

Werk

Titel: Denominal adjectives containing the suffix '-vari' in contemporary Turkish

Autor: Steenwijk , Han

Ort: Wiesbaden

Jahr: 2000

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?666048797_0004 | LOG_0018

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Denominal adjectives containing the suffix *-vari* in contemporary Turkish

Han Steenwijk

Steenwijk, Han 2000. Denominal adjectives containing the suffix *-vari* in contemporary Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 4, 54-76.

The originally Persian suffix *-vari* is reported to be one of the few "Ottoman" derivational morphemes to have survived the Turkish language reform. On the basis of attestations found in recent newspapers and magazines, a morphological and semantic analysis is made of adjectival formations containing this suffix, and of the contexts in which they occur. It appears that the derivation rule for the formations contains restrictions of a semantic nature and that the derivatives mainly occur in stylistically marked environments. A comparison with Late Ottoman attestations shows that the derivation rule for contemporary Turkish differs from that of Late Ottoman grammar.

Han Steenwijk, Böhmsche Straße 48 II, 12055 Berlin, Germany.

1. Introduction

This paper aims at a description of the morphological and semantic characteristics of modern Turkish denominal adjectives derived by means of the suffix *-vari* (in the following: A_{vari}). In the process, special attention will be paid to A_{vari} appearing within a context, ideally a (set of) complete sentence(s) or at least a noun phrase. Isolated attestations of A_{vari} may be useful in order to establish the domain the derivational rule draws upon, but yield insufficient information for a semantic analysis of the derivatives.

Almost all attestations to be discussed were drawn from recent press publications: newspapers and weekly and monthly periodicals. For this reason, strictly speaking, the results of the analysis pertain to the language use of these media only. A_{vari} can also be found in other texts, but in order to obtain a coherent sample of data, the search for attestations was deliberately restricted to the aforesaid press publications.

After this synchronic description a comparison will be made with some incidental Late Ottoman attestations. Unfortunately, as these Ottoman attestations partly originate from dictionaries, they cannot always be precisely fixed in time. A cursory description of the A_{vari} found there will show that the contemporary derivation rule is not identical with the one that applies to the older language stage. Therefore some hypotheses are put forward which could explain the changes that must have occurred in the derivation rule. The synchronic and diachronic sections are preceded by a short

overview of pre-existing descriptions of the morpheme *-vari* and of its sociolinguistic status.

Because in Turkish it is notoriously difficult to distinguish between the class of substantives and the class of adjectives on morphological grounds alone, the notion “class” is to be interpreted rather as a syntactically defined “function-class” (Johanson 1991: 15-17) or a syntactically-semantically defined “expression-class” (Lyons 1990: 438-450). The traditional notions “substantive” and “adjective” are then labels for thus defined classes. Without showing any formal distinction, certain members of the class of adjectives may in Turkish also enjoy the status of members of the class of adverbs. For this reason it should be noted once more that the present study only takes such A_{vari} into account that are used as adjectives.¹

1.1. Sociolinguistic background

In Late Ottoman dictionaries the morpheme *-vari*, a Persian loan,² can be found in several derivatives whose bases also occurred as independent lexemes, e.g. *haçvari* “cross-shaped, crossed”, analysable as *haç* “a cross, a crucifix, a sign of the cross” and *-vari* “like (so and so)” (Redhouse 1890). The Persian origin of the suffix makes it part of a group of morphemes that received special attention during the language reform movement of the 20th century. One of the main objectives of the reform was the elimination of derivational prefixes and suffixes of Arabic and Persian origin.³ As a consequence it became a major task for the language reform movement, especially after it gained momentum from the 1930s on, to elaborate the derivation rules of etymologically Turkish suffixes, which were used to form deliberate neologisms.

This was done so successfully that the great majority of the derivational morphemes of foreign origin quickly lost their productivity. The media and schools passed on the aims and parameters of the Language Reform to the language community at large. Therefore the educated speakers of contemporary Turkish are, to a certain extent and in a schematic way, acquainted with the etymological dimension of their active and passive vocabulary.⁴

As a consequence of concentrating so much effort on the study and application of etymologically Turkish material, the descriptive publications appearing in Turkey ignored⁵ and continue to ignore⁶ derivational morphemes originating from Arabic or

¹ Indeed, in the newspapers and magazines I have checked, I encountered no derivatives used as a syntactic adverb.

² See Tietze (1964: 197).

³ The manifesto of the *Yeni Lisan* movement (1911) advised no longer to apply such morphemes in derivation and to restrict the use of existing derivatives containing them to the most frequent ones (Seyfettin 1989: 27).

⁴ E.g., deliberate neologisms mark the language use of certain social groups, cf. Cüceloğlu & Slobin (1980).

⁵ Gencan (1966: 363) is no exception, because the introduction to the chapter on Arabic and Persian grammatical elements expressly states that acquaintance with them is use-

Persian. Only in works of a prescriptive nature are incidentally occurring, spontaneously coined neologisms that are derived by means of such morphemes identified and criticised.⁷

Thus the study of derivation has been subject to a kind of division of labour, in which it is left to specialists from outside Turkey to deal with the loan morphemes from Arabic and Persian. For instance, Kononov (1956: 112, 147) lists one originally Arabic (*-î / -vî*, adjectival) and two originally Persian (*-hane* substantival, *-i / -yi* adjectival) morphemes; Swift (1963: 74) also mentions *-î / -vî* and furthermore *-en / -an*, adverbial and likewise of Arabic origin. Kononov takes special care to point out that the loan morphemes served to coin new formations within the framework of Turkish.

A_{vari} in contemporary Turkish are defined by Tietze (1964: 197, 200) as “adjectives of comparison”, a semantic description that seems to be supported by Kissling (1960: 240-241) and Lewis (1988: 66). The former translates them as “-artig” and “-haft”, the latter as “-like” and “-ish”. Examples of nominal phrases are *aktörvari bir eda ile* “mit schauspielerhaftem Pathos” (Tietze) and *James Bondvari bir casusluk* “a James Bond-ish case of espionage” (Lewis). As to the selection of the base, Kissling implicitly states that, in addition to Persian bases, *-vari* sometimes combines with Arabic and rarely with Turkish bases. This statement is corroborated neither by the examples just given nor by his own examples *amerikanvari*, *gangstervari*. On the other hand, Tietze writes that A_{vari} allows for formations from Turkish bases or from any base whatsoever. Both authors, then, operate with etymological criteria. Lewis does not give any etymological specification and says only that the suffix “is still productive to a limited extent”. These short descriptions leave room for, among others, the following questions:

1. What kind of lexemes can serve as a base for A_{vari} ? Which phonologically, semantically or etymologically determined selection restrictions are relevant for derivation by means of *-vari*?
2. What kind of lexemes can serve as the head of nominal phrases containing an A_{vari} ? Which collocational restrictions hold for A_{vari} ?
3. Based on the answers to these first two questions, what is the exact semantic value of the suffix? What kind of relationship is established between the head of the nominal phrase and the base of the derivate?

ful when reading (Late) Ottoman texts. The same holds for Bilgegil (1982), whose grammar, despite its title, in parts reads like a grammar of (Late) Ottoman.

⁶ Only derivational morphemes originating from European languages are sometimes touched upon, e.g. by İmer (1991), who discusses the morphemes *tele-* (*telekiz*, p. 24) and *-matik* (*dokunmatik*, p. 24, 27).

⁷ For instance, *önemiyetle* “attentively” (Aksoy 1980: 20), consisting of the deliberate neologism *önem*, the originally Arabic substantival suffix *-iyyet / -iyet* and the postposition *ile*: *önem-iyyet-le*. The coining was probably triggered by analogy to *ehemmiyetle* ‘attentively’.

4. What is the distribution of A_{vari} in relation to other semantically comparable adjectives and adjectival expressions?
5. In terms of its productivity and semantic value, what is the status of the suffix within a description of contemporary Turkish?

Not until these questions have been answered, can the description of the suffix be regarded as more or less sufficient. True, the present description is based on a restricted sample of data, but I feel that this sample is representative enough to arrive at some generalisations about the derivation and distribution of A_{vari} . Thus production rules might be formulated that comply with the criterion that Aronoff (1976: 17-18) regards as paramount for morphological descriptions: "The simplest task of a morphology, the least we demand of it, is the enumeration of the class of possible words of a language". In other words, just as syntactic rules describe the set of possible sentences of a given language, the morphological rules should encompass the set of its possible words.

1.2. Specifics of the data collected

The A_{vari} to be discussed were culled from newspapers and magazines published between 1985 and 1998, preponderantly in the years 1995, 1996 and 1997. These are the European editions of the dailies *Hürriyet* and *Milliyet*, the weekly *Cumhuriyet Hafta* and the magazines *Aktüel*, *Erkekçe*, *Haber Extra*, *Nokta*, *Tempo* and *Tombak*. The distribution of the sample over several years and various sources implies that derivation by means of *-vari* forms an integral part of the contemporary Turkish language system. The derivatives, 21 in number, are listed in appendix A together with their context and source.

Not analysed are the attestations of *Amerikanvari*, because among the A_{vari} this lexeme enjoys a special status. It is the only one of the attested derivatives that appears in the dictionaries (e.g. Steuerwald, *Yeni Redhouse*) and it is encountered in the texts markedly more frequently than the other formations. This lexeme is not a new formation, but an established lexeme that possibly has a lexicalised meaning. Morphologically it distinguishes itself from the remaining derivatives in that it can alternatively be interpreted as de-adjectival. These special characteristics calling for caution, I decided to separate the lexeme *Amerikanvari* from the remaining attestations for the moment.

The semantic interpretations and paraphrases are based on the definitions given in *Türkçe sözlük*. As regards notation, the following should be kept in mind: Concepts are indicated by single quotation marks, and meanings and translations by double quotation marks, e.g. 'gecekondu' "unauthorised construction set up in one night". Concrete words as language material are quoted in italics, e.g. *gecekondu*.

2. Analysis of the contemporary derivatives

2.1. Selection restrictions on the base of A_{vari}

Because of the special status that proper names enjoy within the lexicon,⁸ they are to be kept distinct from other lexemes in a classification based on etymological criteria. Turkish proper names occur five times (*Baykal*, *Çiller*, *Demirel*, *Metin Vertan*, *Özal*) and English (*Barbara Cartland*, *Dallas*, *Texas*, *Walt Disney*), German (*Nietzsche*) and Spanish (*Peron*) proper names together make up six occurrences. The etymology of the base does not seem to be a relevant factor here.

The remaining bases display a different picture. Only one base each was found with an Arabic (*intihar*), Greek (*kukla*) or Turkish (*gecekodu*) etymology, while all other attestations contain bases that are loans from widely spoken modern European languages.

They are of English (*Süpermen*), French (*labirent*, *şezlong*, *şömine*), German (*Nazi*) or Italian origin (*paparazzi*, *tiyatro*). Among them, *Nazi*, *Süpermen* and *paparazzi* are clearly more recent loans than *labirent*, *şezlong*, *şömine*⁹ and *tiyatro*, which entered the language at an earlier stage.

The established distribution shows that, proper names excepted, the derivation draws mainly on non-Turkish, “western” lexical material. With this finding, Tietze’s basically correct etymological statement (see section 1.1.) is further refined.

A phonological analysis shows that monosyllabic bases do not occur. Slightly more than half of the bases contain three or more syllables, with an average of 2.76 syllables per base. Likewise, slightly more than half of the bases contain vowel sequences that are at odds with the laws of Turkish vowel harmony.

Taking semantic criteria as the parameter of analysis, the bases can be divided among the following groups of concepts:

1. Concrete products of human activity (artefacts): ‘gecekodu’, ‘kukla’, ‘labirent’, ‘şezlong’, ‘şömine’.
2. Abstract products of human activity: ‘Dallas’, ‘tiyatro’.
3. Categories of human beings: ‘Nazi’, ‘paparazzi’, ‘Süpermen’.
4. An action: ‘intihar’.

The remaining bases are proper names that refer to:

⁸ Cf. the following statement by Kleiber (1992: 77): “S’il est des mots qui occupent une place à part dans le langage, ce sont bien les noms propres. Quasiment insaisissables, en ce qu’ils déjouent au moment où on y s’attend le moins les critères de définitions les plus subtils: philosophiques, logiques, psycho- / socio-linguistiques et linguistiques.”

⁹ The Ottoman transcription that is added in *Yeni Redhouse* for these three French loans implies that they were already in use before 1929.

5. A location: *Texas*.
6. Individuals: *Barbara Cartland, Baykal, Çiller, Demirel, Metin Vertan, Nietzsche, Özal, Peron, Walt Disney*.

Groups 1 and 2 can be subsumed under the notion of cultural kinds as opposed to natural kinds.

The proper names not only refer to the location and individuals, but also possess as their semantic value the characteristics that are logically associated with these entities.¹⁰ This means that extra-linguistic knowledge is not necessary to ensure successful communication; knowing about characteristics associated with individuals and locations is part of the language competence of the native speakers.

Although the base *Dallas* (the television series) could also be interpreted as a proper name, I prefer to assign it to the group of abstract products. *Süpermen* is known as a fictional hero in comics and motion pictures and could therefore be taken as an abstract product, but precisely because it denotes a fictional hero, the concept is better seen as belonging to a category of (exceptional) human beings. In the case of *Walt Disney* the person as well as the firm could be meant, but in a common view of the world the person is more likely to have been the referent.

While groups 1, 2 and 4 share the semantic feature “+human activity” groups 3, 5 and 6 all contain the feature “+human”. Group 4 contains an action that is commonly associated with human activity only. The location referred to in group 5 is to be understood as a geographical notion that designates an area inhabited and culturally shaped by human beings. As groups 4 and 5 contain one element each, it is too early to decide whether they really are included in the selection restrictions. Especially attestation (A7) *intiharvari eylem* turns out to be rather exceptional, not only because of the etymology and semantics of the base, but in other respects as well (see sections 2.3., 2.4.).

All groups have in common that their members occupy a subordinate position in the taxonomy of semantic categories. They all have to be located well beneath the basic level.¹¹ Most clearly this can be seen in group 6, whose members are “absolute hyponyms”: The classes of possible referents contain one element each. In group 3 very specific categories of human beings are represented. Similarly group 1 contains very specific artefacts.

Although the search for selection restrictions applying to the base of the A_{vari} revealed that the etymological parameter bears some relevance—as far as lexemes other than proper names are concerned—this did not result in a solid rule, but only in a tendency. The same can be said about the phonological parameter. The semantic parameter, however, appeared to be decisive as it yielded two clear-cut rules: 1) +human (activity); 2) subordinate position in the taxonomy of semantic categories.

¹⁰ “Proper names are [, in a loose sort of way,] logically connected with characteristics of the object to which they refer” (Searle 1958: 173).

¹¹ For this notion see Rosch (1977: 30).

The attested A_{vari} are probably all neologisms. This can already be deduced from the quotation marks that are sometimes used in the texts (A13, A14, A16, A18) and from the fact that they are nonces. Only two derivatives (*gecekonduvari*, *Özalvari*) were encountered more than once in independent sources. Considering the different interpretations to be assigned to the attestations of *Özalvari* (see section 2.3.), it is likely that a new formation was independently coined in each of these cases.

2.2. Selection restrictions on the head of the nominal phrase

The denotata of the heads of nominal phrases containing an A_{vari} can be subsumed as manifestations of human activity or human life. In order to get a better grip on this admittedly abstract definition the following subdivision is made.

Firstly, products of human activity are encountered that can again be divided into material products (artefacts) and abstract products. Artefacts are ‘banliyö treni’, ‘cami’, ‘dehliz’, ‘ev’, ‘heykel’, ‘kıyafet’, ‘koltuk’ and ‘ocak’; immaterial products are ‘dedikodu haberi’, ‘dizi’, ‘kitap’ (the contents, not the object), ‘kültür eleştirisi’, ‘senaryo’, ‘tarih’, ‘yazı’ and ‘yöntem’.

Secondly, there are the concepts ‘dünyaya bakış’ “world view”, ‘fikir’ “idea” and ‘temenni’, whose ontological counterparts do not necessarily originate from the conscious creative activity of man but are nonetheless controlled and developed by it. As opposed to this, animals are not imbued with ideas, world views and wishes; these concepts belong to the referential field of human life. In a world without humans, these concepts could not exist.

We shall refer to the concepts mentioned so far as objects, because no concepts with the feature “+alive” are included here.

Thirdly come the typical human activities ‘eylem’ “terror act” and ‘seyahat’, and fourthly a single concept, ‘popülist’, that contains the features “+alive” and “+human”. Last comes a time indication, ‘fasıl’, that has to be construed as a time segment of a human activity (politics in this case).

Thus the selection criterion for the head of the noun phrase turns out to be a semantic feature already encountered in the selection restrictions on the A_{vari} base: “+human (activity)”.

2.3. The semantics of the suffix

Depending on the semantics of the substantives that are made to relate to each other by means of the suffix, one out of the three following paraphrases of the semantics of *-vari* is actuated in the collocation:

- (1) “B-ye benzer”
- (2) “B-ye özgü, B-ye ait olabilecek”
- (3) “B şeklinde”

Paraphrase (1) fits in collocations in which the base belongs to group (1) or (2). These all denote concrete or abstract products that, because of certain properties in common, are compared to the denotatum of the head of the phrase, e.g.:

group (1): <i>şöminevari ocak</i>	“şömineye benzer ocak”
group (2): <i>Dallasvari diziler</i>	“Dallas’a benzer diziler”

The properties of the base that are relevant for the interpretation of the noun phrase inevitably form part of the primary features in the prototype definition, as otherwise a comparison would not make any communicative sense. For the head of the phrase, however, these properties are secondary features, they do not belong to its prototypical definition. Thus, in the examples adduced above, not every television series is like ‘Dallas’ and certainly not all fireplaces of the dwellings in rural Turkey are constructed like a ‘şömine’.

Paraphrase (2) is valid when the base is to be assigned to one of the groups 3, 5 and 6. The head of the phrase refers to objects and other entities, certain properties of which are stereotypically associated with a certain category of human beings or with a single place or person, e.g.:

group (3): <i>Nazivari yöntemler</i>	“Naziye özgü yöntemler”
group (5): <i>Texasvari banliyö trenleri</i>	“Texas’a özgü banliyö trenleri”
group (6): <i>Nietzschevari bir kültür eleştirisi</i>	“Nietzsche’ye ait olabilecek bir kültür eleştirisi”

Paraphrase (3) fits one collocation only, namely attestation (A7) *intiharvari eylem*. Such a terror act is not just similar to suicide, but combines suicide and an act of terrorism in one single action. In other words, although syntactically an adjective, in a semantic analysis *intiharvari* functions as an adverbial expression. I regard these semantics, which deviate from the interpretations given for the other collocations, as an isolated case and will not take them into account in the remainder of this section (however cf. section 2.4.).

The paraphrases (1) and (2) have in common that the exact nature of the relevant properties of the base eludes definition. When the base is a proper name, the fact that the descriptive statements connected with these names are never made explicit (Searle 1958: 171) already causes vagueness about the nature of the properties. In the collocation *Nazivari yöntemler* several properties can be involved, such as “systematically”, “cruelly”, “concentrated on a certain people” and “in huge numbers”. The relevant properties may even vary between one case and another. Thus in (A14) “*Özalvari, Demirelvari*” *temenniler* mainly unjustified optimism seems to be meant, while in (A15) *Özalvari seyahat* the composition and size of the accompanying group of persons is the relevant property. Such variation in the interpretation exceeds by far the usual semantic variation conditioned by actual collocations. The A_{vari} are thus

seen to display relatively vague and polydimensional semantics. They certainly do not predicate such primary features of the head as overall shape and contour.¹²

The two paraphrases stand in close relation to each other, as in both cases the properties that are typically associated with an object, place or person are involved. In order to express the similarity between paraphrases (1) and (2), they can both be rephrased thus:

- (4) “Birkaç niteliği B-ye özgü, ait olabilecek”
şöminevari ocak “birkaç niteliği şömineye özgü ocak”
Nazivari yöntemler “birkaç niteliği Naziye özgü yöntemler”

This new paraphrase is to be understood as the underlying, invariant meaning of the suffix in the structuralistic sense.

A further similarity may be noted between the bases in groups 1 and 2 on the one hand and those in groups 3, 5 and 6 on the other. The concepts in groups 1 and 2 are the products of human activity. As a consequence, the properties relevant in the collocation (= “birkaç niteliği”) likewise are a result of human intervention.

The feature “+human”, the only one shared by all bases, can be taken as the starting point in an attempt to explain the synchronic link between the surface polysemy as expressed in paraphrases (1) and (2). As the feature “+human” is more central to the concepts in groups 3, 5 and 6 than to those in groups 1 and 2, I suppose that the semantic derivation responsible for the polysemy originated in those cases where the base denotes a human being, a region inhabited by human beings or a category of human beings. Thus, paraphrase (2) is to be considered as primary and paraphrase (1) as secondary, as it can be derived from paraphrase (2). This semantic derivation was very probably made possible by the metaphor “typifying human behaviour = style”. The concept ‘stil’ contains a set of typical properties that are, however, secondary to the object in which they become manifest. These properties originate from the creative activity of a certain person or a certain group of persons. This concept ‘stil’ was metaphorically extended to anything in which human activity can play a typifying role: ‘üslûp’. As a matter of fact, both concepts, ‘stil’ and ‘üslûp’, can be represented by the lexeme *üslûp*.

This style is not a generally known and applied style, but, on the contrary, a very individual one. This is already implied by the low position of the bases in the taxonomy of semantic categories (see section 2.1.).

This having been said, the underlying paraphrase (4) can be rephrased in a more natural way. For this purpose, a quasi-synonym of *üslûp* that is more frequent in the press, *tarz*, will be used:

- (5) “B tarzını andıran”
şöminevari ocak “şömine tarzını andıran ocak”

¹² Cf. Rosch (1977: 34) on contour as a powerful factor in the human classification of natural objects.

<i>Dallasvari diziler</i>	“Dallas tarzını andıran diziler”
<i>Nazivari yöntemler</i>	“Nazi tarzını andıran yöntemler”
<i>Texasvari banliyö trenleri</i>	“Texas tarzını andıran banliyö trenleri”
<i>Nietzschevari bir kültür eleştirisi</i>	“Nietzsche tarzını andıran bir kültür eleştirisi”

I regard this paraphrase to be the final one because it includes the following semantic elements: 1) Comparison; 2) set of properties primary to the base but secondary to the head; 3) human intervention; 4) relative vagueness of definition (*andıran*). It is not the case that a semantic feature of the base has hereby been projected onto the semantics of the suffix. The feature “+human activity” is only implicitly present in groups 3, 5 and 6. In groups 3 and 6 two separate features occur, “+human” and “+activity”, that are only combined in the semantics of the suffix. Group 5 is somewhat problematic when one attempts to decide whether the feature “+human” or “+human activity” is present. Leaving aside the semantics of the suffix, this can only be solved by taking into account the semantics of the head. The appropriateness of paraphrase (5) is further supported by the fact that several of the concepts occurring in the attestations belong to referential fields in which the concept ‘stil’ occupies a prominent position: literature, arts and architecture, etc.

The selection restrictions identified in the previous two sections have thus turned out to be directly conditioned by the semantics of the suffix.

2.4. Characteristics of the nominal phrase (semantics, stylistics, quasi-synonyms)

In order to identify differences with quasi-synonymous expressions as regards semantics and selection restrictions, it may be useful first to elaborate on the semantics and stylistics of the nominal phrase in which an A_{vari} occurs.

An A_{vari} nominal phrase is not a metaphorical expression, as only a shift within the taxonomic tree to which the head belongs takes place and not a horizontal transposition from one taxonomic tree to another. If the base constitutes an artefact, it often is a hyponym of the head (‘gecekondu’ → ‘ev’, ‘şömine’ → ‘ocak’, ‘Dallas’ → ‘dizi’). In cases where a hyponym-hyperonym relation between base and head does not exist, as in *gecekonduvari camiler*, both concepts relate as hyponyms to the same superordinate concept (‘bina’). The A_{vari} are qualifying and add new properties to the concept of the head of the phrase, thus establishing a new subcategory.

This newly established subcategory is temporary, as it functions only within the linguistic context in which it is introduced. Cf., for instance, (A10) *Metin Vertanvari (bir yazı)*, a nominal phrase that outside its context does not make sense. Many of the other A_{vari} nominal phrases as well cannot be completely understood without a context. This is probably the reason why sometimes further information is given that relates to the nominal phrase and thus helps to establish the new category. In (A3) the heading *Çillervari tarih* is explained in the text, just as the heading *Chirac’tan Özalvari seyahat* in (A15). In (A11) *Nazivari yöntemler* several further indications

(*yüzlerce masum insan, gaz odaları*) point to the meaning of the nominal phrase, and in the case of (A23) *dünyaya Walt Disneyvari bakışı* this is done by the following sentence *Düşünceleri olağanüstü saf ve temiz*.

Although (A7) *intiharvari eylem* is in fact a rather sharply defined concept, this nominal phrase is also to be interpreted as a temporary category. The text containing the attestation was pronounced before the suicide attacks were actually carried out. I suppose that for tactical reasons the speaker consciously chose a vague expression instead of one of the more usual ones (*intihar eylemi, intihar saldırısı, intihar saldırısı eylemi*). This example is furthermore exceptional because the neologism occurs twice within the same text within only a small interval. This runs contrary to the nonce status of A_{vari} .

Among the text types in which the attestations of A_{vari} were found, the objective-informative style seldom occurred. The attestations originate mainly from comments by the *köşe yazarları* (A2, A3, A13, A14), from interviews and discussions (A1, A12, A16, A22, A23) and from travel accounts (A8, A20, A21). In the reporting section of the newspapers it was only in reports on foreign affairs, which are mostly cast in an expressive-informative style, that some attestations could be found (A11, A15, A17, A18). Expressive-informative reporting on home affairs is the context for (A9) and (A19). The contexts of the occurrences just mentioned and of (A4, A5) and (A10) often contain an evaluating judgement. This evaluation is sometimes positive, mostly, however, negative. As the evaluation can be deduced from the context only, I hesitate to ascribe an ameliorative or pejorative value to the A_{vari} or to the suffix itself.

In two cases the information is given in an objective-informative style. Apart from the exceptional case (A7) already mentioned, this applies to example (A6) *gecekonduvari bir ev*. For the moment this has to be regarded as an exception for which no logical explanation presents itself. One could presume that ‘gecekonduvari’ is developing into a sharply defined concept. This is also suggested by repeated attestations in independent sources.

As A_{vari} markedly often occur in expressive, evaluative contexts, one could justifiably think that they function as stylistic markers of such texts. Taking the etymology of the suffix into account, this assumption is in accordance with the findings of Hřebíček (1975: 225, 230), who likewise stresses the stylistically marked role of Arabic and Persian elements in contemporary Turkish texts.¹³ As regards the base, the use of proper names as full-fledged concepts is a constructive element of texts cast in an expressive mode. Likewise the low position of the other concepts in their respective taxonomy trees aids to achieve an expressive effect.

A further contribution to the expressive value of A_{vari} can possibly be found in their phonological structure. The 21 bases are relatively long, and in 13 cases they show non-harmonic vowel sequences, partly because they are often loans. The same

¹³ Derivates containing a loan suffix were classified as a loan for the purposes of his study (Hřebíček 1975: 225).

qualification holds for the suffix itself. The derivatives have an average syllable number of 4.76, which is well above the average 2.6 for Turkish words (Bazin 1962: 64; Tretiakoff 1970: 32). The derivatives thus appear to be phoneme sequences marked by length and non-harmonic structure.¹⁴

Turning now to quasi-synonymous expressions, their description must remain restricted to some salient properties, as no exhaustive analysis was carried out for them.

(a) *B tarzı*.

As can be seen from paraphrase (5), the *A_{vari}* stand in close relation to this expression. The difference from *A_{vari}* lies in the fact that the “style” in question is not presented as a new, individual and vaguely defined concept, but as a generally known and sharply defined one, e.g. *Nü tarzı çalışmalar*, *Batı tarzı kahveler*. However, the attitude of the speaker is decisive, and therefore new concepts also may be presented as if they were generally known, e.g. *Toto tarzı gruplar*, “*görüntü var ses yok*” *tarzı bir gitar*. Furthermore the expression *B tarzı* lends itself better to use in objective-informative text types without causing stylistic dissonance.

(b) *B usulü*.

In one of its uses, this expression, too, serves to render a generally known and sharply defined concept. In addition, it more clearly stresses that the relevant features of the head originate from human activity, e.g. *Japon usulü erotizm*, *Madonna usulü müzikal*, *Türk usulü bir “Watergate”*. The base often denotes human collectives, and sometimes human individuals. The denotation of artefacts is precluded because of the stress on human activity. Another difference to *A_{vari}* nominal phrases is that in *B usulü* phrases the relevant features of the head came about thanks to the specific activity of the individual or individuals referred to by the base, as in the examples just given. In *A_{vari}* nominal phrases this is left unspecified and may (*Çillervari tarih*) or may not (*Chirac’tan Özalvari seyahat*) be the case.

(c) *B-msi*.¹⁵

According to the description given by Banguoğlu (1957: 16-17) these adjectives have a vague reference (“*takribî benzerlik ifade eder*”), a quality which they share with *A_{vari}*. They distinguish themselves from the latter by the pejorative evaluation they may convey: “*raporumsu bir yazı = kötü bir rapor, sözde rapor demek olur*”. As the semantics of the suffix do not specify exactly how the features shared by the base and the head came into existence, natural objects can also occur as a base, e.g. *meyvemsi bir koku*. The same attestation shows that the denotatum of the base does not necessarily belong to a very specific subcategory, but can easily be picked from a higher level in the taxonomy of natural categories.

¹⁴ Cf. Mathesius (1964) for the associative phonological analysis.

¹⁵ The suffix *-si*, which basically has the same semantics, is less productive and, apart from that, is used in the conscious coining of neologistic technical terms (Banguoğlu 1957: 20-21). For these reasons it will not be considered here.

(d) B *benzeri*.

This expression is likewise rather vague in its reference and does not seem to display any specific selection restrictions, e.g. *AİDS benzeri virüs*, *omurgasız mahlukat benzeri kıvrılma*, *12 Eylül benzeri uygulamalar*. Therefore, with the loss of some semantic specificity, it can function as an alternative to an A_{vari} , as in *gecekondu benzeri evler*. B *benzeri* is especially apt to be used in objective-informative text types, e.g. *borç benzeri kalemler*, *sünger benzeri tüpler*.

2.5. Status of *-vari* within a description of modern Turkish

According to Lyons (1990: 526-534) only derivatives that display morphological, syntactic and / or semantic idiosyncrasies, i.e. whose derivation and meaning cannot be captured by a set of rules, should be incorporated into the lexical component of a linguistic description. Such a set of rules, on the other hand, is part of the grammatical component. In view of the considerable amount of neologisms, their transparent and regular semantics, and their unequivocal selection restrictions, the description of A_{vari} clearly belongs to the derivational part of the grammatical component. This positioning, however, raises the question of the productivity of this derivational rule.

This question cannot be answered satisfactorily on the basis of the data collected so far. Apart from the press texts of a mainly expressive nature, some attestations of A_{vari} were found in non-fiction and in the speech of intellectuals; they are listed in appendix B. In the everyday speech of the lesser educated these derivations do not seem to occur.¹⁶ Within the written and spoken speech production of intellectuals, two distinct thematic fields can be made out. If the topic is somehow related to literature, art and architecture or fashion, an A_{vari} can be coined without any apparent stylistic connotation (cf. also *O'Henryvari*, *romanvari*, *Şarkvari*, *ketenvari*). In other thematic fields the coining is marked and aims at a stylistic effect, cf. also *ortak pazarvari*¹⁷ and especially *Sokratvari*, the exceptional use of which is prepared in context by the introductory remark *Donaldson'un tâbiriyle*. However, such deliberate neologisms pertain to morphological creativity, not to morphological productivity (Van Marle 1985: 45-47). If the attestations listed in appendixes A and B are indicative of the language use in general, then the derivation rule cannot be said to be unrestrictedly productive, as under certain conditions coining is deliberate and stylistically marked. With this in mind, Lewis' statement on the productivity of *-vari* (see section 1.1.) can be confirmed and qualified.

¹⁶ In fact Pierce (1961, 1962) attested his single A_{vari} (*külhanbeyvari*) in written texts and not in the speech of the lesser educated.

¹⁷ This example, that contains an inflectional morpheme positioned between the base and the derivational morpheme, is similar to some attestations cited by Tietze (1964: 197-198), like *Denizli horozuvari*, *Montmartredakilervari*. This order deviates from the general rules of Turkish morphology and might be a manifestation of the phenomenon that Zwicky & Pullum (1987: 336) subsume under the notion "expressive morphology". Tietze calls the style of the context in which the attestations occur "etwas überspitzt". These attestations all stem from one and the same author.

The etymological factor does not provide a restriction on the productivity of the derivation rule. It is true that many bases are loans just like the suffix itself, but for a well-formed derivate no knowledge of any *specific* foreign language is needed.¹⁸ Apart from that, etymologically Turkish bases are also possible, albeit not very frequent if one disregards the proper names.

3. Diachronic observations

As the suffix *-vari* already was an element of the Late Ottoman language system and is a loan from Persian, one might be tempted to regard its use simply as an “Ottomanism”, anachronistically continuing the usage of days gone by.¹⁹ Guided by some attestations, listed in appendix C, an attempt will be made to ascertain to which extent the contemporary Turkish derivation rule for A_{-vari} is a mere copy of rules belonging to the grammar of Late Ottoman proper.

3.1. cursory description of the Late Ottoman material

As regards the selection restrictions on the base, natural categories also may be the denotatum of the base, e.g. (C4) *gagavari*. Likewise, the selection of the head of the phrase is not restricted to cultural categories, e.g. (C4) *burun*, (C5) *nebat*, (C10) *tepeler*. The semantics of the suffix can, in certain attestations, be captured by the paraphrase given above (“B tarzını andıran”), as in (C1) *Arsen Lüpenvari bir intrika*, (C2) *Bekir Mustafavari mestane bir nara*, (C3) *Frenkvari hayat*. If a base or a head is selected that is not a cultural category, the paraphrase “B biçimi” suggests itself, as in (C10) *şemsiyevvari tepeler*. Both these paraphrases can be included in the basic paraphrase “B-ye benzer”, where the use of proper names as a base is metonymic.²⁰ The derivate *sıravari* in, for instance, (C9) *sıravari yalılar* has a deviant interpretation: “bir sıra teşkil eden” (Şemseddin Sami p. 826). It can only occur in noun phrases in which the head refers to more than one object.

As far as objects are concerned, reference does not seem to be particularly vague. In the expression *şemsiyevvari tepeler* it is clear which feature of the concept ‘şemsiye’ is predicated for the concept ‘tepe’. In the case of geometric forms, reference is necessarily unequivocal, as the definition of such concepts is unidimensional: (C5) *haçvari yol*, (C6) *halkavari şekiller*. Here, primary features of the head are referred to. Since

¹⁸ Indeed, as the derivatives serve to establish new and very specific categories, it cannot be excluded that the predilection for “western” bases is determined by extra-linguistic rather than linguistic factors. The modern orientation of Turkish society toward European and American culture may involve a tendency for establishing such new categories by means of familiar western ones.

¹⁹ “The relationship between the modern language and the Ottoman written language, for instance, has been reduced to little more than a myth by those who criticize the use [of] ‘old-fashioned’ vocabulary by labelling it as ‘Ottoman’” (Boeschoten 1991: 176).

²⁰ In concordance with this analysis, the definition given for the suffix in *Kamus-u Türkî* is: “benzer, müşabih, tarz ve biçiminde”.

the possibility of unequivocal reference is given, certain A_{vari} can be lexicalised, like *gagavari* “aquiline”, (C8) *mahallevari* “vulgar”, and even be used as technical terms, like *pıhtıvari* “jelly-like; clotted, coagulated” (Redhouse 1890) and the derivatives *haçvari*, *halkavari* mentioned above. Base and head do not necessarily belong to the same taxonomic tree, see *haçvari yol*, *şemsiyevari tepeler*.

3.2. Some explanatory hypotheses

A comparison between the Late Ottoman and contemporary descriptions shows that the suffix must have been limited to the metonymical use of proper names, thus leaving room for the paraphrase “B tarzını andıran”. It is only after this reinterpretation was made that cultural categories could become included in the selection restrictions. A direct limitation from objects in general to cultural ones only is not well conceivable without this intermediate analytic step.

As a consequence, the synchronic semantic relation between the derivatives is different. Whereas in the Late Ottoman derivation rule, the metonymical use of proper names is secondary, in the rule for contemporary Turkish the general paraphrase starts from exactly these bases, while the derivation from bases denoting cultural categories is made possible by a secondary extension.

In the course of the Language Reform, the suffix *-vari* became a candidate for replacement by etymologically Turkish morphemes. This must have limited its productivity, and some of its semantic functions were taken over by other morphological models. To the functions that were taken over belong the (unequivocal) comparison with natural categories and the coining of technical terms. The semantics and use of the suffix have thus been subject to specialisation and, as was shown in section 2.4., contemporary Turkish has no directly competing candidate for the functions. The semantic specialisation has increased the remaining transparency of the derivation rule.

Some possible explanations for the present situation suggest themselves. I will list them here as hypotheses that might serve as lines of further investigation.

(a) $-(İ)msİ$.

One of the derivational morphemes used to replace *-vari* in the coining of technical terms is $-(İ)msİ$, as in *haçımsı* (Steuerwald) and *halkamsı* (*Türkçe sözlük*). Although in the reformed language system $-(İ)msİ$ could have been a morphological alternative for all aspects of the Late Ottoman derivation by means of *-vari*, the Turkish morpheme apparently did not succeed in taking over all the functions of the morpheme inherited from Ottoman. One reason for this must be the pejorative connotation that may be associated with $-(İ)msİ$. According to an informant, when complimenting a woman, the use of ***prensensimsi* instead of **prensensvari* would be out of place. The examples that Banguoğlu (1957: 16) cites for the pejorative connotation, *odamsı bir yer* and *raporumsu bir yazı*, both contain an artefact as the base and a hyperonym to this base as the head. This may be pure coincidence, but nevertheless it would be worth investigating under which conditions the pejorative connotation arises.

Phonological and etymological selection restrictions should also be considered. For instance, Kononov (1956: 146) points out that monosyllabic bases ending in a consonant are a relevant criterion for the distribution of the suffixes *-sî* and *-(î)msî*. As already stated, in the attestations of A_{vari} the base often contains three or more syllables and is a loan.²¹

If such selection restrictions are actually present in the derivation rule of *-(î)msî*, one could look into the chain of cause and effect. The suffix *-vari* seems to fit precisely into the slot left empty by *-(î)msî*. Or was the expansion of *-(î)msî* into this domain blocked because it was already covered by *-vari*?

(b) *Amerikanvari*.

Probably for several decades already, this lexeme has had a high frequency compared to the remaining A_{vari} . It cannot be ruled out that analogy to this lexeme supported the derivation of modern A_{vari} in their specialised meanings. However, I do not think that the presence of this lexeme was the sole decisive factor in the development of the new derivational model, as already Late Ottoman contained the elements from which the modern model has emerged.

(c) *-kâri*.

The modern use of the suffix *-vari* is very similar to a certain use of the originally Persian suffix *-kâri* encountered in Late Ottoman and in the first decades of Republican Turkish. For instance, Steuerwald (1993: 494) gives as its second meaning “ähnlich wie..., nach der Art von ..., gemahnend an ...”. The derivatives that contain this suffix likewise invoke the concept of an individual and relatively vaguely defined style. My incidental attestations of *-kâri*, just like many of the modern attestations of *-vari*, come from thematic fields such as literature, arts and architecture and politics (see appendix D). It is conceivable that the suffix *-kâri*, which is no longer used, left a vacuum that was filled by *-vari*.

(d) French *-esque*

The French suffix *-esque* shows in one of its uses a strong resemblance to contemporary Turkish *-vari*.²² This resemblance concerns derivatives with proper names or loans as their base in order to create adjectives with the general meaning “présentant le caractère spécifique de”, e.g. *chaplinsque*, *lupinesque*, *molièresque*. In French, this kind of derivation notably from the 19th century onward yielded a certain number of neologisms (Zwanenburg 1975: 227-230). In Ottoman official and intellectual circles the knowledge of French started to spread in the first half of the 19th century and by the middle of that century this process had reached a point where one could justifiably speak of a kind of Ottoman / French bilingualism in the social upper classes.²³ Also after this almost exclusive concentration on French had given way,

²¹ Taking into account actual language use, i.e. the texts screened for attestations, rather than the paradigmatic relations within the language system, derivatives with *-(î)msî* were found to be conspicuously less frequent than derivatives with *-vari*.

²² I am indebted to one of my anonymous reviewers for this valuable suggestion.

²³ Indications for such a state of affairs can be gleaned from Levend (1972: 142-143, 178, 241).

during a large part of the 20th century proficiency in French remained the hallmark of the westward looking Turkish intellectual. As A_{vari} with proper names as their base are also attested for the Late Ottoman period, it is possible that the French derivatives with *-esque* exerted a certain pressure already on the Late Ottoman derivation with *-vari*. When this hypothesis turns out to be true, further research may show whether the influence of the French derivatives remained largely restricted to Late Ottoman times or was also of some relevance for the change between the derivation rules of Late Ottoman and those of contemporary Turkish.

4. Conclusion

Derivation by means of the loan suffix *-vari* has proven to be an integral part of the grammar of contemporary Turkish. Its description cannot simply be delegated to a grammar of Late Ottoman. The clear delimitation of the data set in terms of period and language variety helped to identify the relevant characteristics of the derivation rule. These two criteria could be added to the reasonable prerequisites for a Turkish morphology as listed by Berta (1991). Keeping in mind the high rate of change which Late Ottoman and Republican Turkish have been subject to in the 20th century, I believe it advisable to scrutinise every attestation older than 40-50 years as to its relevance for a description of the grammar of contemporary Turkish.

References

- Aksoy, Ömer Asım 1980. *Dil yanlışları: 900 sözün eleştirisi* (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 470.) Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi basımevi.
- Aronoff, Mark 1976. *Word formation in general grammar* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 1.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Banguoğlu, Tahsin 1957. Türkçede benzerlik sıfatları. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten* 1957, 13-27.
- Bazin, Louis 1962. Note sur la fréquence des voyelles turques. In: Eckmann, János et al. (eds.) *Németh armağanı*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu. 61-68.
- Berta, Árpád 1991. Gedanken zur Erforschung der Wortbildungselemente im Türkischen. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 45/2-3, 205-217.
- Bilgegil, M. Kaya 1982². *Türkçe dilbilgisi*. İstanbul: Dergâh yayınları.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik 1991. Aspects of language variation. In: Boeschoten, H. & Verhoeven, L. (eds.) *Turkish linguistics today*. Leiden: Brill. 150-176.
- Cüceloğlu, Doğan & Slobin, Dan I. 1980. Effects of Turkish Language Reform on person perception. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 11/3, 297-326.
- Devellioğlu, Ferit 1995¹². *Osmanlıca-Türkçe ansiklopedik lûgat*. Ankara: Aydın kitabevi yayınları.
- Gencan, Tahir Nejat 1966. *Dilbilgisi* (Türk Dil Kurumu yayınları 243.) İstanbul: Ahmet Sait basımevi.
- Hřebíček, Luděk 1975. The Turkish Language Reform and contemporary texts: A contribution to the stylistic evaluation of borrowings. *Archív Orientální* 43, 223-231.
- İmer, Kâmile 1991. Türkçenin sözcükteki yeni ögeler. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* 1991, 18-28.

Bildfehler

Die Konvertierung der Seite ist fehlgeschlagen, bitte melden Sie den Fehler an die DigiZeitschriften Geschäftsstelle.

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

Zwicky, Arnold M. & Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1987. Plain morphology and expressive morphology. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 13, 330-340.

Appendix

A. Contemporary Turkish attestations of A_{vari} in the press

(A1) *Barbara Cartland'vari* (kitap)

– Kitabı okudum ve müthiş bir aldatılma duygusu beni sardı.
– Anlamadım niye böyle hissettiğinizi, okudunuz mu hepsini?
– Atlaya zıplaya okudum, bana Barbara Cartland'vari geldi. Aşk üzerine böyle yoğunlaşan bir yazarın belki de erkek olmasıydı bana inandırıcı gelmeyen.” (Zeynep Tunusu, *Haber Extra* 1/5, 23/10/1997, p. 100)

(A2) *Baykal'vari* (fasıl)

“Baykal koşullarla mı geliyor, karşı koşullar sıralamaya başladı ... Daha sonraki fasıl elbette Baykal'vari olacak, kimi isteklerine “geçmişe dönme olasılığını” da ekleyecek.” (Cüneyt Arcayürek, *Cumhuriyet Hafta*, 03/04/1998, p. 19)

(A3) *Çillervari tarih* [heading]

“Çünkü, “tarih”, altın yaldızlı boyaya batırılmış sahte harflerle değil, beyaz üzerine düşen siyah mürekkeple yazılıyor.” (Hadi Uluengin, *Hürriyet*, 07/12/1995)

(A4) *Dallasvari diziler*

“Üstelik, toplumun adetlerine alışkanlıklarına ters düştüğüne büyük kitlenin inandığı Dallasvari dizilerin getirilmesi büyük bir yayıncılık olayı imiş gibi sunulmuş.” (Lale Karaca, İzmit, in a letter to the editor, *Erkekçe* 5/8, October 1985)

(A5) *gecekonduvari camiler*

“Mazi ve istikbali düşünmeden, ancak günün ihtiyacını giderecek vasıfsız, sanat değerinden yoksun, zevksiz ve gecekonduvari camiler yapılıyor.” (Diyanet İşleri Başkanı Mehmet Nuri Yılmaz, quoted in *Cumhuriyet Hafta*, Oct./Nov. 1995)

(A6) *gecekonduvari bir ev*

“Evimiz kiraydı. Dört yıl önce gecekonduvari bir ev yapıp buraya, Beykoz'a taşındık.” (Lise öğrenci Yılmaz Polat, quoted in *Cumhuriyet Hafta*, 11/10/1996, p. 14)

(A7) *intiharvari eylem*

“Yapımızdaki hazırlık böyle intiharvari eylem dönemini geliştirecek seviyededir. Halkımız artık tahammül sınırlarını zorlama noktasındadır. Her PKK militanının intiharvari eylem özelliği olduğunu biliyoruz.” (Abdullah Öcalan (translated), quoted in *Hürriyet*, 30/10/1996, p. 6)

(A8) *kuklavari heykel*

“Bence daha önemlisi hemen altında harekete geçen dört kuklavari heykel.” (Hakan Akçaoğlu, *Tombak* 16, October 1997, p. 78)

(A9) *labirentvari dehlizler*

“Bu arada 1930'larda yapılan bir arkeolojik kazı Çemberlitaş civarında bir takım labirentvari dehlizlerin doğruluğunu kanıtladı.” (Şafak Altun, *Nokta* 13/18, 30/04-06/07/1995, p. 46)

(A10) *Metin Vertanvari (bir yazı)*

“Başka bir okur, gazete yönetimini 15 yıl önce ölen yazar Metin Vertan’ın stilini kopya etmekle kınıyordu. Bu okura göre, özellikle yazının içindeki şu kısım Metin Vertanvari-ydi.” (Güney Menteş, *Erkekçe* 8/2, April 1988, p. 87)

(A11) *Nazivari yöntemler*

“Sırpların, Bosanska Krupa bölgesinde yüzlerce masum insanı öldürdükleri gaz odaları ortaya çıkarıldı. Tanıklar esir kampında Nazivari yöntemlerle öldürülen sivillerin, yöre yakınlarındaki bir köyde bulunan toplu mezara gömüldüğünü söylüyorlar.” (*Hürriyet*, 15/06/1996, p. 17)

(A12) *Nietzsche’vâri bir ‘kültür eleştirisi’*

“‘Dullara Yas Yakışır’da ise, bir önceki gelişmeye ve toplum eleştirisine Nietzsche’vâri bir ‘kültür eleştirisi’ eklenmiş, doğaya ‘kozmetik’ bir yaklaşım gözlemleniyor, biçim denemeleri daha faz[la].” (*Cumhuriyet Kitap* (supplement to *Cumhuriyet Hafta*), 21/12/1995, p. 5)

(A13) *“Özalvari” (fikirler)*

“Yılmaz’ın Kürtler hakkında biraz da “Özalvari” bulunan bu fikirlerini, görüşeceği Alman devlet adamlarına da açıklaması bekleniyordu.” (İzzet Sedes, *Akşam*, quoted in *Hürriyet*, 18/05/1996, p. 12)

(A14) *“Özalvari, Demirelvari” temenniler*

“Ekonomi, lirik bir iş değildir. Hesaba kitaba uymalısınız. Temennilerle tahminleri ayrılmalısınız. Erbakan’ın “Yeniden Büyük Türkiye Projesi”, bu anlamda, ‘Özalvari, Demirelvari’ temenniler bütünüdür.” (Şeref Oğuz, *Milliyet*, 27/01/1997, p. 4)

(A15) *Özalvari seyahat*

“Chirac’tan Özalvari seyahat” [heading]

“Bir zamanlar Turgut Özal’ın yaptığı gibi Latin Amerika gezisine beraberinde kalabalık bir heyet getiren Chirac, gezinin ilk ayağı olan Brezilya’da bugün ve yarın temaslarını sürdürecektir.” (*Hürriyet*, 11/03/1997, p. 17)

(A16) *“paparazzivari” dedikodu haberleri*

“Ben Avrupa’da yaşayan ve Üniversite eğitimi alan gençler ile ilgili bir röportajı ‘paparazzivari’ dedikodu haberlerine tercih ederim. O tür bir programda asla yer almak istemezdim zaten ...” (Lale Barçın İmer, quoted in *Hürriyet TV7 Magazin*, 04/05/1996, p. 7)

(A17) *Peronvari bir popülist*

“Hakkında açılan ‘soruşturmanın’ doğruluğu ya da haksızlığı bir yana, Di Pietro’yu ‘Peronvari bir popülist’ etiketiyle nitelendirenler ve üslubunu eleştirenler – ki aydınların büyük kısmı bu grup içinde – bulunuyor.” (Nilgün Cerrahoğlu, *Milliyet*, 19/11/1996, p. 8)

(A18) *“Süpermenvari” kıyafet*

“Meksika’da, ‘Süpermenvari’ kıyafetiyle varoşlardaki yoksulların yardımına koşarak adını duyuran, ‘Süper Barrio’ şimdi Chiapas Eyaleti’nin bağımsızlığını isteyen yerli gerillalara destek veriyor.” (Dario Lopez Mills (translated), *Hürriyet*, 11/05/1996, p. 8)

(A19) *şezlongvari beyaz koltuklar*

“İzleyicinin rahat etmesi için hiçbir fedakârlıktan kaçınmayan Conrad Açık Hava Sine-ması’nda; yeşil kaplı zeminde, şezlongvari beyaz koltuklar geniş aralıklarla sıralanmış ...” (Pervin Karadağ, *Kaçamak mekanları* (supplement to *Tempo*), 18-23/07/1996, p. 24)

(A20) *şöminevari ocak*

“şöminevari ocak, oturduğumuz divanın yanıtbaşındaydı, ama teyzenin yemekleri ne zaman hazırladığını farkedememiştik.” (*Cumhuriyet Hafta – Dergi*, 26/01-01/02/1996, p. 19)

(A21) *Texasvari banliyö trenleri*

“Teksasvari banliyö trenleriyle en fazla bir saat uzaklıkta bir istasyon.” (*Cumhuriyet Hafta*, 22-28/12/1995, p. 17)

(A22) *tiyatrovvari (senaryolar)*

“Türkiye’de senaryolar Almanya’daki film senaryolarına kıyasla çok daha tiyatrovvari.” (Rebecca Winter (translated), quoted in *Erkekçe* 6/4, June 1986, p. 125)

(A23) *dünyaya Walt Disneyvari bakışı*

– Nicoletta’nın hangi özelliği çekici geldi?

– Zekâsı, yumuşak huyu ve dünyaya Walt Disneyvari bakışı. Düşünceleri olağanüstü saf ve temiz.” (Luciano Pavarotti (translated), quoted in *Aktüel* 263, 18-24/07/1996, p. 14)

B. Further modern attestations of A_{vari}

(B1) *ketenvari ayakkabı* (sales talk in a shoe shop, April 1998)

(B2) *O’Henry vari, Maupassant vari, Çehov vari, Virginia Wolf vari öykü*

“O’Henry vari, Maupassant vari, başı, ortası, sonu, gerilimi, aksyonu, vurucu bitişi olan klasik öykünün olsun; modern öykü adı altında topladığımız Çehov vari, Virginia Wolf vari öykünün olsun, elbet ayrı ayrı işlenişleri var.” (Haldun Taner, quoted in F. Bozkurt, *Türkiye Türkçesi*, İstanbul: Cem yayınevi, 1995, p. 435)

(B3) *ortak pazarıvari bir şey* (manager in the tourist industry in a discussion on politics, July 1996)

(B4) *romanvari kurmaca*

“1797’de, oradan oraya dolaşan bir boyacı, şapkacı, ayyakkabıcı [sic!] ve demir işçisi olarak yaşadığı maceralarla ilgili, ilk bakışta romanvari kurmaca olarak algılanıp okunabilecek bir anlatı ortaya çıkmıştır.” (Suraiya Faroqhi, *Osmanlı kültürü ve gündelik yaşam*, translated by Elif Kılıç, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1997, p. 262)

(B5) “*Sokratvârî*” bir okul

“Mevcut rivâyetlerden İmam Câfer es-Sâdık’ın Medîne’deki bahçeli evine her taraftan ziyaretçilerin geldiği ve onun, burada, Donaldson’un tâbiriyle ‘Sokratvârî’ bir okul teşkil ettiği anlaşılmaktadır.” (Dwight M. Donaldson, translated and quoted by Ethem Ruhi Fiğlalı, *Türkiye’de Alevilik ve Bektaşilik*, Ankara: Selçuk Yayınları, 1994³, p. 265)

(B6) *şarkvari hanlar*

“Camileri ve türbeleriyle, medreseleriyle (cami okullarıyla), öylesine çeşitli ve güzel sokak çeşmeleriyle, köşkleri ve saraylarıyla, büyük şarkvari hanları ve kapalıçarşılarıyla, İstanbul bir Doğu başkenti olarak adlandırılmayı hak etmektedir.” (Fred Field Goodsell,

in *İstanbul 1920*, C. R. Johnson (ed.), translated by Sönmez Taner, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1995, p. 75)

C. Late Ottoman attestations of *A_{vari}*

(C1) *Arsen Lüpenvari bir intrika*

“Yirmi beş sene içinde bin türlü sıkıntı ile, istikballeri için biriktirdikleri serveti bankadaki kasadan Arsen Lüpenvari bir intrika ile aşırıp Amerika’ya kaçtığından beri karı koca ismini bile ağızlarına almıyorlardı.” (Ömer Seyfettin, *Bahar ve kelebekler*, İstanbul: İktbal Kütüphanesi sahibi Hüseyin, 1927, p. 46)

(C2) *Bekir Mustafavari mestane bir nara*

“Mesut Beyin hanesinde bir gece döşeklere girildiği esnada kapı önünde Bekir Mustafavari mestane bir nara işitildi.” (Hüseyin Rahmi [Gürpınar], *Tebessüm-ü elem*, İstanbul: Tüccarzade İbrahim Hilmi, 1339, p. 520)

(C3) *Frenkvari hayat*

“Bütün vükelâ, vüzera, erkân rical ile yüz göz olmuş; kapılarını vurmada, kartını göndermeden, hademeye aldırmadan odalarına giriyor, vakitli vakitsiz evlerine gidiyor, uykudan uyandırıyor, yataklarının üzerine oturup konuşuyor, Frenkvari hayata düşkün, yanında daima birkaç mühendis bozuntusu, bayağı yüzlü, fakat şapkaklı herif, otomobil ile İstanbul’u vızıl vızıl dolaşiyor, Alman sosyetelerine girip çıkıyor, ceneral bilmem kimin kızı yanında çarşığı geziyor, müdür-ü umumî bilmem nenin madamasıyla Eyüp’e gidiyor, yalnız onlarla düşüp kalkıyor.” (Refik Halit [Karay], *İstanbul’un iç yüzü*, İstanbul: Kitaphane-i Hilmi, 1336, pp. 124-125)

(C4) *gagavari (burun)*

“Burun Fransızların ‘akilin’ tabir ettikleri şeklinde yani gagavari ufacak siyah gözler gayet çukurda!” (Hüseyin Rahmi [Gürpınar], *Şık*, Dersaadet: İbrahim Hilmi, 1336², pp. 16-17)

(C5) *haçvari (nebat)*

“[salibî] haç şeklinde olan, haçvari, haç şeklini ibraz edecek surette dört yaprağı olan (nebat).” (Şemseddin Sami, p. 832)

(C6) *haçvari yol* (Şemseddin Sami, p. 566)

(C7) *halkavari şekiller*

“[daire] fiçının çemberi gibi. Yahut def ve kalbur misillü şeylerin tahtadan olan halkavari şekiller gibi.” (Muallim Naci, *Talim-i Kiraat* 1. kısım, İstanbul: 1325³³, p. 54)

(C8) *mahallevari su-i zanlar*

“Gayet fassal, dedikoducuydu da ... Her gelen misafir hanımın namusundan şüphe getirir:
– Kaltağın biri, yürüyüşünden belli ...
yahut:

– Halis aşüfte, üstünden akıyor ...

gibi mahallevari su-i zanlarla dünyayı lekeler, kirletirdi.” (Refik Halit [Karay], *İstanbul’un iç yüzü*, İstanbul: Kitaphane-i Hilmi, 1336, pp. 68-69)

(C9) *sıravari yalılar, ağaçlar* (Şemseddin Sami, p. 826)

(C10) *şemsiyevari tepeler*

“Şu karşiki yamaçta, koyun rakid ayinesinde, meftûnâne akislerini seyreder gibi birer halâvetle eğilmiş, şemsiyevari tepeleri, güneşle yaldızlanmış üç büyük fıstık ağacı var.” (Hüseyin Rahmi [Gürpınar], *Tebessüm-ü elem*, İstanbul: Tüccarzade İbrahim Hilmi, 1339, p. 16)

D. Attestations for other derivational models(D1) *dehlizkârî çerçeveli melceler*

“Sığınak: (Sahra tahkimatı)nda vakte ve cuz’î veya oldukça kâfi inşaat malzemesine göre muhtelif şekillerde yapılabilen ve hava, parça... tesirlerine karşı tahaffuz temin eden basit, dehlizkârî, çerçeveli, melcelerle (Daime tahkimatı)nda (Gaz, Bomba ve Mermi emniyetli) olarak vücutte getirilen kuvvetli ve büyük melcelerin umumuna şâmil bir tâbirdir.” (Selahaddin A. Kip, *Askerî Kamus*, İstanbul: Vakıf, 1939, pp. 221-222)

(D2) *Fecr-i Âtîkârî (mecmua)*

“Bu mecmuayı pek lenfatik ve çok Fecr-i Âtîkârî bulduğumuz için, Akil Koyuncu ile konuştuk, adını Genç Kalemler’e çevirdik.” (Ali Canip Yöntem, quoted in Hasan Ali Yücel, *Edebiyat Tarihimizden 1*, Ankara: 1957, p. 197)

(D3) *garpkârî bir edebiyat* (Steuerwald 1993, p. 494)(D4) *Macarkârî bir müsaadekârlık* (Steuerwald 1993, p. 494)(D5) *Molière’kârî icatlar*

“Meselâ, *Cehennemlik*’in başındaki, Hasan Ferah Efendi ile üç ayrı devrin zihniyetinin mümessili üç doktorun konuşmaları, yine aynı romanda, ihtiyar Merakî’nin nesliyle genç neslin görüşlerini karşılaştıran, şiir ve edebiyat hakkındaki konuşma sahneleri Molière’kârî icatlar diye vasıflanabilir.” (Pertev Naili Boratav, “Hüseyin Rahmi’nin romancılığı”, in: *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 3/2, 1945, reprinted in id., *Folklor ve Edebiyat (1982) 1*, Adam Yayıncılık, 1982, p. 326)

(D6) *şarkkârî köşeler*

“İç içe üç oda lebaleb doluyor. Birçok şarkkârî köşeler yapmışlar, bunlar üstünde bağdaş kurup oturmuş Alman zabıtları, ellerinde bir tambur veya bir kitara ile yan yatmış Viyanalı kadınlar; duvardan indirilmiş bir uzun çubuğu tütürmeğe uğraşan Beyoğlulu gençler var.” (Yakup Kadri [Karaosmanoğlu], *Kiralık Konak*, Dergâh Mecmuası, 1338, p. 230)