

ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ

UDC 81'44, 811.512.161, 811.521

Attributive Syntactic Patterns in Turkish and Japanese

A. S. Avrutina, V. A. Shishkin

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation

For citation: Avrutina A. S., Shishkin V. A. Attributive Syntactic Patterns in Turkish and Japanese. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Asian and African Studies*, 2024, vol. 16, issue 4, pp. 747–758. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2024.408>

The paper expands on the idea of analyzing the syntax of the Japanese language through the prism of V. G. Guzev's syntactic theory, as Turkish, on the material of which the theory was developed, and Japanese show a certain degree of typological similarity. The article explores attributive syntactic patterns of Japanese and Turkish from the point of view of this theory. Objective, attributive and adverbial models existing in the two languages are considered, and the existing similarities and differences are established. Study shows that adjectives in both languages are indifferent to whether the trait belongs to a noun or a verb. Peculiarities of direct object case marking in both languages are explored. Due to differentiated object marking phenomenon Turkish direct object may not be marked with accusative case suffix. Similarly, Japanese direct object is often affected by the omission. A comparative analysis of Turkish *ezafe* and Japanese *ezafe*-like grammatical models shows that these languages demonstrate a certain degree of similarity. Some of the Japanese *ezafe*-like models have emerged under the influence of Chinese. The paper discusses the substantive-adjective forms of Turkish, one of the important distinguishing features of V. Guzev's theory, and presents their Japanese counterparts. The terminology of the Polish researcher of the Japanese language A. Jabłoński took an important place in the study. Namely, regular adverbs and quasi-adverbs are distinguished, the former being considered as part of the adverbial syntactic subpattern and the latter as part of the attributive syntactic subpattern.

Keywords: Japanese, Turkish, contrastive linguistics, syntax, object, attribute, adverbial, attributive construction.

Introduction

According to N. Z. Gadzhieva and B. A. Serebrennikov, although the concept of “syntax” is crucial to modern linguistics and has a long history in this field of study, it is considered to be the weakest aspect of general linguistics [1, p. 16]. The syntactic archetype as

a type model has a certain morphological support which makes it possible to say that the material of different agglutinative languages, even if quite distant, demonstrates typological similarity to a certain extent [2].

There are numerous definitions of the term “syntax” in contemporary linguistics. Within traditional grammar, the syntax of a language is described in terms of a taxonomy of the range of different types of syntactic structures found in the language. The central assumption underpinning syntactic analysis in traditional grammar is that phrases and sentences are built up of a series of constituents, each belonging to a specific grammatical category and serves a specific grammatical function [3, p. 1].

The dominant theory of syntax is due to Noam Chomsky and his colleagues, starting in the mid-1950s and continuing to this day. This theory, known as Generative Grammar (GG), posits that sentences are formed by a series of subconscious procedures akin to computer programs. These procedures are inherent in our cognitive abilities, and the goal of syntactic theory is to model these procedures [4, p. 13].

One of the relevant modern syntax theories is introduced by the Russian Turkologist V. G. Guzev. This theory, functional at its core, suggests that syntax is a subsystem of language, which includes 1) syntactic inventory comprising intralingual correspondences of words and word forms appearing in speech; 2) rules of linear arrangement of words and word forms in speech; 3) abstract models formed in the human psyche, various structures larger than one word; 4) images of functions of autosemantic words as components of utterances (lexical subject — lexical predicate, subject — predicate, modifier — modified headword) [5]. This syntax theory has become the core of our paper.

Traditionally, functional grammar has been considered the most crosslinguistically proved linguistic paradigm. The primary goal of this paper is to confirm the findings from the initial study on Japanese and Turkish [6] by closely analyzing the attributive syntactic patterns in both languages. This paper aims not only to describe the chosen patterns, but it also proposes their crosslinguistic similarities from the viewpoint of Guzev's syntax.

General characteristics of attributive syntactic patterns

The attributive pattern is a model in which one component represents the modified headword while the other component represents the modifier (attribute, object, or adverbial). It consists of three subpatterns: 1) attributive which in speech generates constructions like *kırmızı elma* ‘red apple’; 2) objective used as a basis for constructions like *kitab(ı) okuyor* ‘is reading a book’ that are formed in speech; 3) adverbial which can be embodied, for example, in the construction *yarın geleceğim* ‘I will come tomorrow’ [7, p. 260].

Attributive syntactic subpatterns

Attributive syntactic models are the forms in which the relation of an object or action to its characteristic is reflected and generalized. Emerging in the linguistic system by abstracting from a variety of specific attributive constructions in speech such as *kara bulut* ‘black cloud’, *çabuk koşmak* ‘run fast’, these forms can be tentatively represented as a sum of its two components: attribute (trait) + headword (possessor of the trait) [5, p. 30].

In Japanese, the dependent component typically comes before the headword. This means that it is a consistent head-final language [8, p. xx]. In order to become an attribute, a word in Japanese needs nothing more than a change of position to the pre-head position [6, p. 12], as attributive forms of verbs and adjectives in Modern Japanese became indistinguishable from their respective final forms [9, p. 23]. As shown in the previous study, an adjective, adnominal or verb can act as an attribute to a noun, and an adjective as an attribute to a verb. Also, under the influence of “to”-infinitives in English, two forms (i. e., *beki* and *beku*) of the old auxiliary *beši* were adopted during Meiji: *beki* to modify a noun, and *beku* to modify a verb or an adjective, though the latter has already become out of date [10, pp. 24–25].

It is worth mentioning that, strictly defined, this is not a new knowledge. For example, according to Jabłoński, the attribute position in Japanese may be taken by any elements (including nouns themselves) but adverbs [9, p. 22]. However, it is a major point of Guzev’s terminology that the category of attribute encompasses some modifiers of verbs too (“traits of actions”). Just as an adjective in its adverbial form can act as an attribute to a verb in Japanese, an adjective in Turkish can act as an attribute to a verb too [7, p. 270]. It can be assumed that adjectives in both languages are indifferent to whether the trait belongs to a noun or a verb.

Guzev’s syntax treats nouns as if they function as adjectives, but in his terms, which are based on the material of Turkish, they all belong to the *ezafe* paradigm. *Ezafe* is a syntax model where nouns serve as both the attribute and headword, known as the attributive substantive model which is categorized into three types [5, p. 33]. According to V. G. Guzev and A. A. Burykin, this form of attributive substantive model is common in most agglutinative languages [2, pp. 110–111].

Ezafe I is a form of (unaffixed) *ezafe*, which is a combination of two unaffixed nouns, from the meaning of the first of which (attribute) a relative trait is abstracted. This trait may include the material, shape, spatial location, or other characteristics of the object referred to by the second noun (headword) [7, p. 274]. In Turkish, *ezafe* I is distinguished by the lack of any morphological indicators for both the attribute and headword:

- (1) *demir* *kapı*
 iron.NOM door.NOM
 ‘Iron door’

An approximate analog of this phenomenon in the Japanese language can be found in compound nouns. For example: *tecū + boo* ‘iron rod’. According to V. M. Alpatov, this feature is not originally inherent in the Japanese language, but it developed under the influence of the Chinese language [11, pp. 18–19]. Moreover, such compounds are not always possible to consider as single words (for example, in situations where the component not marked with the postposition *no* is subordinated to a marked component):

- (2) 今後の事業展開
koNgo *no* *jigyoo+teNkai*
 hereafter GEN business+development
 ‘Future Business Development’

The analogy is only approximate because the resemblance is purely morphological. In Japanese, “ezafe-like” clauses lack grammatical indicators that show attributive relationships. From a semantic perspective, in Turkish, ezafe I can only be used within attributive relationships that pertain to material, a person’s profession or social status, gender, or a qualitative characteristic of an object. In contrast, Japanese does not have these restrictions, as seen in (2). Therefore, a comparable expression in Turkish is constructed using ezafe II, as shown in (3).

Ezafe II is an attributive combination of two nouns with a 3rd person possessive affix in the headword (single-affix ezafe). This form is used to convey a wide range of relative traits abstracted from the meaning of the attributive component. It is this particular language tool that significantly reduces the need for relative adjectives in Turkish:

- (3) *İş* *gelişme-si*
 Business.NOM development.NOM-POSS3SG
 ‘Business Development’
- (4) *Çocuk* *kitab-ı*
 Child.NOM book.NOM-POSS3SG
 ‘Children’s book’

The postposition *no* is used in Japanese to convey the meaning of this ezafe:

- (5) 3月のライオン
saNgacu no raioN
 march GEN lion
 ‘The Lion of March’

In Turkish, the same phrase looks like this:

- (6) *Mart* *Aslan-ı*
 March.NOM lion.NOM-POSS3SG
 ‘The Lion of March’

Ezafe III — models which are realized in speech as constructions representing a attributive substantive model with a noun or pronoun in the function of attribute in the genitive case and with a noun-headword with the 3rd person possessive affix (double-affix ezafe), serving as a means of expressing the relation between objects, which the speaker considers possessive and, therefore, as it can be assumed, has the grammatical meaning “possessor + object of possession”.

In modern Turkish, this form serves as a means of conveying object relations perceived by the speaker as possessive relations [2, p. 111]:

- (7) *Araştır-ma-mız-ın* *bilgi-leri*
 investigate-NML-POSS1PLU-GEN information-POSS1SG
 ‘Our investigation information’

Upon comparing this form with the material of the Japanese language, it can be observed that the only means of expressing the same meanings as those indicated by the ezafe III in Turkish is the postposition *no*, which can also form possessive relationships with nouns or pronouns (in the Japanese, pronouns are only a semantic class of nouns [12, p. 472]):

(8) 私達の捜査情報

wataši-tači *no* *soosa+jyooohoo*
1ST-PLU GEN investigation+information'
'Our investigation information'

Regarding attributes in Turkish, there are two distinct verb-noun forms which are referred to by the term “**Substantive-Adjectival Form**” (SAF) introduced within the framework of the St. Petersburg Turkological school by V. G. Guzev himself. Possessing the temporal semeem (present/past and future) of tenses, they represent *action* as an *object* or a *trait* centered on the present moment. The representation of action as object is closely related to verb nouns (though Turkish verb nouns [masdars] have no temporal semeem) while action as a trait is associated with participles.

The examples below show the use of the SAF -dIk with the present/past tense indicator and personal suffix (9), future tense indicator and personal suffix (10) in modern Turkish.

(9) *Kıskan-dığ-ım* *ressam*
Envy-SAF.PST-POSS1SG artist
'An artist I envy'

(10) *Gid-eceğ-imiz* *tren* *peron-a* *yaklaş-tı*
Leave-SAF.FUT-POSS1SG train platform-DAT arrive-PST3SG
'Our train (lit. the train on which we will leave) has already arrived at the platform'

Generally, researchers do not differentiate participles and SAFs in Turkish. This is especially true for those working in the GG paradigm. GG deals exclusively with “relative clauses” and “participles” in Turkish, an approach fraught with a number of inconsistencies. Attempts to correct this, without overstepping the bounds of theory, lead to rather radical ideas. For example, E. Solak treats all participles as suffixes deriving noun phrases out of stemmed verb phrases and all relative clauses as noun phrases [13, p. 244]. Guzev's theory does not completely eliminate participles but instead reduces their number, as some of them are considered a separate phenomenon — the SAF.

However, Japanese syntax does not exhibit this phenomenon despite the language having the possibility to evolve in that direction. The same meaning as in (10) is conveyed in Japanese through the use of a relative clause:

(11) 私たちが乗る列車はすでにホームに到着しています。
wataši-tači *ga* *nor-u* *reQša* *wa* *sudeni* *hoomu*
1ST-PLU NOM ride-NPS train TOP already platform
ni *toočaku+ši-te-i-mas-u*
DAT arrive+do-PRO-AUX-POL-NPS
'Our train has already arrived at the platform'

Objective syntactic subpatterns

These models represent a type of attributive syntactic model that consists of two components: the object and its headword. They serve as a way to express the connection between an action, characteristic, or object with an object, and likely convey the idea that “the object is associated with the action, attribute, or object” [7, p. 282].

Çauşević suggests that Turkish has several ways of marking the object in its grammar [14, p.97]. The **direct object** may (12) or may not (13) be marked with an accusative case suffix *-(y)I*. This phenomenon is known to global linguistics as “**differentiated object marking**” (DOM). It was shown by Kornfilt and von Heusinger that case marking of the direct object in Turkish is conditioned by semantics, morphology and syntax. In Turkish, DOM is determined by the information structure, usually indicated by word order, and by the referential category of the specificity: If a direct object is topicalized in a sentence (which usually requires it to be specific), or if it is specific in its preverbal position, it must have overt case [15, p.41].

(12) *kitab-ı oku-yor-um*
book-ACC read-PRS-1SG
'I read a book'

(13) *araba kullan-ıyor-um*
car.NOM drive-PRS-1SG
'I drive a car'

In accordance with V. G. Guzev's theory, the indirect object in Turkish signals that the object is interpreted by the speaker either as the object of some indirect, mediated act, or as a secondary object, or as a participant in some other indirect syntactic relationship [7, p.282].

Similar to other languages that have flexible word order (Japanese allows both SOV and OSV), Japanese uses case-marking to indicate grammatical function assignment. In Japanese, the **direct object** is usually indicated by the postposition *o* (the accusative case marker), but what is unusual about this language is that speakers can often omit this case marker (14). In casual conversation the rate of omission for the accusative marker is 51 % [16]. It was shown by C. Kurumada and T. Florian Jaeger that case omission in Japanese is affected by both the demands inherent to the grammatical planning of utterances and communicative goals [17, p.170].

(14) 別、責任取れないからさ
becu Ø sekiniN Ø tor-e-nai=kara=sa
particularly DAT responsibility ACC take-POT-NEG=CSL=XCL
'It's not like I can take responsibility'

The indirect object in Japanese is usually marked by postposition *ni* (15) and all indirect objects are optional complements. Thus, the postposition *o* is used as an indicator of the second argument while *ni* is used to indicate the third argument [12, p.185].

(15) テーマパークに行きたい
teemapaaku ni ik-ita-i
theme-park DAT go-DES-NPS
'[She] wants to go to theme park'

Moreover, as Kuno observes, the case of a direct object in Japanese is determined by the stativity of a verb. When a verb is not stative, its object receives accusative case, but

when a verb is stative, its object is given nominative case [18]. Kuno demonstrates this with the following example:

- (16) *John wa nihoNgo o/ga hanas-e-ru*
 John TOP Japanese ACC/NOM speak-POT-NPS
 'John can speak Japanese'

In this case, direct object can be marked either by accusative or by nominative case. The former is used if *nihoNgo* 'Japanese' is felt to be the object of the lexically not stative *hanas* 'to speak', and the latter is used if *nihoNgo* is felt to be the object of the derived stative *hanas-e* 'to be able to speak' [18, pp. 138–139].

Adverbial syntactic subpatterns

This is a kind of attributive syntactic pattern consisting of an adverbial and a head it modifies. The meaning of this form signals that a phenomenon (most often an action) is connected with another phenomenon accompanying it and thus in some way characterizing, clarifying it [7, p. 288]. Adverbial models in Japanese are represented by converb forms of verbs, adverbs and postpositions.

V.M. Alpatov and V.I. Podlesskaya distinguish two types of **converb** forms in Japanese: a nonfinite verb form that consists of a stem and an inflection (primary converb) and a nonfinite verb form that consists of a primary converb in combination with agglutinative affixes or function words (secondary converb) [19, p. 465]. Primary converbs are represented by: gerund (*-te* form), infinitive (*-i* form), conditional (*-tara* form), provisional (*-ba* form), representative (*-tari* form), literary negative infinitive (*-zu* form), concecive (*-tatte* form).

In the syntax theory proposed by V.G. Guzev, the adverb is primarily understood as a lexical item representing an adverbial (as a syntax clause element) which refers to a phenomenon that accompanies another phenomenon and is connected to it [7, p. 88]. Whether there is an adverb in Japanese as a class of lexicon is debatable, but even if we were to single it out, it would turn out to be extremely scarce. In this study, we follow A. Jabłoński's approach of identifying regular adverbs and quasi-adverbs in Japanese [20, p. 13].

Regular adverbs, though few, include intensifiers and quantifiers, words carrying aspectual and modal meanings, etc. These elements are rather semantically close to regular adverbs of other languages and reveal specialized and strong adverbial character from the syntax perspective [20, pp. 14–15].

The group of **quasi-adverbs** includes several subgroups: adverbial forms/usage of conjugable adjectives, adverbial forms/usage of non-conjugable adjectives, adverbial forms/usage of other elements [20, p. 13]. Under the framework of the current study, this group is regarded as part of the *attributive syntactic subpattern* rather than the adverbial syntactic subpattern.

The characteristic feature of the Japanese language is an extremely extensive category of **postpositions**. For example, adverbials can be expressed with: *de* (instrument or locative); *to* (comitative); *e* (goal); *made* (terminative); *nite* (locative); *kara* and *yorì* (ablative) [12, p. 186].

The following are examples of the adverbials of manner in Japanese:

- (17) この軌道の近日点は太陽の周りを周回する形でゆっくりと移動している。
kono kidoo no kiNjicuteN wa taiyoo no mawari o
 this orbit GEN perihelion NOM sun GEN circumference ACC
šūkai+su-ru katači de yukkuri-to
 go.around+do-NPS form INS slowly-ADV
idoo+ši-te-i-ru
 move+do-PRO-AUX-NPS
 ‘The perihelion of this orbit is moving slowly in orbit around the Sun’
- (18) 全員が大声で笑って反応した
zeNin ga oogoe de waraQ-te haNnoo+ši-ta
 everyone NOM large.voice INS laugh-SEQ reaction+do-PST
 ‘They all reacted by laughing out loud’

As shown in (17), adverbial of manner can be represented by regular adverb *yukkuri-to*. Moreover, as stated by Chironov [21, p. 97], grammaticalized noun *katači* (with postposition *de*, though it is not essential) also represents an adverbial of manner in (17). Example (18) also presents two options: adverbial use of the noun by means of a postposition *de* and the gerund.

For comparison, in Turkish, the category of adverbial forms with postpositions and converbs includes more than a hundred units [5, pp. 53–62]. The following are examples of the adverbials of manner in Turkish: converb with suffix *-y(ArAk)* (19) and converb with suffix *-(y)A...* (y)A (20).

- (19) *Güneş gülümse-yerek selamla-dı onlar-ı*
 Sun smile-CNV greet-PST3SG they-ACC
 ‘The sun greeted them with a smile’
- (20) *Mehmet sevinç içi-n-de atla-ya*
 Mehmet joy inner.part.POSS3SG-CN-LOC jump-CNV
zıpla-yakoş-tu
 hop-CNV run-PST3SG
 ‘Mehmet ran, jumping for joy’

L. Johanson suggests that there are four levels of Turkish converb segment construction [22, p. 313].

At level 1, both the base segment and the converb segment are complete predications, as each of them has a first actant regardless of whether it is explicitly expressed or not:

- (21) *Tren istasyon-a var-ınca taksi gel-di*
 Train station-DAT arrive-CNV taxi arrive-PAST3SG
 ‘When the train arrived at the station, a taxi arrived’

At level 2, the converb segment and the base segment have the same first actant, the base segment just constituting a second predicate:

- (22) *Ben-i gör-ünce şaşır-dı*
 I-ACC see-CNV surprise-PASS3SG
 'He was surprised to see me'

At level 3, the base segment is a still more limited element. A common verbal phrase is formed where the base segment just constitutes a second predicate core:

- (23) *Al-ıp git-*
 Take-CNV go-
 'Take away'
- (24) *don-up kal-*
 Freeze-CNV stay-
 'To stay frozen'

At level 4, the base segment is just part of the predicate core, i. e., of a periphrastic construction where it functions as a grammatical marker. The converb segment subjunctive plus the base segment verb stem form a postverb expressing actionality, for instance, durativity by means of *-ıp kal-*.

Conclusion

An in-depth study of attributive syntactic patterns has shown that the syntactic structures of Japanese and Turkish display a significant degree of typological similarity. It is a major point of V. Guzev's terminology that the category of attribute encompasses some modifiers of verbs too.

Thus, within **attributive syntactic subpatterns**, both a noun and a verb can be a headword. The attributes to nouns in Japanese language are represented by adjective, adnominal or verb, and quasi-adverbs function as an attribute to a verb. In Japanese, an adjective in its adverbial form (quasi-adverb) can function as an attribute to a verb, and similarly in Turkish, an adjective can also function as an attribute to a verb. It can be assumed that adjectives in both languages are indifferent to whether the trait belongs to a noun or a verb.

The comparative analysis of Turkish *ezafe* and Japanese *ezafe*-like patterns shows that these languages display a certain degree of similarity at the contemporary stage of their historical development. Compound nouns can be considered a Japanese counterpart of **ezafe I** even though they developed under the influence of the Chinese language. The postposition *no* is used in Japanese to convey the meanings of **ezafe II** and **III**.

The SAFs are a distinct feature of Turkish attributive syntactic subpatterns. Possessing the temporal semeem (present/past and future) of tenses, they represent *action* as an *object* or a *trait* centered on the present moment. Their Japanese counterparts are relative clauses.

The Turkish **direct object** may or may not be marked with an accusative case due to the DOM. The Japanese direct object is typically marked by an accusative postposition, though it is often omitted. The case of a direct object in Japanese is determined by the stativity of a verb.

The Japanese indirect object is usually marked by postposition *ni* and all indirect objects are optional complements. The Turkish indirect object usually precedes the head-word, direct object demonstrates the same pattern. Indirect object signals that the object is interpreted by the speaker as some indirect influence (for example: *Öğretmene sordum* ‘I asked from the teacher’, or as a secondary object (for example: *Ben bu kitabı kardeşime aldım* ‘I bought this book for my brother’), or as a participant in some other indirect syntactic relationship (*yardıma muhtaç* — indirect addition ‘in need of help’).

Adverbial models in Japanese are represented by converb forms (primary and secondary converbs), adverbs and extremely extensive group of postpositions. In Turkish, the category of adverbial forms with postpositions and converbs includes more than a hundred units.

Japanese **regular adverbs** are regarded as part of adverbial syntactic subpattern and **quasi-adverbs** are regarded as part of the attributive syntactic subpattern.

Due to the extreme semantic extensiveness of the adverbial category in both languages, its variants have been demonstrated by the adverbials of manner.

List of abbreviations

1 — first person; 3 — third person; ACC — accusative; ADV — adverb; AUX — auxiliary verb; CN — connector (in Turkish); CNV — converb (in Turkish); CSL — causal; DAT — dative; DES — desiderative; GEN — genitive; LOC — locative; NEG — negative; NOM — nominative; NPS — nonpast tense; PART — participle; PLU — plural; POL — polite; POSS — possessive; POT — potential; PRO — progressive; PRS — present tense; PST — past tense; SEQ — sequential; SG — singular; TOP — topic; XCL — exclamatory.

References

1. Gadzhieva N. Z., Serebrennikov, B. A. *Comparative and historical grammar of Turkic languages*. Syntax. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1986. 283 p. (In Russian)
2. Guzev V. G., Burykin, A. A. Common structural features of agglutinative languages. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*, 2007, 1, pp. 109–117 (In Russian)
3. Radford A. *English Syntax: An Introduction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004. 384 p. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841675>
4. Carnie A. *Syntax: A Generative Introduction*. 4th ed. Malden, Wiley-Blackwell, 2021. 545 p.
5. Guzev V. G., Avrutina A. S. *Functional syntax of modern Turkish: A coursebook*. St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg University Press, 2013. 71 p. (In Russian)
6. Avrutina A. S., Shishkin V. A. Structural syntactic patterns of agglutinative languages (Based on Japanese and Turkish). *Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 2023, 9 (1), pp. 5–20. https://doi.org/10.22250/24107190_2023_9_1_5 (In Russian)
7. Guzev V. G. *Theoretical Grammar of the Turkish Language*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University Press, 2015. 320 p. (In Russian)
8. Shibatani M., Miyagawa S., Noda H. (eds). *Handbooks of Japanese language and linguistics*. Vol. 4: *Handbook of Japanese syntax*. Boston; Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 2017. 892 p.
9. Jabłoński A. Less is Better — on Japanese Parts of Speech. *Silva Iaponicarum*, 2013, iss. 35–36, pp. 11–26.
10. Miura A. The Influence of English on Japanese Grammar. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 1979, 14 (1), pp. 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/489539>
11. Alpatov V. M. Case variation in Japanese. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo humanitarnogo universiteta im. M. A. Sholokhova. Filologicheskie nauki*, 2014, vol. 1, pp. 14–33 (In Russian)

12. Alpatov V.M., Arkad'ev P.M., Podlesskaya V.I. *Theoretical Grammar of the Japanese Language*. Vol. 1. Moscow, Natalis Publ., 2008. 560 p. (In Russian)
13. Solak E. On relative clause in Turkish. *The VII International Conference on Computer Processing of Turkic Languages (TurkLang 2019)*. Kazan, Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk Respubliki Tatarstan Publ., 2019, pp. 240–249.
14. Čaušević E. *Grammar of the modern Turkish language*. Zagreb, Hrvatska Sveučilišna Naklada, 1996. 553 p. (In Croatian)
15. von Heusinger K., Kornfilt J. The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkic Languages*, 2005, vol. 9, pp. 3–44.
16. Fry J. *Ellipsis and wa-marking in Japanese conversation*. New York; London, Routledge, 2003. 204 p.
17. Kurumada C., Jaeger T.F. Communicative efficiency in language production: Optional case-marking in Japanese. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 2015, vol. 83, pp. 152–178.
18. Kuno S. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MIT Press, 1973. 410 p.
19. Alpatov V.M., Podlesskaya V.I. Converbs in Japanese. *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms — Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*. Ed. by M. Haspelmath, E. König. Berlin; Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 1995. pp. 465–486. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463-015>
20. Jabłoński A. On Japanese Adverbs and Quasi-Adverbs. *Silva Iaponicarum*, 2014, iss. 38–39, pp. 11–24. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sijp.2015.38/39.1>
21. Chironov S.V. Japanese katachi: From the marker of adverbial and beyond. *Iazyk i kul'tura: sbornik materialov XXVIII Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*. Ed. by S.S. Chernov. Novosibirsk, Tsentrazvitiia nauchnogo sotrudnichestva Publ., 2017. pp. 90–98. (In Russian)
22. Johanson L. On Turkic converb clauses. *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective: Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms — Adverbial Participles, Gerunds*. Ed. by M. Haspelmath, E. König. Berlin; Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 1995, pp. 313–348. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884463-010>

Received: February 5, 2024

Accepted: August 27, 2024

Authors' information:

Apollinaria S. Avrutina — Dr. Sci. in Philology, Professor; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3162-2825>, a.avrutina@spbu.ru

Valerii A. Shishkin — <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9362-9237>, st097583@student.spbu.ru

Атрибутивные синтаксические конструкции в турецком и японском языках

А. С. Аврутина, В. А. Шишкин

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9

Для цитирования: Avrutina A.S., Shishkin V.A. Attributive Syntactic Patterns in Turkish and Japanese // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Востоковедение и африканистика. 2024. Т. 16. Вып. 4. С. 747–758. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2024.408>

В статье развивается идея анализа синтаксиса японского языка через призму функциональной синтаксической теории В. Г. Гузева, поскольку турецкий язык, на материале которого была разработана эта теория, обнаруживает определенную степень типологического сходства с японским. В статье исследуются атрибутивные синтаксические модели японского и турецкого языков с точки зрения данной теории. Рассматриваются дополнительные, определительные и обстоятельственные модели, существующие в двух языках, устанавливаются существующие сходства и различия. Исследование показывает, что прилагательные в обоих языках безразличны к тому, принадлежит

ли признак существительному или глаголу. Исследуются особенности маркирования прямого дополнения в обоих языках. Из-за феномена, известного как «differentiated object marking», турецкое прямое дополнение может не маркироваться суффиксом винительного падежа. Схожим образом японское прямое дополнение часто подвергается эллипсису послелога. Сравнительный анализ турецких изафетов и японских изафетоподобных грамматических моделей показывает, что эти языки демонстрируют определенную степень типологического сходства. Некоторые из изафетоподобных моделей возникли под влиянием китайского языка, а не присущи языку изначально. В статье рассматриваются субстантивно-адъективные формы турецкого языка — одна из важных отличительных черт теории В.Г. Гузева, а также приводятся их японские аналоги. Важное место в исследовании заняла терминология польского исследователя японского языка А. Яблонски. В частности, выделяются так называемые *истинные* наречия и *квази-наречия*, причем первые рассматриваются как часть обстоятельственной модели, а вторые — как часть атрибутивной синтаксической модели.

Ключевые слова: японский язык, турецкий язык, контрастивная лингвистика, синтаксис, дополнение, определение, обстоятельство, определительная конструкция.

Статья поступила в редакцию 5 февраля 2024 г.,
рекомендована к печати 27 августа 2024 г.

Контактная информация:

Аврутина Аполлинария Сергеевна — д-р филол. наук, проф.;

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3162-2825>, a.avrutina@spbu.ru

Шишкин Валерий Андреевич — <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9362-9237>, st097583@student.spbu.ru