

Semantic Features of English Prepositions: An Analysis of Spatial and Temporal Meanings

Nargiza Amanturovna Naamatova

Senior Lecturer, Osh State University, Kyrgyzstan, nargiza8305@mail.ru

Nurzaada Abdibalieva Sadykova

Master's Student, Osh State University, Kyrgyzstan, sadykovanurzada7@gmail.com

Abstract

Based on the author's work, the features of a number of postpositions in the Kyrgyz language are considered. It is noted that despite the fact that the functions of postpositions are similar to the case endings of nouns, their functional scope is much wider. The author emphasizes that postpositions play an auxiliary role: they are used together with independent words, express the grammatical meaning of case endings, and act as connecting elements necessary to establish semantic relationships between the significant parts of speech in a sentence. It is shown that postpositions are capable of expressing the meanings of place, direction, instrument, reason, etc.

Keywords: postpositional construction, Kyrgyz language, Turkic languages, agglutination, postposition

For citation: Naamatova N.A., Sadykova N.A. (2026). Semantic Features of English Prepositions: An Analysis of Spatial and Temporal Meanings. *Open Journal of Eurasian Issues*, no. 4, pp. 186-193. doi: 10.65469/eijournal.2026.4.21

Introduction

In Turkic languages, there are linguistic units that do not have their own meaning and are not used as independent words, but directly perform the function of substitution in the formation of new words and the unification of linguistic units. According to L. Tenier, one of the authoritative researchers in the field of structuralism, there are two important categories of words: full-meaning words (*mots pleins*) and semantically empty words/incomplete words (*mots vides*). The first group includes words that have independent meanings, express abstraction or association, and are directly involved in the verbalization of a certain thought. The second group includes words that are not endowed with a semantic function and serve to mark, clarify a concept or introduce additional semantic nuances, and to establish connections between words. They are also called "grammar tools". While in languages such as Chinese, the difference between these two categories is clear, in some languages the boundaries between them are blurred [1]. In Turkic languages, characterized by agglutination, identifying grammatical tools is not difficult. These categories of words: full-meaning



words (*mots pleins*) and semantically empty words / incomplete words (*mots vides*) - differ according to the principle of semantic content.

Considering these categories of words in a syntactic aspect, Tenier distinguishes between independent words that are capable of forming phrases and sentences, and auxiliary words that cannot create syntactic constructions, that is, they are not structure-forming. However, auxiliary words can accompany an independent word, which is the structural center of a syntactic construction, thereby becoming part of it [1]. At the same time, at the morphological level, the scientist divides words into inflected words, in which formative morphemes express grammatical meanings and serve to connect words in a phrase and sentence, and indeclinable words, in which the connection with other words in a phrase and sentence is expressed in an analytical way.

Auxiliary units are service parts of speech and formants that do not exist as separate semantic units, so they cannot be used in isolation from an independent word or root. For example, in the Russian language, in combination of a noun with the preposition from the road, the preposition from in isolation from the noun the road does not convey information; we need to understand the meaning of the lexeme road; in the word jam, the suffix -eHj- is also devoid of independent meaning without the root -bap- (to cook). In the Kyrgyz language, for the word сүтчү (milkman) we need to know the meaning of the word сүт (milk), for the construction дарак үчүн *darak үchүн* (for a tree) or даракка окшоп (like a tree) we need information about the word дарак (tree). While derivational morphemes are semantic links between new and old information (as between productive and derived stems), inflectional morphemes are auxiliary links that structure a linear information structure (statement).

Methods and Materials. Postpositions are auxiliary units that convey information about location, direction, boundary, similarity, reason, result, formed under the condition of a combination of words that have the following categorical meaning: “state + state” or “state + action” [2]. Despite the fact that L. Tenier’s definition qualifies auxiliary morphemes as passive and completely concentrated on independent morphemes, it can be said that postpositions in Turkic languages usually change the valence of the significant word.

Since in Turkic languages there is no ending that can be separated from a word and form a postposition, all postpositions were created by semantic derivation from the significant parts of speech. From the roots of nouns or verbs, special units were formed, which acquired the ability to combine with new nouns or verbs, ensuring their inflection, and over time turned into postpositions. In the process of the evolution of postpositions, one can also observe the phenomenon of their transformation into case endings.

Postpositions as auxiliary units acquire meaning only if they form noun phrases together with nouns or verbs. In the process of mutual influence of independent words and postpositions, harmonization of sounds occurs, the so-called synharmonism.

According to B. Vardar, in the Turkic language post-positional noun phrases in combination with a predicate become post-positional complements (мектепке карай кетти - 'went towards the school') [2].

Both when solving problems related to the automatic processing of natural languages and when building a language theory, the researcher inevitably faces the problem of linguistic diversity. To solve this problem, different areas of linguistics use conceptually similar methods. Thus, in computational linguistics, when moving from one language to another, the parameters of a language

model are adjusted in accordance with a new set of data, and in theoretical approaches, the method of parameterizing the grammatical systems of specific languages is successfully used to describe interlingual variation [3].

The parameterization method is also applicable to the description of intralingual diversity. This approach is based on the assumption that language is a collection of grammatical systems. The different conditionality of grammar variants allows us to identify several types of intralingual variability [Gerasimova]. Firstly, variability can be considered within a linguistic community. The distribution of grammars in this case is determined by external factors: territorial (dialects), social (sociolects), functional-stylistic (styles, genres), historical (historical cross-section of the language). Secondly, there is a distribution of grammars among native speakers: each individual has an idiolect - the result of individual parameterization. The coexistence of grammars and their close interaction cannot be ruled out: for example, within the same language there are syntactically homonymous constructions, the choice between which is determined by private language licensors.

The purpose of the article is to explore intralingual variability in Kyrgyz postpositional constructions.

To solve this problem, three methods are used: corpus analysis, generation experiment and acceptability experiment, which allows not only to establish the distribution of options, but also to determine the status of the phenomenon from a synchronic point of view and from the perspective of language development.

1. Postpositional constructions in the Kyrgyz language

Postpositional constructions in the Kyrgyz language are formed by a heterogeneous category of lexical units, grammaticalized to varying degrees as functional ones [4] identifies postpositions themselves and postpositional words, which "... differ from postpositions in that they have living word-formation relationships and lexical-semantic connections with significant parts of speech...". Accordingly, postpositional words have a significant equivalent that has a lexical meaning:

Жазуунун үстүндө узаак отурду 'Долго сидел над письмом' in this sentence "үстүндө" is used as the postpositional word, «In the sentence-*Суунун үстүндө кайык сүзөт* — слово "үстүндө" play the role of the noun. [Кыргызская грамматика]. Postpositional words control the noun phrase in a specific case form.

So, for example, postposition *тарап* 'к' and и postpositional word *көрү* 'ввиду, из-за, по' govern dative, but postpositional word башка '*кроме*' и *соң* 'после' — ablative. A large class of postpositions and postpositional words are used with a noun phrase in an unmarked form, coinciding with the nominative - the case of the subject. This class includes postpositions proper, for example, *менен* 'с', *үчүн* 'для', as well as postpositional words associated with nouns with a locative or abstract meaning, for example, *үстүндө* 'над', *жанында* 'рядом, к', *ордуна* 'вместо' (ср. урын 'место'), *жардамында* 'благодаря' (ср. жардам 'помощь'). Often, postpositional words form groups united by a common base and distinguished by case affixes, for example, *жака* 'к' (датив), *жанында* 'около' (локатив), *жанынан* 'мимо' (аблатив); *артынан* 'за, вслед' (датив), *артында* 'за, позади' (локатив), *айынан* 'из-за' (аблатив). Kyrgyz grammar indicates that with postpositions and postpositional words of this class, noun pronouns are used in the genitive form. Thus, case variation arises in the postpositional construction: noun phrases based on a noun (or

substantivized attribute, verbal nominalization, etc.) show an unmarked form, while noun pronouns show a genitive form: «... *ал менен кылуу* ‘делать с ним (с братом)’, *ал үчүн* (досум үчүн) *тырышуу* ‘стараться ради него (друга)’». Kyrgyz grammar includes personal pronouns of 1st and 2nd persons as noun pronouns *мен* ‘я’, *сен* ‘ты’, *биз* ‘мы’, *сиз* ‘вы’, 3rd person pronouns *ал* ‘он’ и *алар* ‘они’, возвратное местоимение *өзү* ‘сам’, вопросительные местоимения *ким* ‘кто’, *нерсе* ‘что’, as well as a series of indefinite and universal pronouns formed on the basis of interrogative pronouns. The differentiated marking of an object in a postpositional construction is thus licensed by a formal factor—its morphosyntactic category. The difference between personal pronouns and other substantives is also manifested in the fact that postpositional words demonstrate personal-numerical (possessive) agreement with the genitive pronominal object [7].

The following examples show postposition forms that are consistent in person and number with a pronominal object: а. *алдында* ‘перед’; в (1с) — the same postposition in the 3rd person form. Жок, сиздиң мен алдымда бир гүнөнүз да жок. ‘Нет, вы передо мной ни в чем не виноваты. б. Таксырлар, азыр мен сиздердиң алдыңыздарда бир зор нерсе ачып беремин. ‘Господа, сейчас я открою вам (= перед вами) одну очень важную вещь’. Для исследования были отобраны две группы лексических единиц. Во-первых, это послелогии, не имеющие позиции для лично-числового согласования и синхронно нечленимые на именную основу и падежный аффикс: *аркылуу* ‘через, поперек, посредством’, *менен* ‘с’, *болуп* ‘подобно, в качестве’, *кошулуп* ‘впережку с’, *окшоп* ‘как’, *үчүн* ‘для’, *себеп* ‘из-за, по причине’, *сымаал* ‘как’. Во-вторых, это послеложные слова, формально совпадающие с падежной формой притяжательного склонения синхронно функционирующих существительных: *алдында* ‘перед’ (*ал* ‘перед’), *аркасында* ‘из-за’ (*арка* ‘спина’), *артында* ‘за’ (*арт* ‘зад’), *астында* ‘под’ (*асты* ‘низ’), *нигизинде* ‘благодаря’, *үстүндө* ‘над’ (‘верх’), *тарабынан* ‘посредством’ (*тарап* ‘сторона’), *айланасында* ‘рядом’, *турасында* ‘о’ (‘прямо, напротив’), *ордуна* ‘вместо’ (*урын* ‘место’), *чынында* ‘о’ (‘право, правда’), *жанында* ‘сбоку, около, у’, *жардамында* ‘благодаря’ (‘помощь’).

The postpositional construction is the result of grammaticalization of a nominal syntagm headed by a locative or abstract noun in one of the case forms. The dependent in the postpositional construction, accordingly, is a dependent and forms a possessive construction with the vertex. The possessive construction in the Kyrgyz language also demonstrates differentiated marking of the possessor argument. Traditional grammar distinguishes two types of possessive constructions - the isafetic construction and the isafetic construction.

2. Corpus research

We obtained materials for the study from the Kyrgyz national corpus “Улуттук тили” (“Mother Tongue”), which includes marked up texts in the literary Kyrgyz language and contains many word usages. The corpus includes texts of various genres: fiction, media texts, educational literature, scientific publications, etc. The corpus implements morphological search, has the ability to search by lexeme and word form, as well as search for several lexemes or word forms that satisfy certain linear or structural characteristics (for example, at a distance of 2 words, within one sentence, after a comma, etc.).

Using corpus material, possible constructions with given postpositions and postpositional words were studied for different morphological-syntactic classes of dependents. The dependents were: • personal pronouns 1–2 лица *мен* ‘я’, *сен* ‘ты’, *биз* ‘мы’, *сиз* ‘вы’; • местоимения 3 лица

ал 'он' и алар 'они'; • reflexive pronouns өзү 'сам' с изафетным показателем өзүм 'я сам', өзүн 'ты сам', өзү 'он сам'; •

Interrogative pronouns-nouns **КИМ** 'кто' и кемдер 'кто.pl'; • substantivized attributive pronouns кайсы 'который из нас' и which of us кайсы бири 'который из вас'.

Results and Discussion. Thus, the corpus study allowed us to make a number of non-trivial generalizations about the use of postpositional constructions of different structures in texts in the literary Tatar language, which were not reflected in grammars. However, the limitations of corpus research are also obvious. Firstly, it was not possible to find out how substantivized attributive pronouns behave in the context of postpositional words: they were found only in the context of postpositions менен 'с' and үчүн 'для' in an unmarked form, in an amount clearly insufficient for generalizations. Secondly, within the framework of corpus research, the problem of demarcating postpositional words and names arises, especially in semantically ambiguous contexts. So, in the example, only the involvement of a broader context makes it possible to understand that менин аркамда is here a postpositional construction 'because of me', and not a nominal syntagm 'on my back'

Conclusions

The conducted research showed significant differences between the characteristics of the postpositional construction presented in the grammatical description and observed in the linguistic behavior of Tatar language speakers. The differences concern both the choice of the case form of the dependent word and the possibilities of agreeing the postpositional word. First, noun pronouns do not form a single class with regard to case formation in the postpositional construction. The form of Lyutikova E. A., Gerasimova A. A. genitive is typical for personal pronouns of the 1st–2nd person and pronouns of the 3rd person singular numbers; other noun pronouns show a clear tendency to be used in an unmarked form, which is confirmed by both corpus and experimental studies. This pattern can be traced for both postpositions and postpositional words, although to varying degrees. Secondly, we can conclude that the process of grammaticalization of postpositional words has not yet been completed.

Despite the fact that in the corpus study nouns homonymous to postpositional words were not taken into account in their lexical meaning (control was carried out manually), and in experimental studies the functional meaning of the construction was quite strictly imposed by the context, a number of properties are observed that combine postpositional constructions with nominal isafetic constructions. These are: (1) the possibility of choosing the dependent genitive for non-personal pronouns and nouns; (2) preference for the non-possessive form of the postposition only with personal pronouns of 1–2 persons and, partially, with reflexive pronouns of 1–2 persons; (3) the correlation between the choice of the dependent genitive and the consistent possessive form, on the one hand, and the choice of the unmarked dependent form and the inconsistent possessive form. Third, the postpositional words themselves appear to be grammaticalized to varying degrees. In this regard, the contrast between the postpositional word *тырасында* 'о' and the almost synonymous postpositional word *тырасында* 'о' looks especially striking in the corpus; inconsistent possessive forms are recorded in constructions with personal pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons.

Apparently, this means that in the synchronic grammars of Kyrgyz speakers, the inconsistent possessive form is fixed as unchangeable. It can be assumed that other postpositional words will subsequently lose their position for personal-numerical agreement.

References

1. Теньер Л. Основы структурного синтаксиса / Л. Теньер / пер. с фр. И. М. Богуславского. — Москва: Прогресс, 1988. — 655 с.
2. Герасимова А. А. (2016) Параметрический подход к внутриязыковому варьированию: проблемы и методы // Рема. Rhema. № 3. С. 63–74.
3. Лютикова Е. А., Перельцвайг А. М. (2015) Структура именной группы в безартиклевых языках: универсальность и вариативность // Вопросы языкознания. № 3. С. 52–69.
4. Gerasimova A. A. (2016). A parametric approach to intralingual variation: problems and methods [Parametricheskii podkhod k vnutriyazykovomu var'irovaniyu: problemy i metody]. Rhema, № 3, pp. 63–74.
5. Татарская грамматика (1993) Т. 2: Морфология / Под ред. М. Ф. Закиева. Казань: изд-во Казанского гос. ун-та.
6. Pereltsvaig A., Lyutikova E. (2014). Possessives within and beyond NP: Two ezafe-constructions in Tatar. *Advances in the syntax of DPs: Structure, agreement, and case*. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 193–219.
7. Zakiev M. F. ed., (1993). Tatar grammar. Vol. 2: Morphology [Tatarskaya grammatika. T. 2: Morfologiya], Izdatel'stvo KGU, Kazan.

Евразия изилдөөлөрү ачык журналы, 2026, №4, бб. 186-193

doi: 10.65469/eijournal.2026.4.21

eijournal.ilimbilim.kg

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ / PHILOLOGY

УДК 811.111'367.633:81'37

Англис тилиндеги предлогдордун семантикалык өзгөчөлүктөрү: мейкиндик жана убакыт маанилерин талдоо

Наматова Наргиза Амантуровна

улук окутуучу, Ош мамлекеттик университети, Кыргызстан, nargiza8305@mail.ru

Садыкова Нурзада Абдибадиевна

магистрант, Ош мамлекеттик университети, Кыргызстан, sadykovanurzada7@gmail.com

Аннотация

Автордун эмгегинин негизинде кыргыз тилиндеги бир катар сүйлөмдөрдүн өзгөчөлүктөрү каралат. Басма сөздүн милдеттери зат атоочтордун регулярдык жалакчаларына окшош болгонуна карабастан, алардын функционалдык чөйрөсү алда канча кеңири экени белгиленет. Жазуучу сөздүн жардамчы ролун аткара тургандыгын баса белгилеген: алар өз алдынча сөздөр менен бирге колдонулат, септиктин соңунун грамматикалык маанисин туюнтат, ошондой эле сүйлөмдөгү маанилик кеп мүчөлөрүнүн ортосунда семантикалык байланыштарды орнотуу үчүн зарыл болгон байланыштыруучу элементтердин милдетин аткарат. Постпозициялардын орун, багыт, аспап, себеп ж.б.

Ачкыч сөздөр: постпозициялык конструкция, кыргыз тили, түрк тилдери, агглютинация, постпозиция

Открытый журнал евразийских исследований, 2026, №4, сс. 186-193

doi: 10.65469/eijournal.2026.4.21

eijournal.ilimbilim.kg

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ / PHILOLOGY

УДК 811.111'367.633:81'37

Семантические особенности английских предлогов: анализ пространственных и временных значений

Наматова Наргиза Амантуровна

старший преподаватель, Ошский государственный университет, Кыргызстан, nargiza8305@mail.ru

Садыкова Нурзаада Абдибалиевна

магистрант, Ошский государственный университет, Кыргызстан, sadykovanurzada7@gmail.com

Аннотация

На материале работы автора рассматриваются особенности ряда послелогов в кыргызском языке. Отмечается, что несмотря на то, что функции послелогов имеют сходство с падежными окончаниями существительных, их функциональная сфера намного шире. Автор подчеркивает, что послелогов играют вспомогательную роль: они используются вместе с самостоятельными словами, выражают грамматическое значение падежных окончаний, а также выступают в роли связующих элементов, необходимых для установления смысловых отношений между знаменательными частями речи в предложении. Показано, что послелогов способны выражать значения места, направления, инструмента, причины и др.

Ключевые слова: послеложная конструкция, кыргызский язык, тюркские языки, агглютинация, послелог