



UDK:113:4578:1614

**Muxammadjon MIRZAAXMEDOV,**  
English Teacher, Renaissance Education University  
E-mail: mrmirzaakhmedov@gmail.com

Reviewed by: U. Sadiqov, PhD, Associate Professor, Tashkent State University

### ANAPHORIC DEPENDENCIES IN KOREAN AND UZBEK

Annotation

This study aims to examine the behavior of anaphoric references in Korean and Uzbek sentences. The analysis focuses on a comparative investigation of the linguistic expressions used for anaphora in Korean and their counterparts in Uzbek. To guide this exploration, Lee's (1998) Referential Hierarchy (RH) of anaphora will be applied, which is based on three core principles: the Referentiality Condition, the LDB Condition, and the Relative Referentiality Condition.

**Key words:** Anaphora, pronoun, pronominal, reference, coreference, antecedent, phi-features, binding, local binding, long-distance binding, government, syntactic structure, referential property, Referential Hierarchy, Relative Referentiality Condition.

### KOREYS VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA ANAFORIK BOG'LIQLIKLAR

Annotatsiya

Ushbu tadqiqotda koreys va o'zbek gaplaridagi anaforik ishoralarning tabiatini o'rganilgan. Tahlil koreys tilida ishlatiladigan anafora ifodalari va ularning o'zbek tilidagi muqobillarini qiyosiy o'rganishga yo'naltirilgan. Tadqiqotda Lee (1998) tomonidan taklif etilgan (anaforik) Ishora Ierarxiyasi qo'llanildi. Bu yondashuv uchta asosiy tamoyilga asoslanadi: Referensiallik sharti, Uzoq masofali bog'lanish sharti va Nisbiy referensiallik sharti.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Anafora, Ishora Ierarxiyasi, nisbiy ishora, uzoq masofali bog'lanish sharti anafora, olmosh, pronominal, ishora, hamishoralik, oldingi element, fi-belgilar, bog'liqlik, lokal bog'liqlik, uzoq masofali bog'liqlik, boshqaruv, sintaktik tuzilish, ishoraviy xususiyat, ishoraviy ierarxiya, isbiy ishoraviylik sharti.

### АНАФОРИЧЕСКИЕ ЗАВИСИМОСТИ В КОРЕЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация

Данное исследование направлено на изучение поведения анафорических ссылок в корейских и узбекских предложениях. Анализ сосредоточен на сравнительном исследовании лексических выражений, используемых для анафоры в корейском языке, и их аналогов в узбекском языке. Для проведения этого исследования будет использована Иерархия Ссылок (IR) анафоры Ли (1998), основанная на трех основных принципах: Условие Ссылочности, Условие Долгосрочной Связи и Условие Относительной Ссылочности.

**Ключевые слова:** Анафора, местоимение, прономинал, референция, кореференция, антецедент, фи-признаки, связывание, локальное связывание, дистанционное связывание, управление, синтаксическая структура, референтное свойство, референтная иерархия, условие относительной референтности.

**Introduction.** Anaphoric relations refer to the connection between a pronoun (or other anaphoric expression) and its antecedent, which is the word or phrase it refers to in the discourse. Anaphora helps avoid redundancy by using pronouns like he, she, it, or they to refer to previously mentioned entities (Chomsky, 1981).

**Key points:** Anaphor: The pronoun or expression referring to an antecedent (e.g., «he» in «John went to the store. He bought milk»).

**Antecedent:** The noun or noun phrase that the anaphor refers to (e.g., «John»).

**Binding Theory:** Governs when and how anaphora can link to its antecedent, often with restrictions on position and agreement.

**Long-Distance Anaphora:** When the anaphor and antecedent are separated by clauses or sentences.

Anaphoric relations help maintain coherence in language and are essential for understanding sentence structure and meaning.

Anaphoric dependencies in Korean and Referential Hierarchy

Lee (1998) observes that traditional approaches to Long-Distance Binding (LDB), which differentiate between

monomorphemic and biomorphemic anaphors—assigning LDB effects to the former and local binding to the latter—are inadequate in accounting for certain empirical data. For instance, such approaches do not satisfactorily explain the behavior of the Korean biomorphemic pronominal anaphor kucasin, nor the distinctions between the monomorphemic anaphors caki and casin. To address these limitations, Lee proposes an alternative framework that links LDB effects to the referential properties of Korean anaphoric expressions. This leads to the development of the Referential Hierarchy (RH) for Korean anaphoric phrases:

ku>kucasin>caki>casin>cakicasin>selo

The hierarchy is established by examining the inherent semantic attributes—namely, the phi-features—of nominal elements (Chomsky, 1995). The following table presents the phi-features of Korean anaphoric expressions, as outlined by Lee (1998):

ku:	[p(3rd), g(male), n(sg)]
kucasin	[p(3rd), g(male), n(sg)]
caki:	[p(3rd), g(-), n(sg)]

casin:	[p(-),	g(-),
n(sg)]		
cakicasin:	[p(-),	g(-),
n(sg)]		
selo:	[p(-),	g(-),
n(sg)]		

The following table illustrates the phi-features that each Uzbek anaphoric expression carries:

u:	[p(3rd),	g(-),	n(sg)]
o'zi	[p(3rd),	g(-),	n(sg)]
uning o'zi	[p(3rd),	g(-),	n(sg)]
o'z-o'zi	[p(3rd),	g(-),	n(sg)]
bir-biri	[p(3rd),	g(-),	n(pl)]

Lee's proposal for defining referentiality between two elements that depend on each other can be defined by the referentiality condition. In essence, when comparing two anaphoric expressions (A and B) in the same linguistic system, if A contains more grammatical information (such as person, gender, and number) than B, then A is considered to be more referential or more specific in its reference. This implies that A provides more information about the identity or characteristics of the referent it points to compared to B. For example, in accordance with the Referential Hierarchy (RH), Korean pronominal *ku* is regarded the most referential of all due to the fact that it is fully specified in phi-features [person+, gender(m), number(sg)], thus enabling it to be placed on the highest position on the hierarchy. The reciprocal expression *selo*, on the other hand, takes the lowest position since it carries number feature only [person (-), gender (-), number (pl)].

In addition, the pronominal *ku* being more referential, can show longer in binding distance (LDB effects) than the rest, which is in accordance with the LDB condition. In simpler terms, the condition means that when an anaphoric expression is highly referential, it has the capacity to refer back to its antecedent even when there is a greater amount of language elements or discourse between them. Conversely, less referential anaphoric expressions may require a closer proximity to their antecedents to avoid ambiguity or ingrammaticality.

If two anaphoric expressions (i.e. *casin* and *cakicasin*) show semantically no difference and are equal in terms of phi-feature specification, relative referentiality between the two are defined with Relative Referentiality Condition which implies that if two anaphoric expressions (A and B) have identical phi-features, the one considered more referential is the one that can establish a binding relationship with the other. In this simpler terms, A can refer back to B in a meaningful and grammatical way, but B cannot do the same for A. This suggests that A is more specific or capable of referring to the other within the given linguistic context.

Lee's conditions provide a potential framework for analyzing Uzbek data. The hypothesis suggests that while these conditions may offer valuable insights into Uzbek anaphoric expressions, certain modifications may be necessary to account for the specific subtleties and complexities inherent in the Uzbek language. Based on the reviewed materials, five distinct types of Uzbek anaphors can be identified, which appear to exhibit similarities to those found in Korean:

#### Binding and Referentiality in Uzbek Anaphora

Let us investigate the binding behaviors of five anaphoric expressions in Uzbek—*u*, *o'zi*, *uning o'zi*, *o'z-o'zi*, and *bir-biri*—with a focus on their ability to exhibit discourse effects, local binding, and long-distance binding (LDB). Although these expressions share identical phi-features ([3rd person, unspecified gender, singular/plural]), they display distinct binding properties, suggesting that phi-features alone cannot account for their referential differences. By applying Lee's (1998) Referential Hierarchy framework, we can examine how lexical complexity influences referentiality and binding strength in Uzbek. Special attention is given to asymmetries in binding directionality, as seen in cases where more complex forms (e.g., *uning o'zi*) can bind simpler ones (*o'zi*, *o'z-o'zi*), but not vice versa.

According to the data presented all Uzbek anaphoric expressions exhibit identical phi-features. Therefore, they possess the same referential capability, in accordance with the Referentiality Condition. This condition posits that when evaluating two anaphoric expressions, A and B, within the same linguistic system L, A is considered more referential than B if A contains a greater amount of lexical content. This lexical content encompasses phi-features like person, gender, and number, in comparison to B.

LDB condition cannot be applied to the anaphors presented due to the presence of identical phi-features in all the anaphoric expressions, which would imply that they should all exhibit same binding distance. However, the data demonstrate variations in the binding behaviors of these anaphoric expressions. Therefore, Condition LDB may not provide an adequate explanation for why '*u*', '*uning o'zi*', '*o'zi*', and '*o'z-o'zi*' can exhibit long-distance binding (LDB) effects while reciprocal anaphor '*bir-biri*' is not capable of doing so.

Finally, let's examine the applicability of the Relative Referentiality Condition in explaining Uzbek anaphoric expressions.

The pronoun '*u*' can serve as the binder of the anaphoric expressions '*o'zi*', '*uning o'zi*', and '*o'z-o'zi*' but none of them can bind it which can be seen in:

Salimi [uj o'zi\*i/j-ga/uning o'zi\*i/j-ga/o'z-o'zi\*i/j-ga juda yoqadi] dedi.

Salim-Top he-Nom self/him himself/self-self much like said

'Salim said that he likes self/him himself/self-self much.'

\*Salimi [ uning o'zii/o'zii/o'z-o'zii ui-nga juda yoqadi] dedi.

Salim-Top he himself/self/self-self-Nom him- Acc much like said

'Salim said that he likes self/him himself/self-self much.'

Similarly, data shows that biomorphemic pronominal expression '*uning o'zi*' can bind both monomorphemic anaphor '*o'zi*' and the reduplicated anaphor '*o'z-o'zi*' whereas neither '*o'zi*' nor '*o'z-o'zi*' can bind '*uning o'zi*':

Mardonningi aytisicha [uning o'zii o'zii/j-ga/o'z-o'zii/\*j-ga ishonmaydi ].

Mardon-Top says self-Nom him himself-Dat/selfself-Dat trust not

Mardon says that self does not believe him himself/self-self.

Mardonningi aytisicha [o'zii /o'z-o'zii uning o'zii-ga ishonmaydi ].

Mardon-Top says self/selfself-Nom him himself-Dat trust not

Mardon says that self/self-self does not believe him himself.

In the case of *o'zi* and *o'z-o'zi*, the former can bind the latter but the reverse order is impossible:

Zohida [o'zi o'z-o'zi-ga va'da berdi] deb aytdi.

Zohida-Top self-Nom self-self-Dat promised said

Zohida said that self promised self-self.

\*Zohida [o'z-o'zii o'zii-ga va'da berdi] deb aytdi.

Zohida-Top selfself-Nom self-Dat promised said

Zohida said that selfself promised self.

Regarding the reciprocal expression bir-biri it cannot bind none of the other anaphors. However, it can be bound by o'zi and o'z-o'zi:

Sora va Lolai [ o'zii/o'zi-o'zii-miz bir-birii-miz-ni tanqid qildik] dedilar.

Sora and Lola -Top selves/self-selves-Nom each other-Acc criticize said

Sora and Lola said that selves criticized each other.

\*Sora va Lolai [ bir-birii-miz o'zii/o'zi-o'zii-miz-ni tanqid qildik] dedilar.

Sora and Lola -Top each other-Nom selves/self-selves-Acc criticize said

Sora and Lola said that each other. criticized selves.

It appears that, based on the data presented above, only Relative Referentiality Condition can account for certain distinctions among the Uzbek anaphoric expressions. Specifically, the greater referentiality of an anaphor can be associated with its binding characteristics.

Based on relative Referentiality Condition and the data related to Uzbek sentences, we can establish the following Referential Hierarchy (RH) for Uzbek anaphoric expressions:

u > uning o'zi > o'zi > o'z-o'zi > bir-biri

**Conclusion.** The investigation of Uzbek anaphoric expressions reveals that while all five forms—u, o'zi, uning o'zi, o'z-o'zi, and bir-biri—share identical phi-features, their binding behaviors diverge significantly. This undermines the applicability of the LDB Condition, which predicts uniform binding behavior based solely on phi-features. Instead, Lee's (1998) Relative Referentiality Condition effectively accounts for the observed asymmetries in binding directionality. More referentially complex forms consistently exhibit stronger binding capacity over less complex ones. As such, the proposed Referential Hierarchy for Uzbek anaphors—u > uning o'zi > o'zi > o'z-o'zi > bir-biri—reflects the nuanced relationship between lexical complexity and binding strength in Uzbek.

This analysis offers a preliminary assessment, and a more comprehensive investigation is required to fully uncover the complexities of Uzbek anaphoric expressions. Expanding the dataset and conducting deeper analysis will be essential for developing a more nuanced and reliable understanding of their behavior in the language.

#### REFERENCES

1. Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
2. Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
3. Lee, G. (1998). A-bar Dependency, Wh-Scrambling in Korean, and Referential Hierarchy. *Korean Linguistics*. 9:1-37.
4. Lee, G. (1998). Local obviation as a Relative Phenomenon. *English Language and Literature Teaching*. 5:63-78.
5. Lee, G. (2002). Phi-feature Specification and Anaphoric Dependency. *The Journal of English Language and Literature*. 6:35-47.