a very good doctor.'

---

[1] EMM stands for Emphatic Mood Marker and is used for marking predicative phrases in this paper.

(2) Bizim   dekanımız   Ahmet Dalmaç(tır).
    we-GEN   dean-POSS1PL   Ahmet Dalmaç-(EMM)
    'Our dean is Ahmet Dalmaç.'

While the attributive copular sentence illustrated in (1) cannot be inverted, the equative one in (2) can be inverted easily, as seen in (3) and (4), respectively:

(3) *Çok   iyi   bir   doktor   bu   adam-(dır).
    very   good   a   doctor   this   man-(EMM)

(4) Ahmet Dalmaç   bizim   dekanımız-(dır).
    Ahmet Dalmaç   we-GEN   dean-POSS1PL-(EMM)
    'Ahmet Dalmaç is our dean.'

In this paper I will claim that 'equative' and 'attributive' distinctions are not valid for nominal copular sentences and show that the inversion observed in such sentences is not subject to a distinction of sentence types, but to a semantic hierarchy among noun phrase (NP) types. Drawing on the data of personal pronouns in copular sentences from Turkish and various other languages, I will also show that the semantic hierarchy seems to be typologically formed.

2. Nominal copular sentences and inversion

Nominal copular sentences (NCSs) consist of two NPs and a copular element. The copular element in NCSs can be located in different syntactic positions cross-linguistically. For example, in the basic word order, the copular verb follows the two NPs in Turkish, whereas this type of verb occurs between the two NPs in English. However, the Irish copular element, which is not a verb, is normally placed first in the sentence. The formulas in (5) show these possibilities and the sentences in (6) exemplify them.

(5) NP_1 NP_2 cop   *Turkish*
    NP_1 cop NP_2 *English*
    cop NP_1 NP_2 *Irish*

(6) Ali   doktor   idi.
    John   is   the doctor.
    Is   é Seán   an dochtúir.
    (The copular elements are underlined.)

Another peculiarity of NCSs is that they can be classified into two types based on the semantic properties of NPs in the first and second positions. The NCS whose first NP is definite/referential but whose second NP is indefinite/nonreferential is called an "attributive copular sentence". The copular sentence in which both NPs are definite/referential is called an "equative copular sentence". (7) shows these relations.

(7) *Attributive copular Sentence*   *Equative copular Sentence*
    NP₁   NP₂   NP₁   NP₂
    def-ref   indef/non-ref   def-ref   def-ref

In attributive copular sentences, the secondary NP forming a unit with the copular element is considered a predicative NP. In such sentences the secondary NP attributes describe or classify the first NP. In equative copular sentences, referential sources of both NPs are equalized and the predicative element is the copular element.

The main difference between attributive copular sentences and equative ones is that the former cannot be inverted:

(8) a John is a teacher.   *Attributive*
    b. *A teacher is John.

In this respect, attributives are like adjectival copular sentences:

(9) a. John is honest.   *Adjectival*
    b. *Honest is John.

However, equative sentences invert easily:

(10) a. John is the teacher.   *Equative*
     b. The teacher is John.

In Turkish, where the copular element is the verb –*i* which appears when the tense, mood and agreement suffixes are needed, the picture is the same as in English at first glance. The examples in (11), (12) and (13) show the acceptability of the inverted forms of copular sentences in Turkish:

(11) a. *Ali bir   öğretmen-(dir).*
        Ali   a   teacher-(EMM)
        'Ali is a teacher.'
     b. **Bir öğretmen   Ali-(dir).*
        a   teacher   Ali-(EMM)

(12) a. *Ali   dürüst-(tür).*
        Ali   honest-(EMM)
        'Ali is honest.'
     b. **Dürüst Ali-(dir).*
        honest Ali-(EMM)

(13) a. *Ali   o   öğretmen-(dir).*
        Ali   that teacher-(EMM)
        'Ali is that teacher.'

    b. *O   öğretmen,   Ali-(dir).*
        that   teacher   Ali-(EMM)
        'That teacher is Ali.'

Note that the copular verb is absent when the subject is in the third person and the tense is present in Turkish.

On the other hand, when it comes to the presence of personal pronouns in so-called "equative copular sentences", a clear distinction between English and Turkish is apparent. It is not possible to invert a copular sentence in English when the first NP is a personal pronoun:

    (14)   a. *The teacher am I.
           b. *The teacher are you.
           c. *The teacher is he.

However this type of sentences inverts easily in Turkish:

    (15)   a. O   öğretmen   ben-im.
              that   teacher   I-COP1SG
              'That teacher is me.'
           b. O   öğretmen   sen-sin.
              that   teacher   you- COP2SG
              'That teacher is you.'
           c. O   öğretmen   o-(dur).
              that   teacher   he-(EMM)
              'That teacher is him.'

At this point, again note that the copular verb is not present in (15c) since Turkish has no agreement suffix for the third person singular.

Italian, like Turkish but unlike English, allows inversion in NCSs whose subject is a personal pronoun, a fact observed by Moro (1995) and (1997):

    (16)   a. Io sono il re della Francia.
              'I am   the king of France.'
           b. Il re della Francia sono io.
               'I am the king of France.'

The conjugated form of the copular verb (*sono*) for agreement in (16b) shows that the second NP, not the first one, must be the subject because the morphology of the copular verb belongs to the first person, not to the third.

As we see in (15) and (16), Turkish and Italian display different properties from English when it comes to inversion in equative copular sentences which have a personal pronoun in the first position.

On the other hand, the inversion is not always free in Turkish and Italian. In the examples of Turkish in (17)-(20) where the second position is also filled with a pronoun, inversion is blocked, except for the third person pronoun:

(17) a. Ben   sen-im.
         I   you-COP1SG
         'I am you.'
      b. *Sen ben-im.
         you   I-cop1sg

(18) a. Sen   ben-sin.
         you   I-COP2SG
         'You are me.'
      b. *Ben sen-sin.
         I   you-COP2SG

(19) a. Ben   o-yum.
         I   he-COP1SG
         'I am him.'
      b. O ben-im.
         he I-COP1SG
         'He is me.'

(20) a. Sen   o-sun.
         you   he-COP2SG
         'You are him.'
      b. O sen-sin.
         he you-COP2SG
         'He is you.'

In Italian, inversion is blocked whenever the subject is a personal pronoun, including the third person.

(21) a. *Lui sono   io
         he   be-COP1 I
         'I am him.'

Moreover, in Turkish, it is impossible to construct a sentence with the third person pronoun in the subject position when the first or second person pronoun is predicative.

(22) a. *O   ben(-dir)
         he   I-(EMM)
      b. *O   sen(-dir)
         he   you-(EMM)

Overt regular Turkish NPs also behave similarly to the third person pronoun in copular sentences in this respect.

(23)   a. *O   öğrenci ben(-dir)
            that   student   I-(EMM)

        b. *O   öğrenci sen(-dir)
            that   student   you-(EMM)

The picture is the same in Italian with overt NPs. Inversion in this language is constrained if there is an overt NP in the subject position and a pronoun in the predicate position, as in (24):

(24)   *Il   re   della Francia è   me
        ART   king   GEN   France   be-COP3   me
        attempted reading: 'The king of France is me.'

However, a pronoun in the predicate position seems to cause no problem in English:

(25)   That teacher is me.

The examples given in (14)-(25) make us think that inversion is not a valid criterion to observe the difference between equative and attributive sentences. What is more, some of the equative sentences cannot be inverted at all, and inversion seems to be affected by the type of NPs, including personal pronouns and overt NPs, not the type of sentence in which it occurs.

3. Towards a hierarchical explanation

The first structural analysis of NCSs within the generative framework comes from Tim Stowell. Stowell (1978) and then Stowell (1984) take the copular verb as a raising verb, a verb that does not assign any theta-role and case but selects small sentences as its complement. The first NP takes the external role from the second one and raises to the initial position of the sentence as shown in (26) and (27):

(26)   be [John the teacher]

(27)   John$_i$ is [t_i the teacher]

This approach, however, does not take any distinction between attributive and equative sentences into account. So, in his analysis the first phrase of the sentence should raise from the subject position to the sentence initial position as seen in (28):

(28)   The teacher$_i$ is [t_i John]

Heggie (1987), accepting the presence of equative sentences like *John is that teacher,* says that because *the teacher* in (28) also has an indefinite/non-referential reading, this phrase must have been raised from the predicate position of an attributive NCS. According to her, indefinite/non-referential reading is possible only with a phrase originally located in the predicate position. The most original evidence Heggie (1987) presents is that the focus in the basic order can be either on the first or the second NP, whereas in the inverted structure the focus can only be on the second NP, as seen in (29):

(29) a. JOHN was the teacher.
   b. John was the TEACHER.
   c. The teacher was JOHN.
   d. # The TEACHER was John (with the non-referential reading of *the teacher*)

Based on some tests used in Heggie's work, whose details will not be dealt with here, *the teacher* in (28) does not show any features of an argument because it is originally predicative.

Edwin Williams, who accepts that copular sentences are divided into two types, adjectivals and equatives in Williams (1983), later (see Williams 1997) claims that there are actually no equative sentences. He states that there is an epistemic difference, thus an asymmetry between the two NPs. According to Williams (1997), the idea that the subject is referential but the predicate is not is false, and the predicative phrase should only be considered less referential than the subject phrase.

In fact, it was noted by Heggie in 1988, long before Williams (1997), that there is an asymmetry between the two NPs of NCSs, and semantically the NPs can either be in exact balance or the second one is in a lower position in a semantic hierarchy, as she proposed for English in (30). "Deixis" (actually demonstratives) being at the top of the list are followed by (proper) "names", "definite descriptors" and finally "indefinites", respectively (see Heggie 1988: 106):

(30)   deixis > names > definite descriptors > indefinites

Within such a hierarchy, when we reconsider Heggie's (29c), we realize that the non-referential use of the first NP can only be possible when a proper noun is used in the secondary NP. Otherwise, if we reconstruct this sentence as in (31), this reading will disappear:

(31)   The teacher is a woman.

This obviously shows that the semantic features of NPs in NCSs affect inversion and related readings.

4. A semantic classification and hierarchy for Turkish NPs

In this section, following Williams' (1997) idea, I propose to put attributives and equatives, that is all NCSs, into the same category of nominal copulars by considering only adjectival copular sentences in (9) and (12) as attributives. According to this proposal, there are no "attributive NCSs" anymore.

And, applying Heggie's hierarchy to Turkish, I claim that whether nominal copulars can be inverted is determined by a semantic hierarchy which is formulated and defined based on semantic properties of NPs (such as definiteness, specificity, genericity) in this language.

Diagram (32) represents a typology including four types of NPs with three distinctive semantic features, and (33) represents the semantic hierarchy derived from this typology.

(32) *A semantic classification for Turkish NPs*

	definite	specific	generic
1st NP- type	+	+	-
2nd NP-type	-	+	-
3rd NP-type	+	-	+
4th NP-type	-	-	+

(33) *The hierarchy for Turkish NPs*
  1. 1st and 2nd personal pronoun (*ben, sen*) >
  2. definite specific NPs > (including proper nouns and the 3rd personal pronoun *o*)
  3. indefinite specific NPs >
  4. definite generic NPs >
  5. indefinite generic NPs

As can be seen, if one compares the NP-types in (32) and the levels in the hierarchy of (33), 1st and 2nd personal pronouns in Turkish are separate from the rest of the definite-specific NPs, including proper nouns and the 3rd personal pronoun.[2]

Now let's examine the hierarchy studying each NP type in (32) with Turkish NCSs.

(34) a. Pelikan   kuş(tur).
       Pelican   bird(EMM)
       'The pelican is a bird.'
    b. Kuş   pelikan(dır).
    c. Pelikan   bir kuş(tur).
       Pelican   a bird(EMM)
       'The pelican is a bird.'
    d. *Bir pelikan kuş(tur).

---

[2]   For the preliminary discussions of the classification in (32) and the hierarchy in (33), see Uzun 2003.

The sentences in (34a) and (34b), both of whose NPs are definite generic, and the sentence in (34c), whose secondary NP is lower than *pelikan* in the hierarchy, are fine, but if in the first position we put an NP which is hierarchically lower than the secondary NP, the sentence becomes incorrect, as in (35d). This observation states that definite generic NPs are higher in the hierarchy than indefinite generic ones, and the higher one must come first in copular sentences. The indefinite generic NP *bir pelikan* cannot stand at a higher position than *pelikan*, which is a definite generic NP. So, the hierarchy blocks the string with *indefinite generic NP + definite generic NP*.

The difference between the sentences in (35), on the other hand, shows that indefinite specific NPs are at a higher position than definite generic NPs. A sentence with *gizli polis* in the first position and an indefinite specific NP in the second position becomes ill-formed when the first NP takes a definite generic reading, as illustrated in (35b):

> (35) a. Bu okulda   bir öğretmen,   gizli   polis(tir).
>   this school-LOC   a   teacher   secret   police-(EMM)
>   'In this school one of the teachers is a secret police officer.'
>   b. *Gizli polis, bu okulda bir öğretmen(dir).
>   c. *Bir gizli polis, bu okulda bir öğretmen.

Of course, the blocking still works in sentence (35c) with an indefinite generic NP in the first position.

However, the incorrectness of (35b) and (35c) does not seem to be only a matter of hierarchy. When we look at (36), we find a more general restriction in Turkish copular sentences: Secondary NPs in nominal copulars can not be specific if there is a specific NP in the first position of a sentence.

> (36)   *Çocukların   dün   bahçede   yakaladığı   bir kuş,
>   children-GEN   yesterday   garden-LOC   chase-PART-AGR   a   bird
>   bu kuş(tur).
>   this   bird(EMM)
>   'This bird is a bird that the children caught in the garden yesterday.'

Before moving on to examples of first level NPs in the hierarchy, let's consider the second level NPs together with definite generic ones. The examples in (37) illustrate this relation:

> (37) a. Pelikan   bu   kuş(tur).
>   Pelican   this   bird-(EMM)
>   'The pelican is this bird.'
>   b. Bu   kuş   pelikan(dır).
>   'This bird is the pelican.'

The definite generic NP *pelikan* violates the hierarchy standing over the definite specific NP *bu kuş* in (37a), but the sentence is still perfectly grammatical. So, this means that (37a) is the inverted form of (37b).

The fact that both of the NPs can be focused in (37b) while only the secondary NP in (37a) can, strongly supports this claim:

(37')   a.   *?PELİKAN bu kuş(tur).
                Pelikan BU KUŞ.
          b.   BU KUŞ pelikan(dır).
                Bu kuş PELİKAN(dır).

Let us now focus on an example for uninvertible pairs: The indefinite generic NP in (38) violates the hierarchy and as a result, the sentence is ungrammatical. No sort of focusing can make (38) acceptable (see (38')). Skipping two levels of hierarchy should also be an effective factor.

(38)   *Bir pelikan bu kuş(tur).
(38')   *BİR PELİKAN bu kuş(tur).
              *Bir pelikan BU KUŞ(tur).

Here I claim that there is no inversion between NPs having the same status in the hierarchy. At this point, if we return to (34), we can say that neither (34a) nor (34b) is the inverted form of the other. We can observe this better when we compare the definite specific NPs that occur in (39) and (40) to the examples given before:

(39)   O öğretmen, Ali(dir).
              Ali, o öğretmen(dir).
(40)   O, Ali(dir).
              Ali, o(dur).

Crucially, we can focus all the NPs freely as illustrated in (39') and (40'), and this proves that there is no inversion among the pairs given:

(39')   O öğretmen, ALİ(dir).
              O ÖĞRETMEN, Ali(dir).
(40')   ALİ, o(dur).
              Ali, O(dur).

What is more, (39) and (40) indicate that definite specific NPs, including reference expressions, proper nouns and third person pronouns, do not stand in an asymmetric relationship to each other. This explains perfectly why proper nouns can stand in secondary position in small clauses in Turkish:

(41) a. Ben   Ali'yi   okuldan   bir   arkadaşın   sandım.
      I   Ali-ACC   school-ABL a   friend-POSS2SG   consider-PAST-1SG
   b. Ben   Ali'yi/seni   sen/Ali   sandım.
      I   Ali-ACC/you-ACC   you/Ali   consider-PAST-1SG
   c. Ben   Ali'yi   o   avukat   sandım.
      I   Ali-ACC   that   lawyer   consider-PAST-1SG

In contrast, as Rappoport (1995) observed earlier, the secondary position of small clauses in English is reserved only for non specific NPs:

(42 a. *I believe Jones a certain friend of mine.
     b. *I proved our professor Riki.
     c. *I consider Tali that woman over there.

Let us now consider the NPs at the top of this hierarchy and study this observation. First of all, let us make a quick statement: If the two NPs or two pronouns have different personal features, then the phrase whose feature is higher in the hierarchy determines the agreement. We shall now check this statement with Turkish examples:

(43) a. Ben   o   öğretmenim(dir).
      I   that   teacher-COP1SG-(EMM)
      'I am that teacher.'
   b. O   öğretmen   benim(dir).
      that   teacher   I-(EMM)
      'That teacher is me.'
   c. *O öğretmen ben(dir).

In (43a), based on the basic word order facts in Turkish, the first person pronoun which occupies the first NP position is the subject of the sentence and the copula must be inflected with the first personal agreement morphology. However, if we put the NPs in reversed order, as in (43b), we see that this time the copula agrees with the NP in the second position, since this inverted phrase is still the subject. The sentence in (43c), on the other hand, illustrates the unacceptability of the third person agreement morphology.

Again, we see that the top-most element determines the agreement whatever its position is in the sentence. The unacceptability of the focus on the first phrase in (43b') shows that this sentence is inverted:

(43b') O öğretmen BENİM(dir).
       *O ÖĞRETMEN, benim(dir).

The facts in (43) indicate that *o*, which is traditionally considered the third person pronoun, can not be a genuine personal pronoun. Therefore, I claim that personal

pronouns are divided into two groups, 1st and 2nd personal pronouns, and there is no third personal pronoun in Turkish.

Here is the supposed personal pronoun 'o' and the relationships derived from "the one at a higher position determines the agreement" principle:

(44) a. Ben oyum.   O   benim.
         I   he/she-COP1SG   He/She I- COP1SG
         'I am him/her.'   'He/She is me.'
      b. *Ben o(dur).   *O   ben(dir).
         I   he/she-(EMM)   He/She I-(EMM)
(45) a. Sen osun.   O   sensin.
         You he/she-COP2SG   He/She you- COP2SG
         'You are him/her.'   'He/She is you.'
      b. *Sen o(dur).   *O   sen(dir).
         You   he/she- (EMM)   He/She you- (EMM)
(46) a. Ben senim.   Sen   bensin.
         I   you-COP1SG   You   I-COP2SG
         'I am you.'   'You are me.'
      b. *Ben sensin.   *Sen   benim.
         I   you-COP2SG   You   I-COP1SG

5. Cross-linguistic data

I believe that the semantic hierarchy for NPs in copular sentences is cross-linguistically configurated. The peculiarity of languages, such as presence of articles and demonstratives or the subdistinction of personal pronouns and their relations with demonstratives, may vary the hierarchical ordering of NPs. Therefore, it is to be expected that this hierarchy may affect the agreement relations between NPs and copulas differently in different languages.

Heycock and Kroch (1998) explain how the copular verb in Italian agrees with the NP in the second position in Moro's examples by pointing to the scrambling features of this language. They see a connection between the fact that the NP in the second position of copular sentences is the subject and the fact that the subject of a sentence in Italian comes after the verb, unless it is emphatic. This special connection could also be made for Turkish, which has scrambling features as well. However, Heycock and Kroch (1998) would be correct only if no other language that has parallel structures but lacks typical scrambling features existed. In addition, the scrambling feature is not a cline. Some languages, like Turkish, allow scrambling freely; some others, like Italian, are less free, and yet English shows this feature very poorly. How much scrambling is sufficient for inversion?

When we deal with inversion, which has many language-specific features, we are forced to state that the facts must be motivated by lexical sources of languages. At this point, I believe we can explain unexpected inversion aspects of languages through the configuration of lexical categories in a semantic hierarchy.

Let us look at Serbian, which shows parallel behavior with Italian, and Urdu, which shows parallel behavior with Turkish in respect to the personal pronoun hierarchy.[3]

In Italian, personal pronouns are divided into three as in (47), and the copular verb is conjugated in three different forms with these three personal pronouns as in (48):

(47) io   ('I')
      tu   ('you')
      lui   ('he')
(48) sono ('be' for 1st person singular)
      sei   ('be' for 2nd person singular)
      è   ('be' for 3rd person singular)

The personal pronoun which comes first, including also the 3rd person pronoun, determines the agreement in Italian, as seen in (49):

(49) a. Io sono te.
        I am   you
        'I am you.'
     b. Tu sei   me.
        you are   me
        'You are me.'
     c. Lui è   me.
        he is me
        'He is me.'

If we invert the examples in (49), the pronoun in the second position which will be in the first position after the inversion, does not allow the copular verb to agree with the pronoun which will be in the second position after the inversion, contrary to the fact that Italian easily allows this type of configuration with the overt NPs in (16):

(50) a. *Io   sei   tu.
         I   are   you
     b. *Tu   sono io.
         you am   I
     c. *Lui sono io.
         he   am   I
     d. *Lui sei   tu.
         he   are   you

In Serbian, personal pronouns are also divided into three, as in (51), and the copular verb is conjugated according to these personal pronouns as in (52):

---

[3] For a deeper discussion of cross-linguistic data, see Uzun 2004.

(51)   ja   ('I')
        ti   ('you')
        on   ('he')
(52)   sam   ('be' for 1st person singular)
        ti   ('be' for 2nd person singular)
        je   ('be' for 3rd person singular)

In this language, the personal pronoun which comes first, including also the 3rd person pronoun, determines the agreement, as in Italian:

(53) a. Ja sam ti.
     b. Ti si ja.
     c. On je(ste) ti/ja.

Again, no personal pronoun in Serbian allows the copular verb to agree with the pronoun in the second position after the inversion, as seen in (54):

(54) a. *Ja si ti.
     b. *Ti sam ja.
     c. *On sam ja.
     d. *On si ti.

However, Serbian, just like Italian, easily allows the copular verb to agree with the personal pronoun in the second position when the first position is filled by an overt NP, as seen in (55):

(55)   Doctor sam ja.
        Doctor si ti.
        Doctor je(ste) on.

These examples indicate that these two languages give all personal pronouns the same place in the hierarchy.

On the other hand, in Urdu, although traditionally there are three personal pronouns as in (56), subject agreement facts are not the same as in Italian or Serbian.

(56)   men   ('I')
        tum   ('you')
        vo   ('he/she/it')
(57)   hun   ('be' for 1st person singular)
        ho   ('be' for 2nd person singular)
        he   ('be' for 3rd person singular)

Urdu, like Turkish, puts the third person pronoun in a different place from the other personal pronouns. Agreement facts in NCSs are the same as in Turkish in every aspect, as in (58):

(58) a. men   tum   hun.   *men tum   ho.
     I   you   am   I   you   are
     'I am you.'

   b. Tum   men   ho.   *Tum   men   hun.
     you   I   are   you   I   am
     'You are me.'

   c. Vo   men   hun.   *Vo   men   he.
     he   I   am   he   I   is
     'He is me'

   d. Vo   tum   ho.   *Vo   tum   he.
     he   you   are   he   you   is
     'He is you'

Thus, in my opinion, Urdu has only two personal pronouns for the first and second persons, and the pronoun (*vo*) is not in the same place in the hierarchy as the other pronouns. Urdu has two and Turkish has three demonstrative pronouns to mark different spatial positions. One of these pronouns (underlined in (59)) is also used as a personal pronoun in these languages:

(59)   ye 'this'   -   <u>vo</u> 'that'   *in Urdu*
       bu 'this' şu 'that' <u>o</u> 'that'   *in Turkish*

Urdu and Turkish use one of the demonstrative pronouns as the third person pronoun. At this point, a piece of evidence comes from the demonstrative classifications in the languages discussed here. There are specific demonstrative pronouns independent from the third personal pronoun in Italian and in Serbian.

(60)   questo 'this' codesto 'that' quello 'that' *in Italian*
       ovo 'this'   to 'that'   ono 'that'   *in Serbian*

Above all, the hierarchy may require some unfamiliar categories. Korean is one of the languages whose hierarchy shows a very special category.

In Korean, we find demonstrative pronouns independent of personal ones, so we expect that the subject NP can not be inverted if it is not higher than the predicative NP in the semantic hierarchy. But the picture is not that clear. First, let us look at the personal pronouns in Korean:

(61)   ne   ('I')
       neo   ('you')
       gu   ('he/she/it')
       oori   ('we')
       dangshin ('you')
       gudul   ('they')

In addition, this language has independent demonstrative pronouns, as seen in (62):

(62)   i   ('this')
        cheo ('that')

But, Korean has no personal agreement system realized on predicative elements. Therefore, there is no way to observe the inversion relations between the NPs in an NCS:

(63) a. Neka   sonsengida.
        I-NOM   teacher:COP
        'I am a teacher'
     b. Neoka   sonsengida.
        You- NOM   teacher: COP
        'You are a teacher'
     c. Guka   sonsengida.
        He/She/It-NOM teacher: COP
        'He/She/It is a teacher'
     d. Oorika   sonsengida.
        we- NOM   teacher: COP
        'We are a teacher'
     e. Dangshini   sonsengida.
        You(PL)-NOM   teacher: COP
        'You are a teacher'
     f. Guduli   sonsengida.
        They-NOM   teacher: COP
        'They are a teacher'

As seen in (63), the copular element (*i-da*) never changes due to different pronouns in the subject position, so personal agreement relations say nothing about inversion. At this point, evidence for inversion may come from another area of agreement in this language: "honorifics".

In Korean, when the subject is an honorific, the suffix *–sshi* is added to the predicative phrase preceding the copular element. Thus, in a copular sentence carrying this honorific suffix, we can say that there is inversion if we see an honorific lexical element in the second position, and a non-honorific element in the first position.

In (64a), the subject is not an honorific, so the copula does not need a suffix for the honorific. Therefore, the honorific suffix makes (64b) ungrammatical:

(64) a. Dodogi   neoida
        thief-NOM   you-COP
        'The thief is you'
     b. *Dodogi   neoisshida
        thief-NOM   you:HON-COP

But if we keep *dodog* 'thief' in the first position and put the honorifical word *songseng* 'professor' in the second position, we see that the honorific suffix may come before the copular element, as seen by comparing the sentences in (65):

(65) a. Sonsengi   dodogi(sshi)da
         teacher-NOM   thief-(HON-)COP
         'The teacher is the thief'
    b. Dodogi   sonsengi(sshi)da
        thief-NOM   teacher-(HON-)COP
        'The thief is the teacher'

Of course, the sentences in (65) will sound more natural if the copular element is replaced by the elements of exclamation as seen in (66):

(66) Dodogi   sonsengi(sshi)-ne/ya/guna
      thief   teacher-(HON-)EXC
      'The thief is the teacher!'

At this point, a problematic case appears when the sentences in (64) and (65) are put together: The sentences in (64) show us that Korean is similar to English in terms of inversion involving the personal pronouns and that this language puts its personal pronouns, including the third person, in a higher position in the hierarchy than the NPs, but the sentences in (65) unexpectedly show us that Korean is similar to Turkish or Italian in terms of agreement facts involving honorific NPs and that this language does not block inversion when the copular sentences have honorific NPs. Korean puts honorific NPs in the hierarchy as a particular lexical category, not only in respect to agreement, but also inversion.

6. Additional evidence for the hierarchical explanation

Lastly, let us see how a unitary approach to nominative copulars —considering all of them under one category— can account for an observation that Özsoy (2001) made following Contreras (1995).

Özsoy (2001) points out that small clauses in raising structures in Turkish behave differently with regard to the type of copular they include. Adjectival copulars in small clauses can construct a sentence while nominatives can construct only complex predicates, not sentences. In the same vein, we can also say that adjectivals can undergo negation and obtain a governing domain while nominals cannot, as exemplified in (67b):

(67) a. Herkes   [beni mutlu   değil]   sanıyor.
        everybody I-ACC happy   not   consider-PRES3SG
        'Everybody considers me not to be happy.'

b. *Herkes   [beni avukat değil]   sanıyor.
   everybody I-ACC lawyer not   consider-PRES3SG
   'Everybody considers me not to be a lawyer.'

Obviously, it is not possible to explain why (67b) is ungrammatical when we accept the traditional distinction for copular sentences as equative or attributive, and the idea that attributives include the ones whose secondary position is occupied by an NP as the embedded clause, as illustrated in (67b). The small clause in (67b) is actually an attributive NCS according to the definition in (7), so it is not different from the small clause in (67a) in respect to copular type. This case brings a question to mind: What makes (67a) grammatical, but (67b) ungrammatical?

At this point, assuming that a widely observed feature of NCSs occurs in Turkish, too, it becomes clear why nominal copulars cannot construct a sentence.

In Russian, attributive sentences have an optional copular verb while equatives have an obligatory pronominal. In Yiddish, copular sentences in the present tense do not have a copular verb, and attributives have an optional agreement pronoun, but this agreement pronoun is obligatorily used in equatives. English has an optional copular verb in small clauses whose secondary position is occupied by an adjective; however, it is obligatorily used when the small clause is equative:

(68)   I consider the winner (to be) a good runner.
        I consider the winner *(to be) Mary.

All of the above observations indicate that the equative nominal copular sentences have a copular element obligatorily; that is, the inflectional category is obligatory for this type of sentence. Assuming that this obligatory mechanism works in Turkish for "equative" copular sentences, for the NCSs within the framework of this paper, we can say that the NCS in (67b) can not construct a sentence since it does not have an inflectional category.

The ungrammaticality of (67b) also tells us that this copular sentence is still an NCS even if the secondary NP is indefinite, and that all NCSs are monosemic in Turkish.

7. Conclusion

This paper claims that inversion is not a criterion for the distinction of NCSs as attributives and equatives and that inversion facts in NCSs are determined by a semantic hierarchy.

This claim also states that only those grammatically well-formed sentences that violate the hierarchy should be considered as inverted. Therefore, I reject the analysis argued by Tura (1986) in which she proposes an inversional relation between (2) and (4), repeated in sentences a and b in (69):

(69) a. Bizim   dekanımız   Ahmet Dalmaç(tır).
      'Our dean is A. D.'
   b. Ahmet Dalmaç bizim dekanımız(dır).
      'A. D. is our dean.'

According to my claim, these two sentences are not only in their own basic word order, but also independent from each other, i.e., they are not derived from one another.

Moreover, this paper shows that the unexpected behavior of personal pronouns in terms of inversion can be explained based on how languages rank their lexical categories in this semantic hierarchy, and not on the scrambling features of these languages. This is where cross-linguistic variations such as the Korean data related to honorifics are especially significant since they draw attention to the need for examining more languages.

References

Göksel, Aslı 2001. The auxiliary verb at the morphology-syntax interface. In: Erguvanlı Taylan, Eser (ed.) 2001. *The verb in Turkish.* (Linguistik aktuell = Linguistics today 44.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 151-181.

Heggie, Lorie 1987. A unified approach to copular sentences. In: Borer, Hagit (ed.) 1987. *Proceedings of WCCFL 7.* Stanford, CA: Stanford Linguistics Association. 129-142.

Heggie, Lorie 1988. The syntax of Copular Structures. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southern California.

Heycock, Caroline & Kroch, Anthony 1998. Inversion and equation in copular sentences. In: Alexiadou, Artemis & Fuhrop, Nanna & Law, Paul & Kleinhenz, Ursula (eds.) 1998. *Papers on syntax of clefts, pseudo-clefts, relative clauses, and the semantics of presents perfect.* (ZAS Papers in Linguistics 10.) Berlin: ZAS. 71-78.

Johanson, Lars 2000. Traces of a Turkic copula verb. *Turkic Languages* 4, 235-238.

Kelepir, Meltem 2002. Olmak, var, yok ve değil. Paper presented in the National Conference on Turkish Linguistics (XVI), Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Kornfilt, Jaklin 1996. On copular clitic forms in Turkish. In: Alexiadou, Artemis & Fuhrop, Nanna & Law, Paul & Löhken, Sylvia (eds.) 1996. *Papers on clitics.* (ZAS Papers in Linguistics 6) Berlin: ZAS. 96-114.

Lees, Robert B. 1972. The Turkish copula. In: Verhaar, John W. M (ed.) 1972. *The verb 'be' and its synonyms: philosophical and grammatical studies. 5, Urdu, Turkish, Bengali, Amharic, Indonesian, Telugu, Estonian.* (Foundations of language. Supplementary series 14.) Dordrecht: Reidel. 64-73.

Moro, Andrea 1995. Small clauses with predicative nominals. In: Cardinaletti, Anna & Guasti, Maria Teresa (eds.) 1995. *Small Clauses.* (Syntax and Semantics 28.) San Diego, London: Academic press. 109-132.

Moro, Andrea 1997. *The raising of predicative. Predicate noun phrases and the theory of clause structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Özsoy, A. Sumru 2001. On 'small' clauses, other 'bare' verbal complements and feature checking in Turkish In: Erguvanlı Taylan, Eser (ed.) 2001. *The verb in Turkish.* (Linguistik aktuell = Linguistics today 44.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 213-237.

Stowell, Tim 1978. What was there before there was there. *Chicago Linguistics Society 14*, 458-471.

Stowell, Tim 1984. Subjects across categories. *The Linguistic Review 2*, 272-285.

Tura, Sabahat S. 1986. Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish nonverbal sentences. In: Slobin, Dan I. (ed.) 1986. *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 165-194.

Uzun, N. Engin 2003. Türkçenin koşaç tümceleri üzerine. A paper presented at the 17th National Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Anadolu University, Ankara.

Uzun, N. Engin 2004. Inversion and personal pronouns in nominal copular sentences. A paper presented at the ICKL Conference, Çolaklı.

Williams, Edwin 1983. Semantic vs. syntactic categories. *Linguistics and Philosophy 6*, 423-446.

Williams, Edwin 1997. Asymmetry of predication. In: Blight, Ralph C. & Moosaaly, Michelle J. (eds.) *The syntax and semantics of predication: Proceedings of the 1997 Texas Linguistic Society Conference*. (Texas Linguistic Forum 38.) Austin, Texas: Department of Linguistics, University of Texas at Austin. 323-333.