

EVALUATION IN RELATION TO STRUCTURE AND MEANING PROPERTIES OF TURKISH REDUPLICATION

Türkçe İkilemelerin Yapı ve Anlam Özelliklerine İlişkin Değerlendirmeler

Necmi AKYALÇIN¹

Abstract

In this study we will emphasize some word phrases in Turkish which are assumed as reduplication even if they structural and semantically do not comply with the logic of reduplication of word phrases generated by repeating word, or using words with the same or contrary meaning or those with a similar sound next to each other in order to corroborate a meaning or to use a more efficient, agile and streamlined wording. These samples were collected and analyzed under the following headings: Corroborations generated by the consonants **A-** m, p, r, s **B-** paronomasias being assumed as reduplication **C-** reduplications being generated by -r/mAz structured gerunds. **D-** Compound words like kaçkaç, çekçek, gelgel, benbenci, himhim, zemzeme, kumkuma which are assumed as reduplication although it is a single word. **E-** conjunctives such as ne.....ne or word phrases like köfte ekme, sucuk ekme, böbrek ekme, cin tonik, viski kola, viski soda. **F-** reduplications generated by Ip structured gerunds and phrases generated with the initial phoneme **m**. From the point of the assumption of structure and meaning error of reduplication analyses have been made. The samples given in this research are taken from the previous researches done on the same topic. Therefore, my research aims at discussing the structural problems as well as those that arise in meaning against the background of those previous researches in order to come up with a criteria for Turkish reduplications. It is also the aim of this research to distinguish between reduplications and those which are not, since the Turkish language make use of them abundantly and thereby to contribute to this understanding.

Key words: Reduplication, emphasis, paronomasia.

Özet

Bu çalışmada, Türkçede anlamı pekiştirmek, daha etkili, kıvrak ve akıcı bir anlatımın sağlanması için kullanılan; sözcüklerin tekrar edilmesi veya anlamları birbirine yakın yahut karşıt olan ya da sesleri birbirini andıran iki sözcüğün yan yana kullanılmasıyla oluşturulmuş söz öbekleri olan ikilemeler ele alınarak yapısal ve anlamsal olarak ikileme mantığına uymadığı halde ikilemeymiş gibi değerlendirilen bazı söz öbekleri üzerinde durulmuştur. Bu örnekler **A-** m, p, r, s ünsüzleriyle oluşturulan pekiştirmeler. **B-** İkileme olarak değerlendirilen kökteşlemeler **C-** -r/mAz yapıları oluşturulan ikilemeler. **D-** Tek sözcük olduğu halde ikileme olarak değerlendirilen kaçkaç, çekçek, gelgel, benbenci, himhim, zemzeme, kumkuma gibi birleşik sözcükler. **E-** ne.....ne bağlacı veya köfte ekme, sucuk ekme, böbrek ekme, cin tonik, viski kola, viski soda gibi söz öbekleri. **F-** Ip yapıları oluşturulan ikilemeler ile **m** ön sesiyle oluşturulan öbekler ana başlıkları altında toplanarak ele alınmış ve irdelenmiştir. İkilemelerin yapı ve anlam yanlılıkları varsayımından hareketle çözümlenmeler yapılmıştır. Çalışmada ele alınıp değerlendirilen örnekler, Türkçe ikilemeler konusunda bugüne kadar yapılmış olan çalışmalardan seçilmiştir. Bu bağlamda ikilemelerle ilgili yapısal ve anlamsal olarak karşılaşılan sorunlar ışığında saptamalarda bulunulmuş ve konuya ilişkin ölçütler ortaya konmuştur. Dolayısıyla da bu çalışmayla Türkçe'de yoğun olarak kullanılan ikilemelerle ilgili; bundan sonraki süreçte ikileme olmayan söz öbeklerinin ikilemeymiş gibi değerlendirilmemesi konusunda katkı sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İkileme, pekiştirme, kökteşleme.

¹ Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çanakkale On Sekiz Mart Üniversitesi, e-posta: nakyalcin@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Turkish reduplications are very important to provide expansion of expression, and to provide a strong, fluent, lyrical and lively expression.

“Reduplication is the enrichment, imagination of the Turkish language.” (Hatiboğlu, 1981)

Reduplications used in Gokturk epigraphs holding light to the first written documents in relation to the Turkish language (ağış barım ‘mal mülk’, eb bark ‘ev bark’, kız koduz ‘kız kadın’ tünli künli ‘gececi gündüzlü’, tirmek kubratmak ‘derlemek toparlamak’ vb.) are phrases giving affluence, agility, strength and poetry to the expression. “With this feature reduplication has maintained its importance throughout Turkish history and was used with pleasure by poets and authors to make poems and expressions stronger and melodious.

“Reduplication in Ottoman Turkish is called *atf-1 tefsiri*, in French it is referred to as *redoublement*, *handiadyoin*, in English reduplication dual, *handiadyoin* and in German for the word reduplication the terms *Verdoppelung*, *Zwillingsformen*, *handiadyoin* are used. However *K. Röhrborn*, has used in his *Uigurisches Wörterbuch* the term *Worthäufung* instead of (*handiadyoin*) with the meaning of “word mass” in English (“söz yığınu” in Turkish). (Ölmez, 1998: 35-47) Although in Turkish for the word reduplication (*ikileme*) also the words *mirroring* (*ikizleme*) or “word running” (*söz koşması*) are used, the term reduplication was preferred by considering any direction, feature of the event and occurrence of various finite verbs) (Hatiboğlu, 1981: Önsöz) Since the explanations of Hatiboğlu are found appropriate, it was preferred to use the term “reduplication” in this study.

In reduplication- related studies and for some reduplications of some words various definitions about reduplication was made:

“Reduplication means repeating word, or using words with the same or contrary meaning or those with a similar sound next to each other in order to corroborate a meaning or to use a more efficient, agile and streamlined wording.” (Hatiboğlu, 1981: Önsöz).

“Using tow words with the same or similar meaning as one word are called *handiadyoin*. *Handiadyoins* for the most part consist of two synonyms. In addition, there are *Hendi'n*’s consisted of word complementary to each other or sometimes being the contrary or opposite of each other and the parts of these formations are called *antonyms*” (Çağatay, 1978: 29).

“A reduplication is repeating a word or a reflexive unit or part of a word; or a meaning unit generated by using together a word with another one being synonymous antonymous or in relation with the first word in terms of meaning” (Aksan, 2001: 115).

“Using words with a similar, same or opposite meaning together in order to make the meaning more beautiful and effective is called reduplication. Reduplication typically consists of two words. Sometimes it can be seen that it consists of three words. In languages such as English, German, French, Arabic and Persian language the number of reduplications does not exceed thirty or forty words. Therefore reduplications are one of the most important features of the Turkish language. It facilitates repetition and harmony

in expression. The most important characteristic of reduplication is the repetition of words and the harmony being generated of this repetition. Using words with paromasis together next to each other reinforces the meaning and increases the harmony. Thus the language gains a poetic beauty. Reduplication has an important share on the miraculous beauty of the Turkish language” (Hengirmen, 2002: 403).

“This means to repeat the same words in order to strengthen the meaning or by using words with the similar or opposite meaning or where the sounds are similar together” (Türkçe Sözlük, 1983).

“A word phrase created by bringing successively two words of the same stem or by being imitated is called reduplication. The most appropriate words for structuring reduplications are names, adjectives and adverbs (Kükey, 1975: 3).

“Reduplication means to repeat the same word or to use words with the same or opposite meaning successively” (Sami, 1989).

“Reduplication is word groups being created by repeating the same word or to use words with the same or opposite meaning or words with similar sounds successively” (Aksoy, 1987: 52).

Some researchers and sources call reduplications repetition or group of repetition.

“Repetitions are word groups being generated by to successive words of the same type. Participation of the two words generating the repetition in the repetition is totally exact. They come next to each other without any suffix and both words carry their own emphasis. The basis of this word group structure is the successive repetition of the words. With these features we can call it the simplest and most pure word group” (Ergin, 2001: 375).

“Repeating the same word in order to strengthen the expression or using words with the same, similar or opposite meaning or similar sounds next to each other: like Yavaş yavaş, irili ufaklı, aşağı yukarı” (Büyük Türkçe Sözlük, <http://www.tdk.org.tr>).

In the Turkish language the article of Foy, 1899: 105-136 can be shown as the first study on reduplication. Then, articles prepared by (Çağatay, 1978: 29-66), (Tuna, 1948: 429-447), (Eren, 1949: 283-286), (Marchand, 1952: 60-69), (Ağakay, 1953: 268-271), (Ağakay, 1954), (Tietze, 1966: 423-429)

(Hatiboğlu, 1981), (Ölmez, 1997) and (Ölmez, 1998), succeed these studies. Besides, theses of (Genç, 2003), (Talu, 2003), (Şen, 2002) (Şahin, 1997: 125-135), (Sertkaya, 1982-1983: 265), (Sev, 2004: 497-510), (Aktaş, 1996: 565-575), (Üstünova, 1998: 464-470), (Akerson, 1982: 49-52), (Çoraklı, 2001:53), (Çoraklı, 2005:41-44), (Yüce, 1998: 419-427), (Şen, 2005: 685-704), (Erdem, 2005: 189-226), (Abik, 1999), (Akyalçın, Öztuncer, 2004: 133-165), (Akyalçın, 2005), (Duman, 2006), (Aksan, 2001: 115), (Öz, 1997: 287-311), and (Nagy, 2004: 1125-1136) are sample studies.

Furthermore since (Gökçeoğlu, 2004) in the dictionary and some parts of his works has evaluated reduplications of echo- sounds as beginning of articles; the work of (Zülfikar, 1995) can be shown between topic- related studies.

The books written about the topic of reduplication until today by (Hatiboğlu, 1981) “Türk Dilinde İkileme” and by (Akyalçın, 2007) “Türkçe İkilemeler Sözlüğü, Tanıklı”, and the article of (Tuna, 1986: 163-228) named “Türkçenin Sayıca Eş Heceli İkilemelerinde Sıralama Kuralları ve Tabii Bir Ünsüz Dizisi” are of the feature to be used as main sources for reduplications.

In studies prepared in relation to Turkish reduplication some structures not complying with the structure and meaning of reduplication are still evaluated as reduplication. In order to reinforce the expression, to create reach expression possibilities through the creation of poetic and fluent wording, the reduplication has an important place in the Turkish language and it is thus an important linguistic- related issue that researchers consider and analyze these in a correct way. Because here, grammar elements categorized in a systematic way must be analyzed without being mixed up. In opposite situations some categorical confusion will be inevitable. The aim here is to contribute that the topic is clearly put for the in terms of grammar and to eliminate mistakes. For example;

- A-** Reinforcement is made with certain letters in the Turkish language. This situation is expressed in grammar books as follows: “The superiority of the attributes of an entity and the highest grade is shown with reinforcement adjectives. Creating reinforcing adjectives, a syllable with the consonants m, p, r, s is brought before the adjective. Thus a new syllable is added to the adjectives. For Exaomple: Beyaz---**bembeyaz**: very white, most white, Kara--**-kapkara**: verydark/ black, darkest/ Blackest, Temiz---**tertemiz**: very clean, cleanest, Doğru---**dosdoğru**: very correct, most correct” (Hengirmen, 2002: 134) “Reinforcing syllables brought before the reinforcing words are written adjacent to the word: gömgök, apak, çırcıplak, çırılçıplak, masmavi” (Bilgin, 2006: 130). The adjective where the qualifying meaning is reinforces is called reinforced adjective. “To create a reinforced adjective, the part of the word up to the first vowel is taken. This open syllable is closed with one of the letters m, p, r, s –whichever is appropriate-. This closed syllable is added in front of the word. Düz-dümdüz, yalnız-yapyalnız, temiz-tertemiz, mavi-masmavi.” (Demir, 2004: 3003-304) the samples clearly show how reinforcement is made in the Turkish language and that the reinforcement words do consist of a single word (tertemiz or çırılçıplak). However, reduplication is made by using words next to each other (Bozkurt, 2004: 172). That means that reduplication is created by bringing two words next to each other and creating a meaningful word phrase. However some researchers do mix up these two grammar phrases; Rather, the reinforcement words the first syllable of the reinforced word, e.g. from the word (**yeni**) the first syllable (**ye**) is taken and to reinforce the word the letter (**p**) is added, that means (**yeni**) is combined and when the reinforced word **ye+p+yeni** is generated then it is thought that this is not a reinforced word but a reduplication. E.g. Muharrem Ergin: “Supplemented Repeats: these are repeats made in order to bring an additional element in front of the word. They are separated in two. 1- Those generated with an addition of a sound to the word. 2- For those where a syllable is added to the beginning

of the word, generally the first syllables of adjectives are taken. When these syllable and with vocals then directly, if they and with a consonant, then after throwing the consonant one of m, p, r, s is brought to the word and the element arising of the occurring first syllable is brought as a separate word in front of the main word and thus a syllable repetition based group which we may call repetition in a way is generated” Ergin, 2001: 378, As saying so, they were assumed as reinforcing reduplications. In the same way (Aksan, 2001: Giriş) (referring to Ömer Demircan’s article named Emphatic Reduplications in Turkish) has evaluated these kind of reinforcing structures as reduplications. (Müler, 2003), has also fallen into the mistake to evaluate these incorrectly words not complying with the logic of reduplication and being separated from reduplications in another category as reinforcement in Turkish grammar books in his doctorate study as reduplication (s. 15 çarçabuk, sımsıcak..., s.17 yepyeni, s. 45 büsbütün). As explained with its samples above, structures like this are reinforcing words. To be able to create reduplication, at least two words must come side by side to create a word phrase. Therefore it is false to evaluate reinforcement as reduplication and to consider it in the same category in terms of grammar categories.

- B-** In the Turkish language there are some word phrases expressing and coming next to the action or the tool with which the activity is made. E.g. such as çapa çapalamak, ütü ütölemek, yemek yemek, yazı yazmak, su sulamak. Some researchers consider these word phrases as reduplication and reflect them in their studies. However these word phrases do not exceed the meaning or reinforcement dimension of making the activity (ütölemek, çapalamak, sulamak, yemek, yazmak). In the word phrase of the word phrase e.g. when said “**tası tarağı** topladı gitti” the phrase does not only reflect the tools cab and comb but all necessary tools and helps to express these by reinforcing them. However when saying “ütü ütölemek” it is only expressed to iron some clothes with an iron and there is no expansion of reinforcement in meaning, this case is valid for all phrases generated with similar words. Since such structures are constituted from words with the same stem as Vecihe Hatiboğlu said structures like örtü örtmek, ütü ütölemek, yazı yazmak, yemek yemek may not be called reduplication but paronomasia (Hatiboğlu, 1981: 18). These structures with the nature of paronomasia (Müler, 2003) seems to have evaluated as reduplication in his work and has followed a wrong way by perceiving word phrases such as (s.32, yemek yemek, yağmur yağmak, çakmağı çakmak, yazı yazmak, tadını tatmak) as reduplications.
- C-** In order to be able to give healthy decisions about types and features of grammar elements such as voice, idioms, reduplications etc. it is significantly important to make decisions by considering the semantic feature in the language element so called syntax. This is also valid for word/ gerunds phrases generated by the suffixes **-r/mAz**. The fact that the word phrases “Işıklar **yanar yanmaz**, karar **alınır alınmaz**, hendeği **aşar**

aşmaz structurally are of the nature of reduplication does not mean that semantically they are also reduplications. Because these word phrases give the meaning that the relevant action, say yanma, aşma or alınma actions are right been done. With this structure these are tense gerunds giving the meaning of **DIĞİ anda**. However the word phrases **bilir bilmez** konuşmak, **ister istemez** gelmek with the same structure the case is different in terms of semantic dimension. **Bilir bilmez**: means not the moment he understood but that he/ she talks without knowing this, **ister istemez** is not the moment in which he/ she does not want but it is used as obligatory, obliged and this provides that a phrase is transferred to a reduplication dimension through the expression expansion. In this situation the phrase overlaps with the reduplication logic. (Akyalçın, 2007: 17) It seems that (Müler, 2003) has not considered this semantic difference as he also has evaluated structures like this (s.16 bitirir bitirmez, s. 19 gelir gelmez) as reduplication. Here it is a fact that it will be a better way to evaluate reduplications with a semantic selection.

- D-** In the doctorate work of (Müler, 2003) another problem facing us in terms of reduplication is that words such as (s.21 benbenci, s.29 cimcime, kumkuma, zembeme, s. 43 beraber, s.48 derdest, s. 61 pembemsi, sarsak, sümsük, şapşal, tamtakır, tumturak, çekçek, gelgel kaçkaç) are evaluated like reduplication. As made clear in the definitions of reduplication made above the most determinant features of reduplication is that reduplication consists of two words and that these two words are always written separately even if they are given a suffix (kırık dökük, irili ufaklı). However when looking at the samples given above, it can be seen that the syllables of the words are similar but that the structure occurring through the similar syllables coming together is only a single word. Since a single word can not be a reduplication it is not a correct approach to evaluate these structures as reduplication. Additionally when looking in the dictionary of the Türk Dil Kurumu (<http://www.tdk.org.tr>):

benbenci someone praising himself too much, always talking of himself, proud, arrogant

cimcime 1. a small and sweet melon. 2. *met.* Small lovely child, woman

kumkuma 1. little crock, pot. 2. *met.* Someone, event or place collecting a bad and negative feature on itself

sarsak 1. Someone whose body is shaking because becoming weak due to old age, illness etc. 2. Unsteady, not solid

pembemsi Reminding of the color rose, similar to the color rose, rosy

çekçek, -ği handcart

sümsük, -ğü 1 from the family of gannets, sea bird with sharp beak and short legs (*Sulabassana*). 2. *sf. hlk.* Someone Acting lethargic, lazy, stupid, sluggish, shiftless, wimp

şapşal 1. someone acting stupid, scatty (person) 2. someone not caring for his appearance. 3. wide, unstructured (clothes)

tumturak, -ği 1. flare, pride. 2. using flare words, sounding good even if unnecessary.

gelgel *hlk.* 1. charm, attraction. 2. diamond or golden needle attached to the head.

It can be seen that these structures consist of a single word and that the meanings have nothing to do with the meaning of reduplication. Handling samples in relation to Turkish reduplication it is clear that these kind of words without any relation to both structural and semantic issues of reduplication can not be assumed as reduplication. In this context the words considered as reduplication may not be evaluated as reduplication in any way.

E- The researcher named Şahbender Çoraklı, in his article where he compared German and Turkish reduplications he has evaluated the word phrases *viski soda*, *viski kola*, *cin tonik* (Çoraklı, 2005:43) as reduplication and (Müler, 2003) in his doctorate work he prepared he has evaluated conjunctions like (s. 44) *ne...ne...* and convicted expressions such as *vakit nakittir* as reduplication phrases. For word phrases to be reduplication, the words constituting the phrase; e.g. when saying *tas tarak* must be subject to semantic extension, and expresses more than the words creating the phrase, and may reinforce the meaning. So, when used one by one, *tas*: a. 1. a cap made of metal etc. generally filled with water or liquids. 2. *sf.* In the amount this cap can cover: *two cups of rice*. 3. metal protective head wear. Whereas *Tarak* means: a. 1. toothed tool to comb the hair, beard and animal quill, or women using to attach their hair.:

2. *grubber*, a tool to separate stones from earth in gardening sector 3. a comb-like tool at handlooms where warp yarn goes through the threads. 4. a hilly like tilling on the head of some birds. 5. In humans, the upper portion of the foot. 6. Branchia at animals living in water. 7. *hay. b.* at lamellibranchiata a mollusk with round shell. However the meaning of the reduplication *tas tarak* in addition to covering these meanings also gives the meaning to over all goods, any kind of tool. This is the characteristic of reduplication. However looking at the word phrase *viski kola*, the meaning of this phrase has no other meaning than whisky and cola. So this phrase means the mixture of whisky and cola. In the same way, when it is said *köfte ekmek*, *böbrek ekmek*, *sucuk ekmek*, *viski soda*, *cin tonik* the meaning of the word phrase does not go further than these two words. This means that these phrases will not exceed the meaning of these two words. Also with this feature it is no reduplication. In the work prepared for this topic named *Türkçe İkilemeler Sözlüğü* (Akyalçın, 2007: 19) this situation is defined, too. In order to provide a negative expression in the Turkish language, a sentence with positive verb and the conjunction *ne...ne...* is used to make the sentence negative. So when it is said “Bugün okula ne Ahmet ne Mehmet geldi” it is said that whether Ahmet nor Mehmet went to school. This is a situation caused by the conjunction *ne...ne...* It is also not possible that such a conjunction phrase is a structural or semantic reduplication. This phrase is a

conjunction phrase. And makes the meaning negative. It has no other function. It is not a correct way to consider this conjunction phrase within the reduplication topic. In the same study the word phrase (s.16) vakit nakittir is also assumed as reduplication. However, it is also not a correct method to evaluate such a convictive expression within reduplications. Because, reduplications as word phrases are not convictive. However in this phrase the fact that time is cash is connected to a jurisdiction with the suffix Dlr. Such a convictive word phrase can not be reduplication at all. It is no correct approach to consider structures like this within the topic of reduplication.

In his article Erdem says (Erdem, 2005: 189-226) “Structures consisting of adverb- verb such as *Yine kedip keldi, yumup açgunça* are also no reduplication. Because if these structures would be reduplication they would have the same suffix. As it can be seen in the samples, the first element has taken the adverb- verb suffix “-p” and the second element has the suffix of past perfect tense.

These kind of structures can be named as idioms or compound verb phrases. However it is not possible that these structures are reduplication or repetition.” (Erdem, 2005: 193) However during studies made structures like **pişirip kotarmak, serilip serpilmek, pişirip taşırmaq, itişip kakışmak...** were seen and these were assumed as reduplication. Because it was considered that pişirip kotarmak and similar words have reinforcing meanings and can be assumes as a single word within the reduplication logic. *pişirip kotarmak, pişirip taşırmaq* sstructures, within the sentences they are used as cooking and effusing cannot be thought as separate single words. In the same way, even if these structure are of the statue of compound verbs, it has the function of reduplication in terms of its shape. Saying Running set shape Banguoğlu has assumed these structures in the same way, too. “*Especially in these running set shapes stative verbs coming from compound verbs are widely used as name bases. And these also are available with two suffixes as with the declension. a. Both verbs have the same suffix. alış veriş, yiyecek içecek.... b. the first verb has verbal adverb – ip and only the second verb is added various stative verb suffixes: gezip tozma, yatıp kalkma...*” (Banguoğlu, 1986: 318) From the logical explanation here it is understood that phrases occurring from the structure of actions like this+Ip=pişirip and action+mak=kotarmak are word phrases with reduplication structure and function. Therefore, they are evaluated in the category of reduplications. And even in a topic related study named “Türkçe İkillemeler Sözlüğü” (Akyalçin, 2007) thousand of word phrases in this style (Ip structured) are called reduplication. In Turkish, you can achieve hundreds of thousands of reduplication word phrases by adding the letter **M** in front of a word not beginning with the letter **M** which how ever have no deepness in meaning as with the word phrase **tas tarak**. So to say the deepness of meaning for phrases in the structure of reduplication such as

keci medi, ev mev, peynir meynir, öğrenci möğrenci is not as with real reduplications (tas tarak, abur cabur/cubur, pılı pırtı, kıt kımr, sağımlı sıkımlı....). Since these structure go no further than adding the initial phoneme m to the repeated word, and have no deeper meaning, it is not of the strength of a real reduplication. Therefore in his study with these kinds of samples, Talat Aksan has introduced to the Turkish linguistics in 2004 with the title "Yaşlı maşlı ama dipdiri" he has used the term half reduplication. With this term purposed for word phrases with the initial phoneme m it is contributed in terms of both structural and semantic features and so it will be more suitable not to consider and evaluate these structures as full reduplication phrases but as half/ semi reduplication or phrases not completely reflecting reduplication logic in terms of meaning.

CONCLUSION

In order to place this topic on a solid ground, it is very important to decide on the light of interpretations and explanations of the structures handled and assumed in the 6 heading above whether they are reduplications or not. In this context, defects confronted in Turkish reduplications topics will be eliminated.

Because reinforcements created with the consonants m, p, r, s, paronomasia such as yazı yazmak tadını tatmak single words considered as reduplication such as kaçkaç, çekçek, gelgel, benbenci, himhim, zezeme, kumkuma, and structures of conjunctions such as ne.....ne are no reduplications. Word phrases such as Köfte ekmek, sucuk ekmek, böbrek ekmek, cin tonik, viski kola, viski soda most of the structures created from the gerunds r/mAz as of their semantic dimension are not considered to be. Phrases created with the initial phoneme m- as stated above- as of reduplication phrase in terms of semantic are considered to be half reduplications. It is clear that in terms of phrases created from Ip structured which by some authors are not considered to be reduplications it is accurate/ appropriate to accept these as reduplication phrases as those re phrases overlapping with the logic of reduplication.

REFERENCES

- Abik, D. (1999) "(İsim1+II/IU) (İsim2+II/+IU)" kuruluşundaki ikilemeler. *VII. Milletlerarası Türkoloji Kongresi*, İstanbul.
- Ağakay, M.A. (1953). İkilemeler üzerine. *Türk Dili*, 2(16),189-191,
- Ağakay, M.A. (1953). İkilemeler üzerine. *Türk Dili*, 2(17),189-191,1953
- Ağakay, M.A. (1954). Türkçede kelime koşmaları. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten*.
- Akerson, F. (1982). Türkçenin çeviride tam değerlendirilemeyen bir özelliği: İkilemeler. *Çağdaş Eleştiri*, 6, 49-52.

- Aksan, Y. (2001). *Türkçede zaman anlatım ve kimi ikileme yapıları*, XV. Dilbilim Kurultayı-İstanbul.
- Aksoy, Ö. A. (1987) *Ana Yazım Kılavuzu* (21. Basım). İstanbul: Adam Yayınları.
- Aktaş, T. (1996). Yapı ve anlam bakımından Almanca ve Türkçede ikilemeler. *Türk Dili*, 539, 565-575.
- Akyalçın, N. (2007). *Türkçe ikilemeler sözlüğü*. Anı Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Akyalçın N. & Öztuncer, Ö. (2004). Yaşar Kemal'in firat suyu kan akıyor baksana adlı romanındaki ikilemeler. *Folklor Edebiyat Dergisi*, 37. 133-165.
- Akyalçın, N. (2005). Yaşar Kemal ve Orhan Pamuk'un romanlarında kullanılan ikilemeler. *KIBATEK XI. Uluslararası Edebiyat Sempozyumu*, Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi, Kıbrıs, 352-358.
- Banguoğlu, T. (1986). *Türkçenin grameri*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Bilgin, M. (2006). *Anlamdan anlatıma Türkçemiz*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık,
- Bozkurt, F. (2004) *Türkiye Türkçesi*. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları.
- Büyük Türkçe Sözlük. (<http://www.tdk.org.tr>)
- Çağatay, S. (1978). Uygurcada hendiadyonyoinler. dil ve tarih-coğrafya fakültesi, *Yıllık Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 1, 29-66.
- Çoraklı, Ş. (2001). Türkçenin yaratma gücü ikilemeler I. *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17. 53.
- Çoraklı, Ş. (2005). Türkçenin yaratma gücü ikilemeler II. *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 27. 41-44.
- Demir, T. (2004) *Türkçe dilbilgisi*, Ankara: Kurmay Yayınevi.
- Duman, M. (2006). İkilemeler ve "yalnız başına" örneği üzerine" Ege Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Merkezi. *Uluslararası Türkoloji Kongresi*, Çeşme/İzmir.
- Erdem, M. D. (2005). Harezmi Türkçesinde ikilemeler ve yinelemeler üzerine. *Bilig Dergisi* 33, 189-226.
- Eren, H. (1949). İkiz Kelimelerin Tarihine Dair. *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*. VII, (2), 283-286.

- Ergin, M. 2001. *Üniversiteler İçin Türk dili*. İstanbul: Bayrak Yayınları.
- Foy, K. (1899.) Studien zur Osmanischen Syntax, das Hendiadyoin und die Wortfolge "ana baba" Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen (MSOS), Berlin, 2, 105-136.
- Genç, N. E. (2003). Süheyl ü Nev-Bahâr'da İkilemeler. Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Gökçeoğlu, M. (2004). *Kıbrıs Türk ikilemeleri ve yansıma sesleri sözlüğü*. Lefkoşa/Kıbrıs: Eğitim Vakfı Yayınları.
- Hatiboğlu, V. (1981). *Türk dilinde ikileme*. Ankara: Önsöz TDK Yayınları.
- Hengirmen, M. (2002). *Türkçe dilbilgisi*. Ankara: Engin Yayınları, <http://www.tdk.gov.tr>
- Kükey, M. (1975). *Uygulamalı örneklerle Türkçenin sözdizimi*. Ankara: Kardeş Matbaası.
- Marchand, H. (1952). Alliteration, Ablaut und Reim in der Türkischen Zwillingsformen Oriens, *Ledien*, V, 60-69.
- Müler, H. G. (2003). Morphophonologische Untersuchungen an Reduplikationen im Türkischen", Tübingen, Yayımlanmış Doktora Tezi.
- Nagy, E. K. (2004). İki Taşla Bir Kuş...Çağataycada Hendiadyoin. Türk Dil Kurultayı Bildirileri I. V. *Uluslararası Türk Dil Kurultayı*, 1125-1136.
- Ölmez M. (1998) Eski Uygurca *oduk sak* İkilemesi Üzerine. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 8, 35-47.
- Ölmez, Z. K. (1998) Kutadgu bilig'de ikilemeler: Bahşı Ögdisi. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi*, 21.
- Ölmez, Z. K. (1997) Kutadgu bilig'de ikilemeler. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, 7.
- Öz, A. (1997). Özbek Türkçesinde İkilemeler. *Türkoloji Dergisi*, 287-311.
- Sami, Ş. (1989) *Kâmûs-ı Türkî*. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi.
- Sertkaya, O. F. (1982-1983). Maitrisimit Nom Bitig. *TDAY Belleten* s. 265.
- Sev, G. (2004). Divanü Lûgat'it Türk'te ikilemeler. *Türk Dili*, 634, 497-510.
- Şahin, H. (1997). Ferah-nâme'de geçen ikilemeler üzerine. *Osmanlı Araştırmaları XVII*, 125-135.

- Şen, S. (2002). Eski Uygur Türkçesinde ikilemeler. OMÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Samsun.
- Şen, S. (2005). *Standart Türkiye Türkçesinde ikilemelerle yaşayan tarihi sözcükler*. şinasi tekin'in anısına uygurlardan osmanlıya. İstanbul: Simurg Yayınları.
- Talu, F. N. (2003). Kısasü'l-Enbiyâ'da İkilemeler. Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Tietze, A. (1966). Reduplikasyon ve (r) İle Kurulmuş Çift Sözcükler, *Reşit Rahmeti Arat İçin*, 423-429.
- Tuna, O. N. (1948). Türkçede Tekrarlar. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, 3, 429-447.
- Tuna, O. N. (1986) Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı, *Bellekten*, 163-228.
- Türkçe Sözlük. 1983, TDK Yayınları (I. Cilt). Genişletilmiş (7. Baskı). Ankara.
- Üstünova, K. (1998). Dede Korkut destanlarında aralıklı ikilemeler. *Türk Dili*, 557, 464-470.
- Yüce, N. (1998). İkilemelerdeki ilginç problemler. Bahşi Ögdisi. Klaus Röhrborn Armağanı-Haz. J. P. Laut, M. Ölmez, Freiburg / İstanbul.
- Zülfikar, H. (1995). Türkçede ses yansımaları kelimeler. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları