Werk

Label: ReviewSingle

Autor: Schroeder , Christoph

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 1999

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0003|LOG_0023

Kontakt/Contact

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

info@digizeitschriften.de

Christoph Schroeder: Review of Jaklin Kornfilt, *Turkish*. (Descriptive grammars.) London: Routledge, 1997. xxxii+575 pages. Hb. £ 110,-. ISBN 0-415-00010-6.

Christoph Schroeder, Universität – GH Essen, FB 3, Türkisch, D-45117 Essen.

The first comprehensive description of Modern Standard Turkish published in English since Swift 1963, Underhill 1976, and Lewis 1975, is sure to arouse interest in the worlds of linguistic Turcology and general linguistics.*

Turkish is intended for the linguist, especially for the general linguist, typologist or comparative linguist who is interested in a thorough description of a language he / she has not much knowledge of. The book is part of a series entitled "Descriptive Grammars", edited by Bernard Comrie. To date, the series includes 29 descriptions of different (and mostly minor) languages. According to Comrie's "Editorial statement" (pp. iii-iv), the general aim of the series is to provide *comparable* descriptions which are able to bridge the gap between traditional description and its often isolated terminology on the one hand, and modern linguistic theory on the other hand. As with all the other descriptions in the series, a structured *Questionnaire*, first published in *Lingua*, vol. 42 (1977) provides the framework for the description of Turkish in *Turkish*.

1. Presentation of the book

The book comprises nearly 600 pages. It has a detailed and useful table of contents, a not so useful index (see below, section 3.), and a five-page bibliography. A "brief overview of some important characteristics of Modern Standard Turkish"—not included in the first edition—and a short list of *errata* in form of a seven-page addendum are available free of charge from the publisher.

Five chapters follow the questionnaire, in covering "Syntax" (Chapter 1, 211 pages), "Morphology" (Chapter 2, 271 pages), "Phonology", (Chapter 3, 32 pages), "Ideophones and interjections" (Chapter 4, 3 pages), and "Lexicon" (Chapter 5, 17 pages), followed by 18 pages of endnotes.

Turkish presents a synchronic view, with only a few remarks with regard to the history of a morpheme (for example, on page 260, the suffix *-in* in *yazın* is described

* I am grateful to Leylâ Uzun (Essen, Ankara) for helpful suggestions and to Vicky May, who corrected my English.

as "the old instrumental", and the Arabic dual is noted as having been borrowed by Ottoman as *-ayn*, p. 265).

The author of *Turkish*, Jaklin Kornfilt, is a recognized expert on the language and well known for her linguistic work within the theoretical framework of Government and Binding as well as Minimality Theory. One could say that the emphasis she places on syntax and morphology is influenced by this theoretical approach. Also, Kornfilt's approach basically represents the modern American linguistic discussion. Other Turcological points of view are not discussed, nor are European works (Turkish ones included) integrated to the extent they could have been, which explains the astonishingly short bibliography and gives the discussion a certain imbalance. Although this does not lessen the high quality of the book as a descriptive grammar, the reader should not expect an introduction to the variety of analyses of or approaches to Turkish grammar.

1.1. Chapter 1, "Syntax"

Chapter 1 thoroughly describes the main parts of Turkish syntax, starting with "Sentence Types"(1.1.1.) and an overview of "Subordination" (1.1.2.), followed by "The internal structure of sentences and phrases" (1.2.), "Coordination" (1.3.) and more specific functional domains, such as "Negation" (1.4.), "Anaphora" (1.5.), "Reflexives" (1.6.), "Reciprocals" (1.7.), "Comparison" (1.8.), "Equatives" (1.9.), "Possession" (1.10.), down to functional-pragmatic aspects, such as "Emphasis" (1.11.) and "Topic" (1.12.). Some smaller subsections follow, viz. "Heavy shift" (1.13.), "Other movement processes" (1.14.), "Minor sentence types" (1.15.), and "Operational definitions for word classes" (1.16.).

In particular the subsections 1.4. to 1.12. contain comprehensive information for non-Turcological linguists interested in questions of scope, accessibility and variability in a functional domain. But Turcological linguists, too, will find many new insights into topics which have not been treated consistently in this way before, if at all. Let me point out some of these:

1. To my knowledge, Kornfilt is the first to deal with the phenomenon of adjective arguments (pp. 94-95). It is particularly interesting to see that Turkish does not allow adjectives to have accusative arguments. For example, the verb *kıskan-* 'envy' takes accusative arguments, as in 1, but the corresponding adjective *kıskanç* 'envious' only allows dative arguments, as in 2:

(1) (p. 94, 373)
Hasan Ali-yi kıskan-ıyor.
Hasan Ali-Acc. envy-Pr.Prog[1]
'Hasan envies Ali.'

(2) *Hasan Ali-ye (*Ali-yi) kıskanç*
Hasan Ali-Dat. (Ali-Acc.) envious
'Hasan is envious of Ali.'

For linguists interested in the transitional relationships between word classes and the morphosyntactic consequences accompanying them, this opposition may point to the non-verbal character of adjectives in Turkish, since it means that they may not assign grammatical case.

2. In the section "Adjective clauses" (1.1.2.3.), after having described participle clauses and briefly noting *ki* constructions (see below, section 2.1.), Kornfilt identifies a further type of relative construction which is rarely discussed under that heading.[2] It is a kind of correlative, semantically akin to free relatives, and, structurally, an embedded conditional:

(3) (p. 60, 259)
Ben Chomsky ne yaz-ar-sa on-u oku-r-um
I Chomsky what write-Aor.-Cond. that-Acc. read-Aor.-1.sg.
'I read that which Chomsky writes.'

The discussion deserves mention because it shows Kornfilt's emphasis on functions instead of classification on a formal basis.

3. In the "Coordination" section (1.3.), Kornfilt very clearly shows that the enclitic conjunctional postposition *-(y)lA* has different syntactic properties when used as a coordination marker and a comitative marker (pp. 114-116). First, as a coordinator for noun phrases and nominalized clauses, *-(y)lA* appears between the conjuncts and cliticizes onto the first conjunct, while as a comitative marker, it cliticizes onto the second noun phrase in the unmarked word order. Second, when the postposition is used with the subject of the sentence, the coordinate structure triggers plural agreement on the predicate, while with the comitative construction, the predicate is in the singular. And third, coordinate structures may not be broken up by moving

[1] In the examples from the book I follow the interlinearization given therein.

[2] Ozil (1993) is another noteworthy exception.

either constituents, whereas the noun phrases involved in the comitative construction may move.

4. It is one of the positive outcomes of a description based on a pre-structured framework that topics are raised which are usually neglected. For example, the semantic distinction between "alienable" and "non-alienable" possession is generally not regarded as a distinction with syntactic or morphological reflections in Turkish. Consequently, it is not dealt with in traditional descriptions. In the "Possession" section (1.10.), however, Kornfilt shows that the distinction between alienable and non-alienable may in fact be seen as having an impact on Turkish. First, it makes a difference in the possibility of separating genitive constructions in existential sentences (p. 186). Thus, while alienable possession, as in 4, allows for the separation of the genitive, non-alienable possession, as in 5, does not:

(4) (p. 186, 677)
Hasan-ın garaj-da beş araba-sı var.
Hasan-Gen. garage-Loc. five car-3.sg. exist
'Hasan has five cars in the garage.'

(5) (p. 186, 678)
?? / * Hasan-ın alçı-da bir kol-u var.
Hasan-Gen. plaster-Loc. one arm-3.sg. exist
Intended reading: 'Hasan has one arm in a cast.'

Second, the distinction between alienable and non-alienable possession makes a difference in subject possessive noun phrases of non-nominalized embedded clauses, which at the same time receive the direct object marking of the superordinate clause:

(6) (p. 187, 682)
(Ben) [[Hasan-ın diş-in-i] ağrı-yor] san-ıyor-du-m.
I Hasan-Gen. tooth-3.sg.-Acc. hurt-Pr.Prog. believe-Prog.-Past-1.sg.
'I believed Hasan's tooth to hurt.'

Here, the interpretation of the possession is always alienable. Thus, as Kornfilt points out, it is suggested that "Hasan's tooth would somehow be hurting on its own, without Hasan himself necessarily feeling the pain" (p.187).

5. Traditional descriptions are often troubled by the fact that Turkish verb phrase adverbials such as *erken* 'early', and *dışarı* 'out' may be inflected for adverbial case, e.g. *erken-den* (early-ABL), and *dışarı-ya* (out-DAT). Kornfilt examines this phe-

nomenon from a pragmatic angle where it appears as an instance of topicalization of the adverbial (p. 202).

1.2. Chapter 2, "Morphology"

With 272 pages, Chapter 2 is one of the most detailed descriptions of Turkish morphology written in a language other than Turkish. The chapter has two main subsections, "Inflection" (2.1., pp. 212-444) and "Derivational morphology" (2.2., pp. 444-482). The subsection on inflection follows the traditional path of describing the inflectional properties of each word class, the operational definitions of which are outlined in the last subsection of the syntax chapter.

Again, we find numerous new insights. Particularly remarkable are the detailed treatment of the expressions of local and nonlocal semantic functions in the sentence (pp. 226-255), the subsection on voice categories (pp. 323-336), and the treatment of clitics (pp. 435-444). The overview on incorporation (pp. 396-405) is of note here because it is not confined to the much-discussed direct object incorporation, but also examines cases where postpositions, adverbs, adjectives and other constituents may be regarded as incorporated.

The subsection on derivation is considerably short, given the scope dedicated to this part of Turkish morphology in traditional descriptions such as Banguoğlu (1986) and Ergin (1985). Only the most productive derivational morphology is dealt with. Borderline cases between inflection and derivation are discussed without the author taking explicit standpoints, for example, with regard to nominalization as against the derivation of nouns from verbs (p. 450), formation of adverb clauses as against deriving adverbs from verbs (p. 464) and incorporation as against compounding (p. 477). Not discussed is the use of the converb suffix *-ArAk* with *ol-* 'be' in combination with adjectives, as in *asgarî ol-arak* (minimal be-CONV) 'at least', literally 'being minimal'. Kornfilt labels these combinations the "derivation of adverbs from adjectives" (p. 478). One could also speak of the formation of a subjectless adverbial clause, which can, admittedly, be translated into English in the form of an adverb.

1.3. Chapter 3 "Phonology"

Chapter 3 presents a concise overview of Turkish phonology. The chapter is comparatively short, but references to more detailed treatments of specific phonological topics are included. The frequent statement of "rules" and "principles", the status of which is not completely clear to readers not familiar with the generative approach, is, however, slightly confusing. Sometimes, more "traditional" explanations could have accompanied the description. For example, we find a treatment of the "distinctive

degrees of length in various segments" on page 501. Here, Kornfilt shows that two facts can lead to the distinctiveness of long vs. short vowels in Turkish, which, essentially, has only short vowels (p. 489). The two facts are the long vowels in some loanwords, and, second, the process of "compensatory lengthening" triggered by the "soft *g*" / "yumuşak *g*" in syllable-final position (when it cannot be resyllabified with a following vowel) (p. 488). In a synchronic approach, "compensatory lengthening" is undoubtedly the appropriate term for the process. But a short note explaining that the lengthening results from the loss of a voiced velar fricative in Turkish (cf. Csató & Johanson 1998: 204), would have been helpful.

1.4. Chapters 4, "Ideophones and interjections", and 5, "Lexicology"

Chapter 4 lists a number of Turkish ideophones and interjections. The section on interjections (4.2.) contains a few notes on the way in which the yes / no clitic *mI* is used to express shades of modality and the way in which the forms *şey* 'thing' and *falan* (*filan*) 'and so on' are used in order to structure unplanned spoken discourse.

Chapter 5 provides a useful tool for lexicologists interested in large-scale typological comparisons, since it gives (scarcely commented) lists of words, organized by semantic fields such as "Kinship", "Color", "Body parts" and the like.

2. Some topics in detail: Critical remarks

It goes without saying that a 600-page description of Turkish grammar is bound to contain numerous topics that can be viewed in different ways, that are open to discussion and criticism or that, simply, show shortcomings or create confusion. In this section, I shall address some of these topics.

2.1. The complementizer *ki*

The treatment of the form *ki* is confusing (pp. 3, 12 / 13, 45, 60, 321-323 and 443). When introducing *ki*, Kornfilt calls it a "complementizer" which subordinates finite clauses (p. 46), mostly complement clauses. It is classified as a clitic because it attaches to the preceding word (p. 443), occurs with a subsequent pause and cannot be stressed.

On page 60, some examples are given where constructions with the clitic *ki* may be regarded as resembling relative clause constructions. The discussion closes with the remark that these constructions "have come into disuse".

Later, in the morphology chapter, the topic of the clitic *ki* is taken up again. Here, Kornfilt says that it is used "as a relative pronoun" (pp. 321-322) and states that "it is possible to use the Indo-European [relative clause] construction with relative pronouns" in Turkish (p. 323). An example:

(7) (p. 323, 1137)
O yer ki herkes çok iyi bil-ir
that place which everybody very well know-Aor.
'That place which everybody knows (it) very well.'

Certainly, if we translate *ki* as 'which', we obtain the English relative clause. But constructions like 7 are copies from Iranian languages. There, the phonologically similar form is not a pronoun, nor even used as such. It is simply a subordinator.

It is also confusing to first speak of the "disuse" of a pseudo-relative construction and then to imply that the respective subordinator is regularly used in such constructions. And it adds to the confusion when in the section on anaphora (1.3.) a completely different suffix *-ki*, which attaches to headless genitive modifiers and modifiers of time and place, is also said to function "in some sense" like a relative pronoun (p. 131).

Furthermore, Kornfilt fails to mention that Turkish has a second form of *ki*. It is used in the spoken language and differs from the clitic *ki* in that a pause occurs before it, it can be stressed and it introduces (finite) sentences which could, under certain circumstances, be viewed as a near-equivalent to non-restrictive relative clauses:[3]

(8) *Onlar çok sev-diğ-im* *insan-lar-dı,*
they very love-PART-POSS.1SG people-PL-PST

k i *hala seviyorum.*
ki still love-PROGR-1.SG
'They were people I liked very much, (*ki*) I still like (them).'

2.2. Adjectives and adverbs

On page 91 we find the simple statement that in Turkish, "almost any adjective may be used as an adverb". In a certain way, Konfilt contradicts herself on this topic. On page 404, she mentions that "nonderived adverbs" may not leave the position immediately in front of the verb and may, in this position, be viewed as incorporated. What is omitted, however, is the fact that adjectives in the position of adverbs, which are not morphologically marked as adverbs (i.e., which do not have the suffix *-CA* or are reduplicated), *always* occupy this position. Since Kornfilt does not ex-

[3] The example comes from a corpus of spoken Turkish in Istanbul, 1993-1995.

plain her concept of incorporation (does the incorporated element form part of the verb or does it retain its syntactic status?), the question remains whether the "adverbial" use of adjectives really leads to free adverbial forms or whether it should rather be viewed as the formation of a complex construction with the verb it precedes.

2.3. Postpositions

Five pages in the syntax chapter deal with postpositional phrases (pp. 100-104). It seems that, with regard to postpositions, Kornfilt tries to create a certain uniformity of a word class which, in Turkish, is in fact highly heterogenous.

First, in the "Operational definition for the postpositional phrase", we find the statement that postpositions can easily be distinguished from adjectives because the latter do not assign case (p. 100). The distinction is not that easy. Turkish has a number of forms which, like adjectives, can be used attributively and predicatively. They form complex phrases with complements, to which they assign (adverbial) case, i.e. *ait* 'belonging', 'concerning', *yönelik* 'directed', *bağlı* 'connected, 'related', *ilgili* 'concerning', 'related'. What distinguishes the phrases headed by these forms from phrases headed by so-called "postpositions" like *ile* 'with' and *için* 'for' is the fact that the latter phrases cannot be used attributively, while the first phrases cannot be used adverbially. Thus, a syntactic restriction in the "Operational definition for the postpositional phrase" stating that postpositional phrases are adverbial phrases would have been appropriate. This then would have forced Kornfilt to reconsider the statement made on page 424: "postpositional phrases can also be used as modifiers of noun phrases". On the contrary, it is an important syntactic feature of Turkish that it generally does not allow postpositional phrases to be modifiers, at least not in noun phrases with full lexical first, second or third order nouns (in the sense of Lyons 1977) in head position.

Second, it is problematic to analyze words like *önce* and *sonra* as "postpositions without argument" (pp. 100, 102) when they are used as bare adverbial forms in the meanings of 'previously' and 'later'. Morphosyntactically, these two forms behave exactly like adverbials when they are bare—and "adverbials" is what they are called in another section, on page 452. Is this a sign of inconsistency, or does the author agree that the forms should be assigned two domains of use, on the one hand as postpositions, and on the other hand as adverbs?

Third, further on in the subsection, Kornfilt shows that "postpositions" like *kadar* 'as much' and *gibi* 'like' may take tensed clauses as complements (p. 103). See an example with kadar:

(9) (p. 103, 402)
[yarışma-yı kazan-acak] kadar (güzel)
competition-Acc. win-Fut. as much as beautiful
'As much (beautiful) as to win the competition'

The above example is presented under the heading of "Finite adverbial clauses". We find similar examples on page 97 under the same heading. Here, Kornfilt explains that these clauses "are not genuinely finite, although they are not nominalized" (A reference to this remark would have been appropriate on page 103). I fail to understand why these clauses are not nominalized. Kornfilt may have explained the complement clauses *kadar* may take as clauses formed from attributive participles. These participles are based on the combination of the verb stem with the (future tense) suffix *-EcEk* or the (past tense) suffix *-mIş*. Both participle types are mentioned in the morphology chapter. In the syntax chapter, however, *-mIş* and *-EcEk* appear only in combination with *olan*, 'being', the participle form of *ol-*, 'be' (section on relative clauses, pp. 65-66). Once the existence of participial *-mIş* and *-EcEk* forms is acknowledged, why not regard the respective (verbal) arguments of *kadar* as participle phrases which, consequently, may be said to have a certain degree of nominalization?

The complications with *gibi* and *kadar* do not end here. In a certain way, Kornfilt is right in listing *gibi* under the heading of postpositions taking finite clauses as complements. *Gibi* is rather unique in this respect. It shares three features with *kadar*. These features are not possible with any (other?) postposition: First, the phrases headed by *kadar* and *gibi* may be attributive, predicative and adverbial. Second, as mentioned above, the two forms may take phrases headed by *-mIş* and *-EcEK* participles as complements. Third, both *kadar* and *gibi* may be combined with the possessive suffix of the third person singular and act as anaphoric noun phrases:

(10) *Bunun gibi-sin-i çok gör-dü-k.*
this(GEN) like-POSS.3SG-ACC a lot see-PRT-1PL
'We have seen lots of this (like this).'

(11) *Bu kadar-ı yet-er.*
this as much-POSS.3SG be enough-AOR.3SG
'This (of it) is enough.'

This is a feature which *kadar* and *gibi* share with adjectival modifiers. And *gibi* (but not *kadar*) may also take finite clauses (that is, clauses with a person marker from the predicative / verbal paradigm) as complements:

(12) (van Schaaik 1996: 275)
Beni hiç gör-me-miş-sin gibi dur-up bak-ma!
me emph(neg.) see-NEG-PST-2SG like stand-CONV look-NEG (IMP)
'Don't stand there and look at me as if you've never seen me!'

The four features listed above are not shared by any other postposition. Are *gibi* and *kadar*, then, postpositions? They would at least have to be described as highly exceptional members of this word class. On the other hand, the evidence van Schaaik (1996) gives in his thorough analysis of *gibi*-constructions rather suggests that they should be classified as (non-finite) predicates.

3. *Turkish* and the questionnaire

Some of the qualities and some of the problems of *Turkish* are related to the questionnaire which forms the base for the book.

1. It is an indisputable quality of a pre-structured framework that one learns a lot about structures which are not represented in the grammar of Turkish. In conjunction with this, Kornfilt often gives ungrammatical examples (marked as such) and notes shadings of acceptability in order to give clear pictures of the structural frame within which linguistic phenomena are to be understood.

2. On the other hand, *Turkish* does not offer what the questionnaire does not ask for. For example, we do not find anything about the differences between planned and unplanned speech and we do not find any information about stylistic variations. Similarly, the section on ideophones (4.1.) is rather disappointing. Ideophones are described as if they existed outside of the systematic part of the language. That is, the questionnaire does not ask for the way in which emphatic forms are integrated into the phonological system of the language. In this respect, phenomena such as the productive emphatic reduplication with systematic phonological variations in the reduplicated form (of the type *ev mev* 'house(s) and the like'; cf. Tietze 1953) might have been interesting, or the combination of lexical and phonological variation in the form of frozen binominals (of the type *hayal meyal* 'evanescent', *çoluk çocuk* 'household'). But the absence of these topics does not come as a surprise. Linguistic descriptions usually concentrate on what is in the focus of contemporary research. In pre-structuralistic descriptions, we find a dominance of lexicology, morphology and phonology, while the syntax is neglected; in contemporary structure-oriented approaches, syntax is given more weight, but those dimensions of language are neglected which are difficult to systemize within the framework of current theories. The questionnaire on which *Turkish* is based, and, therefore, *Turkish* itself, are no exceptions to this tendency.

3. The authors of the questionnaire, Bernard Comrie and Norman Smith, wanted "the general direction of description within the questionnaire" to be "from function to form" (Comrie & Smith 1977: 8). The structure of the questionnaire is not as radical in its "function-to-form" approach as it could be.[4] Nevertheless, the emphasis on functional domains, especially in the syntax chapter, allows Jaklin Kornfilt to illustrate the complex interplay of different formal devices in an elaborate and highly successful way.

On the other hand, the emphasis on "function to form" is disadvantageous when one is interested in the way forms serve different kinds of functions. The authors of the questionnaire saw the solution to this problem in an index of forms "enabling the reader to go equally from form to function" (Comrie & Smith 1977: 8). For example, if I want to learn something about the functional load lying on word order in Turkish, then this index may be used by intensive cross-referencing, allowing me to move from one place where word order is mentioned in the fulfillment of a certain function to the next. Another possibility could have been an index listing all forms mentioned and the places where they appear in the book. Instead of being a mere convenience for the reader, cross-referencing and indexing would then form an essential part of the description as the "other half", so to speak, or the form-to-function part.

Unfortunately, this task is not effectively fulfilled by the index in *Turkish*, nor by any other of the books in the series. For example, my question about the function of word order in Turkish is simply left unanswered: "word order" (or "constituent order") is neither an item in the index nor does it form a section in the book. Of course, it is treated in various places in the syntax chapter. But since the cross-referencing is equally unsatisfactory, I would have to read the entire chapter in order to collect a "catalogue" of the functions of word order in Turkish.

4. Conclusion

We could go on discussing the book as one of its numerous merits is the fact that it is thought-provoking. Jaklin Kornfilt has an exquisite knowledge of the language and is a theoretical linguist. Most of the time she resists the temptation of rounding off the edges where this might give the work a smoother finish. Thus, *Turkish* demonstrates the richness of the grammar of Turkish while at the same time making it accessible to comparative investigations. In this way *Turkish* achieves its aim of

[4] For example, the basic divisions of the questionnaire are again form-based ("Syntax", "Morphology", ...). See Mosel (1987: 52-55) and Lehmann (1989: 144-148) for discussions.

bridging the gap between traditional viewpoints and modern linguistic theory. Jaklin Kornfilt is to be congratulated for an outstanding achievement which is bound to become a key reference grammar for both comparative linguists and linguistic Turcologists. *Turkish* deserves a place in the library of every linguistic department.

References

Banguoğlu, Tahsin. 1986[2]. *Türkçenin grameri*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu basım evi.

Comrie, Bernard & Smith, Norval 1977. Lingua descriptive studies: Questionnaire. *Lingua* 42, 1-72.

Csató, Éva Á. & Johanson, Lars 1998. Turkish. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages*. (Language Family Descriptions.) London: Routledge. 203-235.

Ergin, Muharrem. 1985[16]. *Türk dil bilgisi*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi yayınları.

Lehmann, Christian. 1989. Language description and general comparative grammar. In: Graustein, Gottfried & Leitner, Gerhard. *Reference grammars and modern linguistic theory*. (Linguistische Arbeiten 226.) Tübingen: Niemeyer. 133-162.

Lewis, G. L. 1975[2]. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: University Press.

Lyons, John 1977. *Semantics* 1-2. Cambridge: University Press.

Mosel, Ulrike 1987. *Inhalt und Aufbau deskriptiver Grammatiken* (*How to write a grammar*). (Arbeitspapier Nr. 4, N.F.) Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität zu Köln.

Ozil, Şeyda 1993 Türkçede eş işlevli dilbilgisel yapılar – ortaçlar ve koşul tümceleri. In: İmer, Kâmile & N. Engin Uzun (eds.). *VII. Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri*. (Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi yayını 371.) Ankara. 85-94.

van Schaaik, Gerjan 1996. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. (Turcologica 28.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Swift, Lloyd B. 1963. *A reference grammar of modern Turkish*. (Uralic and Altaic Series 19.) Bloomington, The Hague: Indiana Unversity Publications.

Tietze, Andreas 1953. Die Wiederholung mit verändertem Wortbeginn. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 15, 92-108.

Underhill, Robert. 1976. *Turkish grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.