

Werk

Titel: Reports

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1997

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0001 | LOG_0038

Kontakt/Contact

Digizeitschriften e.V.
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Reports

Present-day Turcology at Moscow University

Jurij V. Shcheka

Shcheka, Jurij V. 1997. Present-day Turcology at Moscow University. *Turkic Languages* 1, 278-282.

This brief report contains information about research activities at the Department of Turcology of the Institute for Asian and African Studies of Moscow University.

The Department of Turcology of the Institute for Asian and African Studies at Moscow University was founded in 1943 by the eminent Turcologist and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR N. K. Dmitriev (1898-1954). He was first in the history of Oriental studies at Moscow University to combine a fundamental university education, general Turcology, with multiple fields of expertise in various Turkic languages, comparative-historical Turcology, Turkish folklore, the history and culture of the Turkish people.

At present, lecturers in the department teach Turkish to all undergraduates specializing in Turkish philology, history and economics as well as Ottoman, Tatar and Uzbek to those specializing in philology and history. The department also provides lectures on the following subjects: Theoretical grammar, history and lexicology of the Turkish language, problems of general Turcology, history of Turcological schools, comparative-historical grammar of Turkic languages, the Orkhon-Yenisei and Old Uyghur language monuments, medieval Turkic language monuments, typology of Russian and Turkish, Turkish dialectology, the theory of spoken language and its applications to spoken Turkish, experimental study of Turkish phonology and speech, Turkish intonation,

problems of historical literary typology, history of Turkish literature, Turkish folklore and literature, folk drama and the characteristics of its genres, the theory and practice of translation.

The graduates of the department working as full-fledged specialists in the areas of philology, history, economics, etc. show a high-level command of the Turkish language. Many decades of experience and the resulting methods of teaching Turkish and other languages are materialized in manuals, textbooks and dictionaries written by the members of the department. The latest and most important of them are: Ė. A. Grunina (1988), a textbook of the Ottoman Turkish language, J. V. Šćeka (1996), an intensive course in the Turkish language, (1992c), a Russian-Turkish phrasebook, and (1989), a book on spoken Turkish. There is also a forthcoming textbook of the Turkmen language by Ė. A. Grunina in co-authorship with M. Pendgiev and a Turkish-Russian dictionary by Šćeka comprising approximately 17,000 words and expressions. It should be noted that the important on-going changes in contemporary Turkish set some additional tasks in the designing of textbooks and compiling of dictionaries. Just to give an example, in many existing dictionaries one cannot find such commonly used words as *kaynaklanmak* 'result, spring from', *üstlenmek* 'undertake', *içermek* 'contain'.

Some other works of the lecturers of the department are directly connected with the educational process, e.g. a forthcoming study on the Turkish dialects of Anatolia by Ė. A. Grunina, a historical grammar of the Turkish language (Grunina 1991), and some publications by I. V. Borolina on Turkish literature (e.g. 1993).

The members of the department altogether represent a very wide range of scientific interests reflected in monographs, articles and reports presented at different conferences.

Ė. A. Grunina's scientific interests lie in the areas of both diachronic and synchronic linguistics and extend from problems dealing with older Turkic periods to those concerning the most important grammatical categories of the contemporary Turkic languages. In one of her latest articles (1996) she considers the synchronically existing homomorphy between the means of derivation and inflection as indicating their genetic relation. This approach leads to some far-reaching conclusions about the origin of many functional Turkic verb forms. At present, she is working on problems related to the Oghuz-Kipchak language community (the "mixed" character of the language of some monuments, the *olya-bolya* problem) and to the category of Turkic voice, which reveals many im-

portant peculiarities different from the active-passive opposition in Indo-European languages (Grunina 1993).

J. V. Ščeka's work is interdisciplinary (1993) and relates in particular to a radical methodological reinterpretation of the semantic approach which has become the norm in modern linguistics. In his opinion, structural semantics constitutes an unfounded postulation and a fruitless search for some structure at content level. Content has only one structure, i.e. the "form" corresponding to it. In practical terms, structural semantics is a structural formalism which studies correlations between different components of "form" (word, image, notion) of the integral linguistic-cognitive sign. Language does not only express cognitive notions (thoughts), but also acts (with a certain amount of sociopsychic energy) by means of emotions. Thus content is the motion of linguistic and cognitive structures. It can be "described" only quantitatively in terms of amounts of energy passing from the sociopsychic potential energy of certain forms into the corresponding kinetic (actual) energy (motion) of linguistic, psychic and social structures. A concrete development of this approach necessitates a mathematical apparatus to describe linguistic—and through it, also cognitive—forms. Any form being a regular reproduction of a finite—and therefore approximated—number of qualities can be represented by a discrete spectrum, which in principle opens a path to its quantitative description.

The approach outlined above is methodologically closely connected with experimental phonetics and phonology of Turkish, another one of J. V. Ščeka's fields of interest (1992a). Many phenomena of spoken Turkish and Turkish first language acquisition reflect in detail all the major phases of the evolution of language, which has its interdisciplinary analogy in the law of biogenetics. It allows the reconstruction of these phases, indicating their general characteristics and approximate chronology (1992b).

The areas of scientific work of D. M. Nasilov are theoretical grammar of Turkic languages, grammatical categories of the Turkic verb, in particular the problems of Turkic aspectology (1989), the history of Turkic languages, the study of Old Turkic texts, Old Uyghur morphology, the history of Turcology and Altaistics, and the sociolinguistic situation in the regions of the Russian Federation. Recently, Nasilov has also been investigating the problems of the revival and development of the Turkic and Altaic languages of small ethnic groups in Russia. He has written articles on many Turkic languages of Russia in encyclopaedic works. He

has also co-authored a textbook of the Shor language for students and school children (Nasilov & Šencova 1994).

P. I. Kuznecov is the author of many textbooks of the Turkish language which have been used for quite a long time and are still being used in the training of Turcologists. A new version of these textbooks awaits publication. Furthermore, he is the author of a large number of academic works concerning different problems of the theoretical grammar of Turkish as well as the etymology of the markers of many grammatical categories (1993). His articles are often cited by both Russian and foreign scholars. His latest articles deal with the origin of the predicative and possessive affixes in Turkic languages, the origin of some Turkic markers of preterite, and the origin of the Turkic affix *-leyin* and its possible relations with certain other markers containing the element *-l*.

The field of semantic research of I. V. Borolina concentrates on the problems of historical-literary typology and in particular literary contacts. She has studied the historical-typological principles of the contact between literatures, the poem "Khosrou and Shirin" in the Turkic literatures of the 14th and 15th centuries, the typology of genres (1993), the typology of literary subjects, especially migratory subjects in Turkish literature, and the Turkish version of Turandot (A. Necip's play "İdbar ve İkbāl").

M. M. Repenkova's academic activities are connected with the Turkish novel of the 1950's to the 1970's, particularly the peasant prose of that period (1989). Repenkova investigates the Turkish political novel (of the 12th of March) and its transition into the realistic subjective-psychological prose, as well as new trends in the development of the Turkish novel.

References

- Borolina, I. V. 1993. Tureckaja dramaturgija èpoxi prosveščeniya (genezis i èvoljucija žanrov). In: *Vestnik šelkovogo puti. Voprosy tjurkskoj filologii* 2. Moskva. 98-123.
- Grunina, È. A. 1988. *Učebnoe sposobie po osmansko-tureckomu jazyku*. Moskva: MGU.
- Grunina, È. A. 1991. *Istoričeskaja grammatika tureckogo jazyka*. Moskva: MGU.
- Grunina, È. A. 1993. K istorii tjurkskogo zaloga: Refleksiv, passiv. In: *Vestnik šelkovogo puti. Voprosy tjurkskoj filologii* 2. Moskva. 16-37.

- Grunina, Ė. A. 1996. K istorii tjurkskoj pretemporal'noj sistemy. In: Berta Á. & Brendemoen, B. & Schönig, C. (eds.) *Symbolae Turcologicae*. Stockholm: The Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul. 109-119.
- Kuznecov, P. I. 1993. Ėtimologii semi tjurkskix imennyx slovoobrazovatel'nyx affiksov. In: *Vestnik šelkovogo puti. Voprosy tjurkskoj filologii* 2. Moskva. 38-59.
- Nasilov, D. M. & Šencova, I. V. 1994. *Šor tilinge urgenčabys / Izučаем šorskij jazyk*. Kemerovo.
- Nasilov, D. M. 1989. *Problemy tjurkskoj aspektologii. Akcional'nost'*. Leningrad.
- Repenkova, M. M. 1989. Romancı Fakir Baykurt'un yapıtlarında geçen insan tiplerinin evrimi. *Aylık Edebiyat ve Kültür Dergisi*, Kasım/Aralık 1989, 33-36.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1989. *Tureckaja razgovornaja reč'*. Moskva: MGU.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1992a. Elementy teorii sintaksičeskoj svjazi i intonologii v sinxroničeskom i diaxroničeskom osveščanii (na materiale tureckogo jazyka). *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 5, 118-135.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1992b. Gipoteza o vozmožnyx etapax jazykovoju evoljucii (na materiale intonologii tureckogo jazyka). *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1, 83-99.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1992c. *Russko-tureckij razgovornik*. Moskva: Vysšaja Škola.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1993. Ėnergija jazyka i lingvofilosofija kak obščeteoretičeskie aspekty intonologii (na baze izučeniya tureckoj intonacii). In: *Vestnik šelkovogo puti. Voprosy tjurkskoj filologii* 2. Moskva. 78-97.
- Ščeka, J. V. 1996. *Intensivnyj kurs tureckogo jazyka*. Moskva: MGU.

The 8th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics

Lütfiye Oktar

Oktar, Lütfiye 1997. The 8th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics. *Turkic Languages* 1, 283-294.

The 8th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics was held from August 7 to 9, 1996 at the Faculty of Language, History and Geography, Ankara University, Turkey. This occasion was yet another milestone in the tradition originating at the University of California at Berkeley in 1982 on the initiative of Dan Slobin and Karl Zimmer. The 8th Conference on Turkish Linguistics, as the previous ones, brought Turkish researchers into contact with researchers from the United States, Europe, and Australia.

Lütfiye Oktar, Ege Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Bornova, 35100 İzmir, Turkey. E-mail: loktar@edebiyat.ege.edu.tr.

The fifty-four papers which were presented at the conference covered a wide range of topics on Turkish and various Turkic languages. In the first section, Talât Tekin delivered the introductory paper titled “Dilbilim ve Türkçe çalışmalarına genel bakış” (“General overview of linguistic and Turkish studies”) providing a look into the status of the full spectrum of Turkic studies in Turkey.

Claus Schönig, in “Turkish specialities—some remarks on Turkish-Turkic differences” argued that as a result of historical developments, Turkish has developed its own profile which accommodates structures that differ from those of other Turkic languages. Schönig focused on linguistic developments which may cause problems for Turkic-speaking students of different backgrounds.

Sumru Özsoy, in “Implications of the Minimalist Program for Turkish”, analyzed certain syntactic properties of Turkish, such as the clause structure, the antecedent-contained deletion construction and quantifier raising in the theoretical framework of the Minimalist Program for Turkish.

Jaklin Kornfilt, in “Constraints on free relative clauses in Turkish”, was concerned with three aspects of Turkish relative constructions: (i) the order of morphemes in the verbal complex of Headless Relative Clauses (HRC) with *-DIK* participial morphology; (ii) the lack of so-called “matching effects” in Turkish HRC’s; and (iii) the lack of HRC’s in the future / irrealis.

Sarah D. Kennelly, in “The position of nonspecific arguments in Turkish”, argued that the non-specific arguments, which are interpreted *in situ*, have both narrow scope and wide scope readings. She proposed a structural analysis to indicate the position of the non-specific arguments on a tree diagram.

Geoff Haig, in “The dative as default case in Turkish”, claimed that a systematic description of the dative in Turkish should be based on a functional description following the principles of case assignments in Role and Reference Grammar rather than on its core local meaning.

Celia Kerslake, in “Future time reference in subordinate clauses in Turkish”, was concerned with the conditions which determine the selection or non-selection of *-(y)EcEK* in subordinate clauses.

Hitay Yüksek, in “The multi-purpose future morpheme”, examined the morphological and syntactic properties of the future morpheme, *-ecek / -acak*. She proposed an abstract element *-ACAK* and a bound affix *-acak*; thus she systematically accounted for the structural and morphological properties of the construction which include the “future” morpheme.

Éva Ágnes Csató, in her paper entitled “Syntactic properties of postpositional phrases in Karaim”, stated that Karaim, like Turkish, belongs to the class of postpositional languages, and that, although the feature of postpositional phrases is a harmonic one for Turkish, it is not harmonic with the word order properties of Karaim. In this context, Csató asked whether or not the postpositional constructions in Karaim have the same syntactic properties as in Turkish. She concluded that the syntactic properties of the Karaim data reveal a number of important differences between the types of postpositional phrases found in Turkish and those in Karaim.

Aşlı Göksel, in “On the asymmetries between verbal forms in Turkish and Yakut”, discussed variations in relative clause constructions in Turkish and Yakut. She argued that the source of certain morphological and syntactic differences between the two languages is a morphological constraint on “word length.” She defined the term word length as the

upper limit of affixes a stem can bear and proposed that languages with identifiable affixes are parameterized with respect to this factor. Göksel then claimed that such an approach helps explain certain variations in clause structure in Turkic languages which have hitherto been attributed to idiosyncratic properties of the syntax of these languages.

Kamuran Koyunoğlu in her paper titled “Avustralya’nın resmi dil politikası ve toplum dillerinin ve özellikle de Türkçe’nin görünümü” (“Official language policy and the image of foreign language communities, particularly Turkish speakers, in Australia”), discussed the position of Turkish with reference to Australian multicultural / multilingual policy. It was interesting to hear about the positive attitude in Australia towards the Turkish-speaking community there.

Petek Kurtböke’s paper “A corpus-based analysis of Turkish community newspapers in Australia”, was a preliminary report on an ongoing computer-corpus based project whose aim is to investigate how Turkish is affected by contact with English. The corpus was created by selecting texts from a number of Turkish community newspapers. She claimed that close examination of the corpus provides evidence that the language used in the Turkish community newspapers deviates from the standard variety and transfer from English occurs at lexical and syntactic levels. In spite of the fact that Kurtböke’s study focuses specifically on the Turkish community, the findings offer a significant contribution to language contact studies in general.

Kutlay Yağmur, in “First language attrition among Turkish speakers in Sydney: A sociolinguistic perspective”, discussed the sociolinguistic causes of first language attrition within the framework of the Gilesian ethnolinguistic vitality theory. It was a highly illuminating paper.

Harry M. Klomp in his thought-provoking paper on “The structure of discourse and preferred argument structure”, attempted to relate John W. du Bois’ (1987) hypothesis of a “Preferred Argument Structure (PAS)” in discourse to the analysis of Turkish written narrative discourse. Klomp’s analysis indicated that in Turkish an almost opposite structure to du Bois’ PAS prevails. For Klomp, the source of this opposition stems from the way transitivity is determined in Turkish. As a result, he made the claim that Turkish discourse does in fact display a consistent ergative structure.

Ceyhun Aksoy, in “Context dynamics: Is relevance subscripted?”, stated that a pragmatic proposition is formed by an utterance as relevant to some context, though the utterance itself may be considered as a to-

ken for context analysis by the hearer(s). Aksoy also claimed that a storage pattern representing the elements of an initial context preceding the utterance may not exactly match the resultant pattern following an utterance as input. In order to test the validity of these hypotheses, he carried out an empirical study. With reference to the findings of this research, Aksoy claimed that within a dynamic-context framework, relevance is not a determining factor, but is utilized as a conscript of contextual flux.

Gürkan Doğan, in “Sözde emir tümceleri” (“So-called imperative clauses”), suggested a pragmatic approach to the interpretation of the imperatives whose grammatical structures do not display any differences but whose functions of conveying order / command seem to be questionable, as in (i) *Yaklaş da burnunu sileyim.* (ii) *Toz ol ya da burnunu kırarım.* (iii) *Yaklaş da burnunu kırayım.* (iv) *Çevir istediğin kanalı, karşına şarkıcı çıkar.*

Ümit Deniz Turan, in her paper called “Definiteness and information-status in Turkish”, investigated the relationship between the formal category of definiteness and information-status in naturally-occurring Turkish texts and attempted to answer the following questions: (i) To what extent do the formal grammatical definiteness devices of subjects and non-subjects correspond to ways in which the information status is represented? (ii) If the relationships between definiteness / indefiniteness and information-status is significantly high or categorical, is this an independent tendency or not? (iii) Can the imperfect morphological marking of definiteness be explained in terms of information-status?

Christiane Bulut, in “Strategies of relativization in an Ottoman Turkish text (17th century)”, analyzed the syntactic features of *Seyahatname* and showed that most of the morphosyntactic strategies forming subordinate clauses in present-day Turkish were already applied in Middle Ottoman. She also observed a functional distribution of genuine Turkish syntactic strategies and patterns which obviously developed under the influence of non-Turkic (Iranian) languages.

Yuu Kuribayashi, in “Complement incorporation and subject to object raising in Turkish”, argued that the notion of complement incorporation applies to various complement constructions, accusative complement constructions, and sentential complement constructions found in subject to object raising constructions. After presenting the descriptive data obtained from Turkish, he discussed the theoretical consequences with respect to complement incorporation.

Orhun Orgun, “Turkish direct object non-incorporation”, investigated the properties and the behavior of indefinite, non-specific direct objects in Turkish and pointed out their difference from definite direct objects. He claimed that Turkish does not have direct object incorporation, and that discourse pragmatics seems to be the only way to account for restrictions on Turkish direct objects.

Astrid Menz, in “Gagauz right-branching propositions introduced by the element *ani*”, reported that Gagauz exhibits a number of postpositive subordinated propositions which developed as a result of selective copying from the surrounding Slavic languages, and that unlike typical Turkic non-finite embedded constructions, these postpositive propositions contain introductory elements as well as finite predicates. Among the introductory elements, *ani* (Turkish *hani*) appears in a variety of subordinated constructions as in attributive and adverbial constructions and those functioning as complements. In this context, Menz discussed mainly whether *ani*-propositions are subordinated constructions or are more like Turkish *ki*-constructions. She went on to describe their syntactic differences, and the relationship between these patterns and their genuine Turkish counterparts.

İbrahim Ahmet Aydemir, in “Altay Tuvacası’nda gerundium cümlelerinin özne referanslarına göre tipolojik analizi” (“A typological analysis of converb sentences in the Altay Tuvinian language according to subject references”), carried out a typological analysis of converb sentences in Altay Tuvan and compared his findings with Turkish data.

Filiz Kırıl, in “Iran-Turkic: Use and function of morphosyntactic units copied from Persian”, described and defined the use and function of a number of Iran-Turkic morphosyntactic units, which are considered to be global copies from Persian, with particular reference to Azerbaijanian, Khalaj and Khorasan Turkic.

İlknur Keçik and Zülal Balpınar dealt with a current issue in Turkish in their paper titled “What happened to good old *ve*?” They focused on the use of *ve* and *artı* in terms of the spoken discourse of spontaneous conversations, talk shows and TV discussion programs and analyzed the data on the basis of social variables (age, sex, etc.), and textual and pragmatic aspects, in an effort to find answers to: (i) Is the use of *ve* and *artı* preferred by certain age, sex, or professional groups? (ii) Are they used interchangeably or are they in complementary distribution? (iii) What kinds of functions do they serve in a discourse?

Friederike Braun in her paper on “Covert gender in Turkish”, argued that although Turkish appears to be a gender-neutral language, closer inspection reveals that even apparently neutral forms in fact contain a gender bias. She presented the results of her empirical study which systematically investigates the putative gender bias of Turkish words. She interpreted the findings on the basis of prototype theory and the nature of linguistic categorization, and claimed that Turkish words have covert social gender that does not appear on the surface level of the language structure. Braun’s study was highly impressive in terms of its content. Yet, it would have been more convincing, if she had provided evidence obtained from the statistical analyses carried out on the results.

Kamile İmer, in “Türkçe-Lazca konuşan ikidillilerde kod değiştirimi” (“Code-switching by Turkish-Laz bilinguals”), conducted an empirical research in an attempt to describe the code-switching with respect to age and sex in bilinguals who speak Turkish and Laz. Her research findings demonstrated that elements of Laz exist in Turkish sentences just as elements of Turkish are found in Laz sentences.

Hristo Kyuchukov, in “Some characteristics of Turkish dialects spoken by Muslim gypsies”, presented the morphological and syntactic characteristics of two Turkish dialects spoken by two different groups from Northeast Bulgaria. Kyuchukov discussed the dramatic changes these Turkish dialects have undergone due to the contacts with Bulgarian and due to the influence of Romani.

Firdevs Karahan, in “Üçüncü kuşak göçmen Karaçaylarda düzenek kaydırımı üzerine bir çalışma” (“On code-switching by third-generation Karachays”), described code-switching in the language of third-generation Karachays, an ethnic group who live in Turkey. She argued that the use of Karachay by the third generation Karachay immigrants has decreased due to the influence of standard Turkish, and that social relations seem to be the determining factor in this code-switching.

Hanneke van der Heijden’s “Linguistic aspects of the Turkish of Turkish children in the Netherlands” was based on a longitudinal multiple case-study carried out in the Netherlands. The study compares Turkish-Dutch bilingual children with monolingual Turkish children regarding their acquisition of several devices for expressing tense, aspect, and modality.

Jeroen Aarssen, in “Temporal relations in Turkish children’s narratives”, focused on temporal relations in elicited narratives in the Turkish of Turkish children in the Netherlands, between four and ten years of

age. The data were gathered over a prolonged period of time at one-year intervals in a pseudolongitudinal design. First, Aarssen described the global temporal organization of the narratives. Then, he gave a detailed account of which explicit and implicit linguistic devices children use to indicate the simultaneity of events. Finally, he discussed the question whether there are any differences in the structure and rate of acquisition between the bilingual and monolingual group.

Yaşar Duyal, in “The acquisition of morphological causatives in bilingual Turkish children”, stated that Ammon and Slobin hypothesized that because Turkish, as opposed to Italian and English, primarily uses suffixes in causation, Turkish children rapidly acquire causative sentences. In his paper, Duyal re-examined this view from a different perspective, the acquisition of causative morphemes in Turkish and the probable strategies employed by bilingual Turkish children in their acquisition.

Rémy Dor, in “Counting-out rhymes of Turkey”, talked about the 1,200 counting-out rhymes which he culled from the archives that Pertev Boratav collected in the thirties and forties. He emphasized that the content of these counting-out rhymes is a valuable source of study for linguists, anthropologists and historians alike.

Seyhun Topbaş-İlknur and Maviş-Mine Başol, in “Acquisition of bound morphemes in Turkish”, conducted longitudinal research in order to observe various aspects of language development in 90 children between six and 72 months. They attempted to draw a developmental profile of the acquisition of bound morphemes, investigating the use of inflectional and derivational suffixes.

Seyhun Topbaş and F. Hülya Özcan in their paper “Pronominals and their pragmatic functions in the acquisition of Turkish”, presented the results of a longitudinal study which aimed at charting the developmental profile of personal pronominals in the language of 90 children between 6 and 72 months.

F. Hülya Özcan’s paper on “Comprehension of relative clauses in the acquisition of Turkish” was a cross-sectional study of children from age two to seven. The aim was to determine at what age Turkish-speaking children become aware of the existence of this particular structure and whether the comprehension of relative clauses occurs as slowly and as late as their production.

Seran Doğançan Aktuna and Sibel Kamışlı in their empirical study on “The linguistics of power and politeness in Turkish: Revelations

from speech act use” investigated the discourse strategies used by native speakers of Turkish when performing speech acts of correction and disagreement to status unequal interlocutors. This study draws attention to the relationship between social status, power, context and language use. They analyzed the data in terms of the linguistic markers of politeness within the framework offered by Brown and Levinson. The results of their study demonstrated style variation according to changes in the context of language use as well as changes in the role relationships of participants. Their study is a remarkable contribution to the study of applied linguistics in Turkey and cross-cultural communication in general.

Gülcan Erçetin, in “Linguistic norms of apologizing in Turkish”, employed a sociolinguistic framework to examine the linguistic formulas preferred by native speakers of Turkish in situations which require apologetic responses. Based on the findings from her research, Erçetin claimed that native speakers’ sociolinguistic behavior within the realization of speech acts is highly patterned and that some situations of apology are culture-specific.

Tooru Hayasi, in “Bolu ili ağzının coğrafi dağılımında yaylacılığın etkileri” (“The influences of transhumance on the geographical distribution of the dialect of Bolu province”), on the basis of evidence obtained from dialect studies carried out in Bolu, argued that in comparison with other parts, the southeastern part of that city exhibited a lesser degree of variety in terms of the lexical items. According to Hayasi, this phenomenon is the result of moving to the high plateaus in the spring, which leads to close relations among people, even though these places are remote from each other. Hayasi emphasized that close scrutiny of the language of such migrant peoples may provide dialectologists with valuable source materials.

Nurettin Demir, in “Temel ağız nedir, temel ağzı kim konuşur?” (“What is a base dialect and who speaks one?”), investigating the dialects spoken in Alanya, focused on how to determine the base dialect. His discussion of who spoke the base dialect was grounded in the theories of general dialectology.

Kathryn Libal Arik, in “Kazakh communities in İstanbul and Salihli” dealt with the issue of Kazakh language used by young children (aged two to six) in interactions with family members and peers. Her findings were based on research being carried out in Kazakh communities in İstanbul, Salihli and Manisa during 1996. Referring to the current lan-

guage socialization studies within the field of anthropology and recent considerations of Vygotsky's notion of the "zone of proximal development", she addressed language preference within adult-child and child-child interactions in Kazakh households.

Mehmet Çelik, in "Türkiye Türkçesinde geçmiş zaman eki *-miş* ve kombinasyonlarının Kazakça'daki karşılıkları" ("Comparison of the Turkish suffix *-miş* and its combinations with its Kazakh counterparts"), analysed written data such as novels, short stories, newspapers, magazines, etc., and oral data such as radio and TV programs as well as interviews with informants.

Esin İleri, in her paper entitled "Türkçedeki fiillerin birleşim değeri üzerine bazı düşünceler" ("Some thoughts on the valency of Turkish verbs"), discussed the valency of Turkish verbs employing the method developed by Gerhard Helbig who claims that the verb constitutes the nucleus of a sentence.

Fatma Erkman Akerson, in "Turkish indirect objects with trigger function", stated that in Turkish, indirect objects are those constituents having the morphological endings *-(y)E*, *-DEn*, and sometimes *-DE*. She argued that the phenomenon observed depends upon the function of those indirect objects, and that not all of them can function this way; rather only those with trigger function show this peculiarity. Thus, she added, their functional differences are also made apparent by the choice of morphological endings in relative clauses.

Şeyda Ozil, in "Ortaçlı yapıların ad olarak kullanımları" ("Uses of participle constructions as nouns"), examined the two functions of gerundial constructions, i.e., modifying the noun and conceptualizing a being or a state. She focused on what the differences are between these two functions and under what circumstances and for what purposes these constructions are used in Turkish.

Armin Bassarak, in "New steps towards an integrated model for Turkish inflection" introduced his proposal for integrating verbal and nominal morphology in a single model which reflects the regularities of the order of Turkish suffixes. He claimed that there are some cases where the question marker *-mI* does not seem to occupy its canonical position, especially in contexts with optative and imperative, as in *gid-e-lim mi / ver-sin mi*. He discussed how this kind of "irregularity" could be explained and what the consequences would be for the integrated model of Turkish inflectional morphemes.

Sharon Inkelas, Aylin Küntay and C. Orhun Orgun, in “Turkish electronic living lexicon (TELL)”, informed the audience about the project (TELL) being carried out at the University of California, Berkeley. The project is aimed at forming a computerized lexical database of actual spoken Turkish that includes its phonological and morphological properties.

Lütfiye Oktar and Semiramis Yağcıoğlu in their study on “Türkçede yazılı söylem yapısı ve artgönderim” (“Written discourse structure and anaphora in Turkish”), based their analysis on the assumption that the use of anaphora is closely related to the hierarchical structure of the discourse. They investigated the distribution of a subset of anaphora and the effect of anaphoric patterning on linguistic coding employed in expository written Turkish texts. Rhetorical structure analysis was carried out on the texts under investigation. The results indicated that the rhetorical relations between the propositions of the discourse seem to be the determining factor in the choice of anaphoric patterning used in such discourse. This study is interesting for two reasons. First of all, it takes into consideration the social, interactional, and affective factors that play a significant role in discourse structure. Secondly, it holds the view that texts are organized not only on the basis of informational flow and propositional content but also on the basis of socially accepted conventions. In this sense, this paper attempted to provide a full description of the distribution of the use of anaphora with reference to third person singular humans in expository prose, and exhibited the social as well as informational aspects of the relationship between discourse and anaphora.

Christoph Schroeder in “*Ki*-constructions in Turkish: A discourse approach”, based on data obtained from unplanned spoken discourse, focused on those *ki*-constructions which bear a certain resemblance to relative clauses of the Indo-European type. His study provided further support to the approach elaborated by Johanson who described the *ki*-constructions under investigation as “plot advancing”.

Ahmet Kocaman and Oya Külebi in their paper “-(s)el/-(s)al eklerinin kullanımı üzerine” (“On the use of the suffixes -(s)el/-(s)al”), employed a descriptive approach in their discussion of these Turkish suffixes. In an attempt to investigate to what extent the various uses of these suffixes are relevant to the structure of Turkish, they selected texts from the spontaneous spoken discourse as well as words from Turkish dictionaries. Their main concern was to indicate the frequency of occur-

rence of these suffixes by text type. They also described the semantic and functional dimensions of the use of *-sel / -sal* in these contexts.

Necdet Osam's paper "Türkçenin sözcük dağarcığı kirlendi mi?" ("Is Turkish vocabulary contaminated?") argued that the rapid creolization of Turkish has prompted concern from several writers whose reactions, however, were emotional in nature. He posited a need to treat the phenomena from a linguistic perspective and sought to answer the following questions: (i) Does Turkish vocabulary contain words that fully recover the meanings of borrowed words? If not, then isn't it possible to express the meanings conveyed by these words by some other form? (ii) Are these words used by all strata in society?

Mehmet Ölmez, in "Radloff'un sözlüğü" ("Radloff's dictionary"), focused on the method that will be employed in the publication process of the new edition of Radloff's dictionary.

Irina Nevskaya, in "Locative constructions in Shor", emphasized that space and time seem to be the most important parameters of the world, and that they are mirrored in the spatial and temporal relations expressed by linguistic means. Nevskaya dealt with the relations of spatial localization of an action or an object in Shor, i.e., with the indication to the place where they exist.

Vügar Sultanov presented a paper with the title "Türkçede pasif yapıların tipleri" ("Types of passive constructions in Turkish"). According to Sultanov, there are four types of passive constructions in Turkish, (i) real passive constructions, (ii) passive constructions without a subject, (iii) quasi-passive constructions, and (iv) modal-passive constructions without a subject.

The proceedings of the conference are published in the following volume: İmer, Kamile & Uzun, Engin, N. (eds.) 1997. *VIII. Uluslararası Türk Dilbilimi Konferansı Bildirileri, 7-9 Ağustos 1996* ("Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 7-9, 1996"). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

In the panel session after the general conference evaluation it was agreed that the 9th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics in 1998 will be organized by Celia Kerslake at Oxford University, Great Britain.

In conclusion, I firmly believe that the 8th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics achieved its purpose of bringing together scholars from different countries and providing them with a forum for discussing issues of Turkish and Turkic linguistics. It was a worthwhile

and stimulating experience for everyone involved. On behalf of all the participants I would like to express my sincere thanks to Kamile İmer and N. Engin Uzun, the organizers of this wonderful conference, with the hope of meeting again in Oxford in 1998.