

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE STUDIES

Editors

Eser ÖRDEM

Ömer Tuğrul KARA



© Copyright 2023

Printing, broadcasting and sales rights of this book are reserved to Academician Bookstore House Inc. All or parts of this book may not be reproduced, printed or distributed by any means mechanical, electronic, photocopying, magnetic paper and/or other methods without prior written permission of the publisher. Tables, figures and graphics cannot be used for commercial purposes without permission. This book is sold with banderol of Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Culture.

ISBN Page and Cover Design

978-625-399-121-0 Akademisyen Dizgi Ünitesi

Book Title Publisher Certificate Number

Language and Literature Studies 47518

Editors Printing and Binding

Eser ÖRDEM Printing press Vadi

ORCID iD: 0000-0001-9529-4045

Ömer Tuğrul KARA **Bisac Code**

ORCID iD: 0000-0002-5418-7718 EDU000000

Publishing Coordinator DOI

Yasin DİLMEN 10.37609/akya.2557

Library ID Card

Language and Literature Studies / editors : Ömer Tuğrul Kara, Eser Ördem.

Ankara : Akademisyen Yayınevi Kitabevi, 2023.

113 page.: table.; 135x210 mm.

Includes Bibliography and Index.

ISBN 9786253991210

1. Education.

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION

Akademisyen Kitabevi A.Ş.

Halk Sokak 5 / A

Yenişehir / Ankara

Tel: 0312 431 16 33

siparis@akademisyen.com

www.akademisyen.com

PREFACE

Based in Ankara in Turkey, the independent academic publisher, ***Akademisyen Publishing House***, has been publishing books for almost 30 years. As the directors of ***Akademisyen Publishing House***, we are proud to publish more than 2700 books across disciplines so far, especially in Health Sciences. We also publish books in Social Sciences, Educational Sciences, Physical Sciences, and also books on cultural and artistic topics.

Akademisyen Publishing House has recently commenced the process of publishing books in the international arena with the “**Scientific Research Book**” series in Turkish and English. The publication process of the books, which is expected to take place in March and September every year, will continue with thematic subtitles across disciplines

The books, which are considered as permanent documents of scientific and intellectual studies, are the witnesses of hundreds of years as an information recording platform. As ***Akademisyen Publishing House***, we are strongly committed to working with a professional team. We understand the expectations of the authors, and we tailor our publishing services to meet their needs. We promise each author for the widest distribution of the books that we publish.

We thank all of the authors with whom we collaborated to publish their books across disciplines.

Akademisyen Publishing House Inc.

CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Tane as a Marker of Discreteness in Turkish	1
	<i>Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ</i>	
Chapter 2	Analysis of the Pragmatic Functions of the Turkish Discourse Markers Halbuki and Oysa (Ki)	13
	<i>M. Fatih ADIGÜZEL</i>	
Chapter 3	A Meticulous Reading of Oscar Wilde's Idiosyncratic Writing Style.....	27
	<i>Surena ZANJANI</i>	
Chapter 4	Reception of Popular Fiction in Academia.....	49
	<i>Ali YİĞİT</i>	
Chapter 5	On the Translation of Conceits and Paradoxes: A Morphological Reading of the Turkish Texts of the Flea and Holy Sonnet X By John Donne.....	77
	<i>Ayşenur İPLİKÇİ ÖZDEN</i>	
Chapter 6	Relative Clauses and Passive Constructions in Turkish: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach.....	93
	<i>Eser ÖRDEM</i>	

AUTHORS

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emrah
GÖRGÜLÜ**
İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim
University
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-0879-1049

**Assist. Prof. Dr. M. Fatih
ADIGÜZEL**
Mersin University, Faculty of
Education, ELT Department
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-6962-0078

Ph.D. Surena ZANJANİ
Post-Doctorate in English
Language and Literature, İstanbul
Yeni Yüzyıl University
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-5240-1832

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali YİĞİT
Kırklareli University
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-3705-4913

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayşenur
İPLİKÇİ ÖZDEN**
Samsun University
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-8082-8155

Assoc. Prof. Dr.Eser ÖRDEM
Adana Alparslan Türkeş Science
and Technology University
ORCID iD: 0000-0001-9529-4045

CHAPTER 1

***TANE* AS A MARKER OF DISCRETENESS IN TURKISH**

Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ¹

INTRODUCTION

The word *tane* in Turkish has been investigated in various ways by different researchers over the past a few decades and there have been a number of different analyses about what it actually is and what it does in the structure. In this work, I will review some of the prominent descriptive and theoretical accounts proposed by those such as Lewis (1975), Underhill (1976), Skilliter (1986), Schroeder (1999), Öztürk (2005), Göksel and Gerslake (2005) and Sağ (2019, 2021), among others. Based on a new corpus analysis on the uses of *tane* in the language, I will argue that it is not functioning as an optional classifier and also not a semantic marker that is an overt realization of an otherwise covert cardinal head, as has been proposed in recent theoretical analyses. Instead, I will show that *tane* should be considered to be a pragmatic marker rather than a semantic one. More specifically, *tane* appear within the numeral construction when the referent, whether it is singular or plural, needs to be marked as discrete in the context. This way various uses of it can be uniformly captured in the language.

The structure of this paper is as follows: in the next section, I provide an overview of various accounts that deal with the nature of *tane* and its use in Turkish. This section also includes various

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, emrah.gorgulu@izu.edu.tr

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, Y. A. (2000). *Classifiers: A typology of noun categorization devices*. Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory. Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Y. A. (2006). Classifiers and noun classes: Semantics. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. (2nd Edition). pp. 320-325. Elsevier: Oxford.
- Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: An essential grammar*. Routledge: London & New York.
- Görgülü, E. (2012). Semantics of nouns and the specification of number in Turkish. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Simon Fraser University.
- Ionin, T. & Matushansky, O. (2006). The composition of complex cardinals. *Journal of Semantics*, 23 (4), 315-360. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffl006>
- Ionin, T. & Matushansky, O. (2019). *Cardinals: The syntax and semantics of cardinal-containing expressions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lewis, G. L. (1975). *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Öztürk, B. (2005). *Case, referentiality and phrase structure*. Linguistics Today. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sağ, Y. (2019). The semantics of number marking: reference to kinds, counting, and optional classifiers. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Rutgers University.
- Sağ, Y. (2021). On the (non-)optionality of the Turkish classifier *tane*. Ms. Harvard University.
- Schroeder, C. (1999). *The Turkish nominal phrase in spoken discourse*. Turkologica 40. Wiesbaden: Harratsowitz.
- Sezer, T. & Sezer, B. (2013). TS Corpus herkes için Türkçe derlem. *Proceedings of the 27th National Linguistics Conference*. May 3-4 2013. Antalya, Kemer: Hacettepe University, English Linguistics Department. pp. 217-225.
- Scontras, G. (2014). The semantics of measurement. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Harvard University.
- Serzisko, F. (1980). Sprachen mit zahlklassifikatoren: Analyse und vergleich. Akup 37.
- Skilliter, S. A. (1986). The family of *tane*: Ottoman classifiers and rules governing their usage. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. 76, Festschrift Andreas Tietze zum 70. 255-261.
- Underhill, R. (1976). *Turkish grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

CHAPTER 2

ANALYSIS OF THE PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS Of THE TURKISH DISCOURSE MARKERS HALBUKİ AND OYSA (Kİ)

M. Fatih ADIGÜZEL¹

INTRODUCTION

Discourse connectives are a subgroup of discourse markers which have subjective, interactive and textual functions (Maschler and Schiffrin, 2015:189). Discourse connectives such as *however, in fact, besides* etc. in English and *halbuki oysa(ki), bilakis, ayrıca* etc. in Turkish primarily fulfil textual functions which concern how they contribute to “coherence and textuality in discourse” (Andersen, 2001:76). Discourse markers “signal a sequential relationship between the current message and the previous discourse” (Fraser, 1990:383). Their meanings are not conceptual, but procedural; they instruct the addressee/analyst about how the following proposition or discourse unit is to be understood. In many cases they are pragmatically essential though syntactically optional (Brinton, 2017:16). In fact, the omission of discourse markers, especially discourse connectives, often causes problems as to how the reader/analyst is to interpret the logical connections between the current and the preceding utterance. In terms of cohesion and coherence of discourse such markers are explicit pragmatic tools that “provide instructions about the way the propositional meaning of sentences is to be treated” (Heine, 2013:1211).

¹ Assist. Prof. Dr., Mersin University, Faculty of Education. ELT Department, mfatihad@gmail.com

Markers, which “signal a direct or indirect contrast between S1 and S2” (Fraser, 2009:300). The study also shows the power of corpus data in identifying and describing the polyfunctionality of discourse markers as emphasized by other researchers (Biber, 2009; Tognini-Bonelli, 2001; Schiffrin, 2006, Aijmer, 2013). Thanks to the corpus analysis, this study not only provides a more transparent and detailed interpretation of the functions of *halbuki/oysa(ki)*, briefly mentioned by Göksel and Kerslake (2005:447), but also brings to light a new function not mentioned before.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variation*. John Benjamins.
- Bell, D. M. (2010). Cancellative discourse markers: A core/ periphery approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8(4), 515-541.
- Biber, D. (2009). Corpus-based and corpus-driven analyses of language variation and use. In B. Heine & H. Narrog (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* (pp. 160-191). Oxford University Press.
- Brinton, L., J. (2017). *The evaluation of pragmatic markers in English. Pathways of change*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dér, C., I. (2010) *On the status of discourse markers*. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 57 (1), 3–28.
- Fischer, K.(ed.) (2006). *Approaches to discourse particles*. Elsevier
- Fraser, B. (1990). An approach to discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 383–395.
- Fraser, B. (2009). An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 1, 293-320.
- Göksel and Kerslake (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.
- Heine, B. (2013). On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else?. *Linguistics* 51, 1205-1247. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Maschler, Y. (2002). The role of discourse markers in the construction of multivocality in Israeli Hebrew talk in interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35:1, 1–38.
- Maschler, Y. & Schiffrin, D. (2015). Discourse markers: Language, meaning, and context. In: Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Second edition. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 189 - 221.
- McEnery, T., & Hardie A. (2012). *Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge.
- Mortier, L. & L. Degand. (2009). Adversative discourse markers in contrast: the need for a combined corpus approach. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 14. 338–366.
- Schiffrin, D. (2006). Discourse marker research and theory: revisiting and. In Kerstin Fischer, (ed), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Elsevier, 315–38.
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

CHAPTER 3

A METICULOUS READING OF OSCAR WILDE'S IDIOSYNCRATIC WRITING STYLE

Surena ZANJANI¹

INTRODUCTION

As with all textual criticism, we are comparing readings. What this means practically is that we should never ask whether an attestation has strong or weak coherence on its own. Instead, we always want to ask whether it has stronger or weaker coherence than the other reading. (Wasserman & Gurry, 2017, p.91)

The immortalization of a writer's name and works in the literature of a nation depends on several factors, one of the most important of which is certainly their genius and inherent talent in expressing and transmitting human concepts while creating literary masterpieces. However, without the intervention of other factors, such as the intellectual help of those around him, the criticism of influential critics, the use of the tools of the publishing industry, and the efforts of editors in authenticating his works, the works of an author rarely reach a degree of credit that bring him a lasting "classic" image. Perhaps the most noticeable factor in establishing the name of an author is the science of text editing or research which, with its many branches, accompanies his works in all stages of publication, and it is difficult to produce a work without its help. In most cases, and especially in the case of contemporary authors, the writer himself is directly involved in the editing process and

¹ Dr., Istanbul Canada Schools, s.zanjani@endokullari.k12.tr

Wilde's works from this time on shows that Ross has succeeded in fulfilling his mission about Wilde, and that was transferring his name and works from the crisis period and handing them over to a generation that has the power to receive the works based on objective and independent criteria.

REFERENCES

- Beckson, K. (2005). *Oscar Wilde: The critical heritage*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bloom, H. (2011). *Bloom's modern critical views: Oscar Wilde*. New Edition. New York: Infobase Publishing.
- Bloom, H. (2008). *Bloom's classic critical views: Oscar Wilde*. New York: Infobase Publishing.
- Bowers, F. (1966). *Textual and literary criticism: The Sanders Lectures in bibliography 1957-58*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Erol, B. (2016). *One Day, Oscar Wilde*. Irish Writers Series: 4, Hacettepe University, Department of English Language and Literature. Ankara, Turkey: Bizim Büro.
- Evangelista, S. (2010). *The reception of Oscar Wilde in Europe*. New York: Continuum.
- Fortunato, P. L. (2007). *Modernist Aesthetics and consumer culture in the writings of Oscar Wilde*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Holland, M. & Hart-Davis, R. (2000). *The letters of Oscar Wilde*. London: Fourth Estate Limited.
- Kingston, A. (2007). *Oscar Wilde as a character in victorian fiction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kiss, D. (2015). *What Catullus wrote: problems in textual criticism, editing and the manuscript tradition*, contributors: Giuseppe Gilberto Biondi, David Butterfield, Julia Haig Gaisser, Stephen Heyworth, Daniel Kiss, Antonio Ramírez de Verger. UK: The Classical Press of Wales.
- Millgate, M. (1992). *Testamentary acts: Browning, Tennyson, James, Hardy*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Powell, K. & Raby, P. (2013). *Oscar Wilde in context*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ricketts, C. (1932). *Oscar Wilde: Recollections*. London: Nonesuch Press.
- Roden, F. S. (2004). *Palgrave advances in Oscar Wilde Studies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ross, M. (1952). *Robert Ross: Friend of friends*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- San Juan, E. (1967). *The art of Oscar Wilde*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Tanselle, G. T. (1992). *A Rationale of textual criticism publication of the A.S.W. rosenbach fellowship in bibliography*. USA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Tanselle, G. T. (2001). Textual criticism at the millennium, Vol. 54, *Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*, Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40372244>
- Wasserman, T. & Gurry, P. (2017). *A new approach to textual criticism: An introduction to the coherence-based genealogical method*. Atlanta, USA: SBL Press.
- Watkin, A. (2010). *Bloom's how to write about Oscar Wilde*. UK: Bloom's Literary Criticism.
- West, M. L. (1973). *The textual criticism and editorial technique*. London: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH Publications.

CHAPTER 4

RECEPTION OF POPULAR FICTION IN ACADEMIA

Ali YİĞİT¹

Literature is to be treated as a document in the study of culture, it is first necessary to know something about who reads, why they do so, and how they go about it (1991, ix).

Janice Radway

INTRODUCTION

Since popular fiction emerged in the Western literatures (i.e Great Britain and the US) as a distinct literary field, broadly speaking in late nineteenth century, discussions whether to accept popular genre novels as part of mainstream traditional literature or not have never ceased. Some literary critics, calling it pulp fiction, kitsch literature, escape fiction, distraction books, unserious fiction or lowbrow fiction castigated popular fiction for the understandable reason that popular fiction writers compromise quality, aesthetic and artistic elements for the sake of recording high sales and meeting their readers' or the publishers' demands. For this reason, in academia popular fiction works have not been well received and catalogued for long at university libraries. Yet, in the near history, the fate of popular fiction has begun to considerably change; several scholarly journals have been launched, and numerous theses whether at MA or PhD level have been written. Therefore, I will allocate a special coverage to the continuing debates about popular fiction in academia. In this paper, my argument is two-

¹ Assist. Prof. Dr., Kırklareli University, aliyigit@klu.edu.tr

researches and studies carried out in the field of popular fiction studies, thus libraries have begun to spare more room to popular works of art under such categories as rare works and special collection. In brief, popular fiction which was once derided for its close affiliation with commerce and capitalist industry, and for its formulaic simple plot-driven structure, today stands as a promising field of literature not only as an instrument of entertainment but also as an object of academic scrutiny.

REFERENCES

- Allen, J. S. (1983). History and the novel: Mentalité in modern popular fiction. *History and Theory*, 22(3), 233-252. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2504982>
- Bennett, T., & Martin, G. (1990). Series editors' preface. In T. Bennett (Ed.), *Popular fiction: Technology, ideology, production* (pp. ix-x). Reading: Routledge.
- Berger B. M. (1977). Review of *popular culture and high culture: An analysis and evaluation of taste* by H. Gans. *Contemporary Sociology*, 47(6), pp. 672-675.
- Bianchi, D. & Zanettin, F. (2018). 'Under surveillance'. An introduction to popular fiction in translation. *Perspectives*, 26(6), 793-808. Doi:10.1080/0907676X.2018.1510017
- Bloom, C. (2002). *Bestsellers: Popular fiction since 1900*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bloom, C. (1996). *Cult fiction: Popular reading and pulp theory*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Botting, F. (2012). Bestselling fiction: Machinery, economy, excess. In David Glover & Scott McCracken (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to popular fiction (Cambridge Companions to Literature*, pp.159-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connie V. F. (2003). Popular fiction collections in academic and public libraries. *The Acquisitions Librarian*, 15(29), 63-85. Doi: 10.1300/J101v15n29_07
- Derrida, J. (1980). The law of genre. *Glyph*, 7, 202-232.
- Fletcher, L. (2016). Introduction. In Lisa Fletcher (Ed.) *Popular fiction and spatiality: Reading Genre Settings*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gelder, K. (2004). *Popular fiction: The logics and practices of a literary field*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Germain, A. St. (1977). Teaching popular culture: The tough guy novel. *Studies in Popular Culture*, 1(1), 36-44.
- Glover D. & McCracken, S. (2012). Introduction. In David Glover & Scott McCracken (Eds.) *The Cambridge companion to popular fiction (Cambridge Companions to Literature*, pp.1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Doi:10.1017/CCOL9780521513371.002

- Hartley, J. (1996). *Popular reality: Journalism, modernity, popular culture*. New York: Arnold.
- Hofmeyr, I. (2001). Bunyan in Africa: Text and transition. *Interventions* 3(3), 322-335.
- Horkheimer M. & Adorno T. W. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment: Philosophical fragments* (Translated by Edmund Jephcott). California: Stanford University Press.
- Kernan, A. B. (1990). *The death of literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Montoro, R. (2015). Style in popular literature. In Violeta Sotirova (Ed.) *The Bloomsbury Companion to Stylistics* (pp. 673-689). London, Oxford & New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Nash, W. (1990). *Language in popular fiction*, London: Routledge.
- Neill, S. D. (2004). London by gaslight. In Harold Bloom (Ed.), *The Victorian novel Bloom's period studies* (pp. 171-199). New York: Chelsea House Publishers.
- New Criticism. (2018). In *A Dictionary of critical theory* (2nd ed.). Accessed Feb. 10, 2023, available on <https://www.oxfordreference.com/search?q=new+criticism&searchBtn=Search&isQuickSearch=true>
- New Historicism. (2013). In *Oxford an A-Z guide to Shakespeare* (2nd ed.). Accessed Feb. 10, 2023, available on <https://www.oxfordreference.com/search?q=new+historicism&searchBtn=Search&isQuickSearch=true>
- Nile, R. (1998). Pulp fiction: Popular culture and literary reputation. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 22(58), 66-74. Doi: 10.1080/14443059809387403
- Ogola, G. (2002). Mapping texts: Imagining audiences in popular fiction. *English Studies in Africa*, 45(2), 47-61. Doi: 10.1080/00138390208691314
- Pamuk, O. (2020). What the great pandemic novels teach us. *The New York Times*, accessed Jan. 20, 2023, available on <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/23/opinion/sunday/coronavirus-orhan-pamuk.html>
- Pawling, C. Introduction. (1984). In Christopher Pawling (Ed.), *Popular fiction and social change* (pp. 1-19). London: MacMillan Press.
- Radway, J. (1991). *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill & London: University of North Carolina P.
- Schneider-Mayerson, M. (2010). Popular fiction studies: The advantages of a new field. *Studies in Popular Culture*, 33(1), 21-35. Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23416317>
- Schultz, K. & Throop, R. (2010). Popular culture. *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Third Edition). Doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.00054-3
- Scrivner, C., Johnson, J. A., Kjeldgaard-Christiansen, J., Clasen, M. (2021). Pandemic practice: Horror fans and morbidly curious individuals are more psychologically resilient during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 168, 1-6. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110397>
- Sewell, R. G. (1984). Trash or treasure? Pop fiction in academic and research libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, 45(6), 450-461. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl4506450>
- Swirski, P. (1999). Popular and highbrow literature: A comparative view. *CLCWeb: Comparative literature and culture*, 1(4), 1-14. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.1053>

CHAPTER 5

ON THE TRANSLATION OF CONCEITS AND PARADOXES: A MORPHOLOGICAL READING OF THE TURKISH TEXTS OF THE FLEA AND HOLY SONNET X BY JOHN DONNE

Ayşenur İPLİKÇİ ÖZDEN¹

INTRODUCTION

In seventeenth-century England, several poets such as John Donne, George Herbert, Andrew Marvell, Henry Vaughan, and Richard Crashaw started to write poems that were later called ‘metaphysical poetry’. The earliest use of the term ‘metaphysical’ dates back to a letter by William Drummond of Hawthornden (1585-1649) in which he wrote about poets who use “metaphysical ideas and scholastical quiddities” (Greene, 2012). However, it was John Dryden (1631-1700) who first employed the term metaphysical for these poets in *A Discourse Concerning Satire* (1693). Later it was “Samuel Johnson, who made the first systematic study of Donne and some of his contemporaries in his *Life of Cowley* (and who) defined these poets’ wit as ‘Metaphysical’” (Singh, 1992). When the lexical meaning of this term is considered, it should be understood as a philosophy about explaining existence and cosmology. However, what Johnson meant was different from this general understanding of the word; he most probably must have referred to “a heterogeneous yoking together of ideas by violence” (Singh, 1992). Donne and his followers, pursuant to this idea, were writing

¹ Assist. Prof. Dr., Samsun University, aysenur.iplikci@samsun.edu.tr

as one of the original text, which points to the fact that the style of the poet cannot be reflected in the specific translations of these poems.

It seems obvious that John Donne, his poems, and their translated versions will continue to contribute to man's intellectual development by making people reflect upon them with implicitly embedded meanings, and with their various styles.

REFERENCES

- Bozkurt, B. (2013). *Pire*. (accessed <https://siirantolajim.wordpress.com/tag/john-donne/>, 27.02.2023)
- Brezina, V. & Pallotti, G. (2015) "Morphological complexity tool", available from http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/vocab/analyse_morph.php
- Donne, J. (2006). John Donne's poems. Colin Burrow (Ed.), (p.4-37) *Metaphysical Poetry*. London: Penguin Books.
- Ergin, M. (2019). *Türk dil bilgisi*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları.
- Eser, O. (2007). *Gururlanma ey ölüm*. (accessed <https://www.antoloji.com/death-be-not-proud-gururlanma-ey-olum-siiri/>, 27.02.2023)
- Gardner, H. (1967). *The metaphysical poets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greene, R., Cushman, S., Cavanagh, C., Ramazani, J. and Rouzer, P. (ed.). (2012). *The princeton encyclopedia of poetry&poetics* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Harmon, W. and Holman, C.H. (1996). *A handbook to literature*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hunter, J. C. (Ed.). (2010). *Renaissance literature an anthology of poetry and prose*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- James, T. (1988). *The Metaphysical poets*. Essex: Longman.
- Katamba, F. (1993). *Morphology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Lieber, R. (2016). *Introducing morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, P.H. (1991). *Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCoy, K. and Harlan, J.A.V. (1992). *English literature to 1785*. New York: HarperPerennial.
- Mousley, A. (Ed.) (1999). *John Donne*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Peterson, D.L. (ed.). (1990). *The English lyric from Wyatt to Donne*. East Lansing: Colleagues Press.
- Singh, B. (1992). *Five seventeenth-century poets*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willmot, R. (2008). *Metaphysical poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Winy, J. (1982). *A preface to donne*. London: Longman.

CHAPTER 6

RELATIVE CLAUSES AND PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN TURKISH: A COGNITIVE LINGUISTIC APPROACH

Eser ÖRDEM¹

INTRODUCTION

Cognitive linguistics is an interdisciplinary field that emphasizes that some constructions in a given language need contextual clues owing to nature of fuzzy categorization in human mind (Croft & Cruse, 2004; Evans, 2006; Ungerer & Schmidt, 2013). Thus, language is not seen as an absolute and ideal system. Rather, it is seen as a dynamic competitive process that is incomplete because of the problems experienced in conceptualization and categorization. It is important to unearth the patterns of conceptualization. The fuzziness of categorization can be seen in linguistic production, and some aspects of certain grammatical constructions are competitive in nature. Therefore, frequency and salience appear as pivotal elements in determining which construction is used while referring to meaning. In addition, interactive and social function of language is taken into consideration. Therefore, context matters when form and meaning alone are insufficient. Although conceptual prototypes may play a role in predicting the possible constructions, it may not always be possible to predict all the underlying usages or meanings due to the nature of competitiveness. Each grammatical construction may show

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr., Adana Alparslan Turkes Science and Technology University, eserordem@gmail.com

and salience of the constructions used. Besides, a diachronic perspective can be endorsed with corpus-based or corpus-driven research. From a methodological viewpoint, certain elicitation tasks can be used to comprehend what and how speakers interpret the constructions given to them. In so doing, instead of making intuitive explanations regarding the complex issues in linguistics, it might be better to endorse them with real data obtained from corpora or human subjects.

REFERENCES

- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Croft, W. (2001). *Radical construction grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Çiçek, M. (2008). Türkçede çifte edilgenlik kavramı üzerine bir araştırma. *Journal of Turkish Linguistics*, 2(1), 7-24.
- De Vries, M. (2002). *The syntax of relativization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Utrecht, Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics
- Diessel, H. (2004). *The acquisition of complex sentences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diessel, H. (2007). Frequency effects in language acquisition, language use, and diachronic change. *New ideas in psychology*, 25(2), 108-127.
- Diessel, H., & Tomasello, M. (2005). A new look at the acquisition of relative clauses. *Language*, 81(4), 882-906. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2005.0169>.
- Ekmekçi, Ö. (1990). Acquisition of relativization in Turkish. *Fifth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, SAOS, London University, England.
- Evans, V. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.
- Goldberg, A. (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Hamilton, R. (1994). Is implicational generalization unidirectional and maximal? Evidence from relativization instruction in a second language. *Language Learning*, 44, 123-157.
- Hamilton, R. (1995). The noun phrase accessibility hierarchy in SLA: Determining the basis for its developmental effects. In W. O'Grady (1999). Toward a new nativism. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 621-633.
- Hawkins, J. (1999). Processing complexity and filler-gap dependencies across grammars. *Language*, 75, 244-285.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Keenan, E., & Comrie, B. (1977). Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8, 63-100.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997). Turkish. London: Routledge.
- Kornfilt, J. (2000). Some syntactic and morphological properties of relative clauses in Turkish. In The Syntax of Relative Clauses 121-159. (Eds) Alexiadou, A, P. Law, A. Meininger, C. Wilder. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Labov, William (1973), 'The boundaries of words and their meaning' in Charles-James N. Bailey and Roger W. Shuy, eds, *New ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 340-73
- O'Grady, W. (2011). Relative clauses: Processing and acquisition. In E. Kidd (Ed.), *The acquisition of relative clauses: Processing, typology, and function* (pp. 13-38). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Özçelik, Ö. (2006). *Processing relative clauses in Turkish as a second language* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).
- Özkaragöz, İ. (1986). Monoclausal double passives in Turkish. *Studies in Turkish linguistics*, 8, 77-91.
- Taneri, M. (1993). *The morpheme-Il/(I) n: The syntax of personal passives, impersonal passives and middles in Turkish*. University of Kansas.
- Sebzecioğlu, T. (2008). Türkçede edilgenlik. PhD diss., DEÜ Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2008.
- Slobin, D. I., & Zimmer, K. (Eds.). (1986). *Studies in Turkish linguistics* (Vol. 8). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Tarollo, F., & Myhill, J. (1983). Interference and natural language processing in relative clauses and wh-questions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 39-70.
- Underhill, R. (1976) Turkish grammar. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: The MIT Press.
- Ungerer, F., & Schmid, H. J. (2013). *An introduction to cognitive linguistics*. Routledge.
- Wiechmann, D. (2015). Understanding relative clauses: A usage-based view on the processing of complex constructions (Vol. 268). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110339581>.
- Yilmaz, Engin. Türkiye Türkçesinde ikili çatı sorunu ve bunun öğretimi ile ilgili meseleler. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten* 49, 250-289.