A LINGUISTIC APPROACH

TO

POETRY

FOR

ADVANCED TFL CLASSES

by

Işın Bengi

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Linguistics.

Boğaziçi University

June, 1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

182062

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

There have been various attitudes and approaches towards both the inclusion and treatment of poetry in FL (Foreign Language) programmes. This study may be considered as yet another such approach. The seemingly explicit title of this study : A Linguistic Approach to Poetry for Advanced TFL Classes is not self explanatory and needs to be further developed to prevent a misunderstanding.

Even before stating my principal aim, I should make it clear that it is not the purpose of this study to overburden the heavily loaded FL programmes with poetry, nor does it intend to sacrifice poetry for the sake of language teaching. The motive of this specific study derives from what Poetry and FL programmes have in common and share as their essential material : LANGUAGE. On the one hand we have FL programmes where the ultimate goal is to teach the language for communicative purposes; and on the other, we have poetry which is considered to be a form, a unique form of language used to communicate. As proposed and advocated by H. Widdowson (1979 a, p. 83), studying poetry from this point of view -that is as a unique form of language used for communication- develops in the students "a sharper

awareness of the communicative resources of the language being learned".

The aim of this study is to propose a linguistics-based analytical approach to poetry for the use of the teacher in advanced TFL (Turkish as a Foreign Language) classes. It consists of two essential parts : Part 1 and Part 2. Part 1 will be a discussion on the language of poetry. I must note that my intention is not to give a detailed account of the poetic language, for such an attempt would lead us away from the purpose of this study. Therefore, the discussion of the language used in poetry in this part is limited to the analysis of the fundamental stylistic principle of FOREGROUNDING and its relation to INTERPRETATION and COHESION, with references to various examples from Turkish Poetry. Interpretation based on foregrounded linguistic evidence is indispensable for this analysis since the failure to include it would breach the communicative value of poetry in FL classes (Widdowson 1979 a, pp.13-14).

Part 2 consists of five poems in their entirety : three by Orhan Veli in which we notice a prominent use of foregrounded regularities, and two by Can Yücel which exhibit mastery

in the deviant use of language in poetry. The linguistic analyses applied to the poems are exhaustive and are intended to suggest an approach for the teacher for classroom use. The direction of each analysis is from foregrounded linguistic patterns to the interpretation of the meaning of the poems. Whenever considered to be necessary, morphological descriptions are given for the items that exhibit complexity . The analyses are supplied with sets of questions to stimulate class discussion. Neither the analyses nor the questions should be taken as stereotyped models by the teacher for it is well known that there can be no one way of interpreting a poem. What makes poetry worth studying in FL classes is its endless potential for classroom discussions as a highly creative and open-ended form of literature.

Appended to this study is a list of suggested Turkish poems which are presented in two groups. The first group consists of those poems the interpretation of which owes much to the use of participle suffixes, though there are certainly other foregrounded linguistic features that should also be examined before reaching a broader interpretation. The second group is an entirely

subjective selection consisting of poems which bring
various aspects of the language into focus. They have
been compiled for the teacher with the intention to show
a range of linguistic possibilities that could be explored
in the poems. The list as a whole is obviously far from
being comprehensive and should be enriched by the teacher
according to the age, ability, interest and the proficiency
of the students. While doing this the teacher should keep
in mind that the selection should be based on linguistic
rather than on aesthetic grounds.

At this point a general note should be made as to the
terminology used throughout this study. I exclusively
followed Prof. H. Sebüktekin's terminology as used in his
book Turkish-English Contrastive Analysis. The teacher
should not expect the students to be acquainted with
the linguistic terminology used in this study. It is left
to the sensitivity of the teacher to select and introduce
the terminology when necessary.

Although this study is designed for the teacher's use in
advanced TFL classes, poetry should be introduced to
students early in the programmes, providing that the
ordinary language that sets the background of the foregrounded
linguistic features is within the hold of the students.

All the poems used for illustration in this study
are numbered which refer to sources given on page (112).

1. A METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR FL CLASSES

As stated in the Introduction, the motive for the attempt
to incorporate poetry as an aid to FL programmes derives
from the belief that FL programmes are -as they should
be- designed to develop the "communicative competence"
of the students, and that poetry is full of potential for
this means if presented properly to the students (Widdowson
1980, p.153).

In order for the teacher to guide the students on the right
track to the target, first the teacher himself should
develop an analytical strategy to poetry which cannot
ever be possible without a study on the characteristic
features of the language used in poetry. Such a study
should be done with the purpose of investigating "how the
resources of a language code are put to use in the production
of messages" (Widdowson 1979 b, p.202). Of course such
an approach presupposes poetry as a form of discourse
through which the poet communicates with the readers.
Although it is a unique form of communication, the procedures
to be followed in revealing the hidden message cannot be
much different from those we employ in understanding any
discourse (Widdowson 1980, p.162).

The ensuing section is exclusively on the language of poetry. I believe that the teacher can develop a linguistics-based analytic approach to poetry only if he knows what to look for and how to approach this special use of language.

1.1 Language of Poetry

For the purpose of analysis the language of poetry may be defined as a special language in which such stylistic principles as Foregrounding and Cohesion play a major role. So for a linguistics-based analytical approach to poetry we should familiarize ourselves with such fundamental principles. Poetry derives its communicative value both from the foregrounded deviations and regularities that stand against the background of ordinary language and from their intra-textual relations which function to knit the parts into a meaningful whole (Mukarovsky 1970, p.40; Leec 1970, p.121). Since this is the case, we shall start our investigation with a brief study on ordinary language that sets the background and then proceed to the concepts of foregrounding and cohesion.

1.1.1 The Background to the Language of Poetry : The Ordinary Language

What we mean by the background language of poetry is ordinary language. The ordinary language can best be anatomized

in terms of the abstract "tripartite model" proposed
by G. N. Leech (1980, Ch. 3) with the components
REALIZATION, FORM and SEMANTICS.   Again in line with G. N.
Leech I extend the model over the subsidiary branches
of linguistics -that is DIALECTOLOGY, REGISTER STUDY
and HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS- in order to have a more realistic
picture of language.

What is meant by REALIZATION is PHONOLOGY and GRAPHOLOGY.
The former is responsible for the production of speech
sounds while the latter is responsible for the whole
writing system (including shape, paragraphing, stanzaic
form, spelling and punctuation).

By FORM we mean SYNTAX and LEXIS.   The former, broadly
speaking, can be defined as the arrangement of words in
a sentence, whereas, lexis is a term used for vocabulary.
For any person to be able to speak and understand the
language, it is a prerequisite for him to have at least
some command of the grammar rules and the vocabulary.

SEMANTICS is the study of meaning -meaning that the
lexicographer is interested in.   Although at this point
it seems unnecessary to make a distinction between
lexis and semantics, the fact that language of poetry

exhibits both lexical and semantic deviations necessitates the presence of this sub-division.

Coming to the subsidiary branches of linguistics : DIALECTOLOGY is simply the study of dialects, that is the regional forms of languages. REGISTER STUDY is the study on the language function with special focus on how the language expresses the user's emotions, and HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS is the branch of linguistics that is concerned with development of languages in time.

Now that we have a descriptive model in hand for the ordinary language that sets the background, we may start examining the language of poetry which is characterized by H. Widdowson (1980, p.153) as the "abnormal use of language" and see how communication is secured at this "abnormal" level of language use.

1.1.2 Foregrounding and Interpretation

Foregrounding in stylistic analysis of poetry is a term that applies to both deviations and regularities which are set against the ordinary use of the language. Since poetry is accepted to be a form of literature that makes use of deviations to its limits -to a level that may

"reach pathological degrees of abnormality" (Leech 1980 ,
p.36)- we shall start our survey on deviations (irregularities)
and then shift to regularities.

1.1.2.1 Deviation

Deviation is a term that we use to refer to any sentence
or unit/s that do not obey the rules of a grammar (Crystal,
1980 p.108). What we have in mind is a descriptive grammar
not a prescriptive one. In poetry, we can find deviation
at any level of ordinary language. We shall keep in line
with Leech's model given above.

1.1.2.1.1 Phonological Deviation

Classical Turkish poetry is full of examples for this kind
of deviation. The poets, who were very much concerned
with meter, either lengthened or shortened the syllables
not to damage the meter thus giving way to phonological
deviation.

This is not the case in contemporary poetry. Especially
if we do not accept the use of colloquial speech in poetry
as a form of phonological deviancy, then we should note
that this type of deviation is not frequently observed

in contemporary Turkish Poetry. But for our classroom
purposes we may accept the use of colloquial speech in
poetry as a form of phonological deviation if we base
our programme on the standard use of the language. In
such a case, Turkish poetry is full of poems in which
we notice phonological deviation from the standard use
of the language. The following poem by Can Yücel (6a p. 86)
is an example to that :

YİYİMSERLERİMİZİN
İYİMSERLİĞİ

1   İy'etmiş Selçuklar geldiklerine
2   Osmanlılar da iy'etmiş
3   Biz de iy'ettik geldiğimize
4   Bizden sonra gelenler de iy'edecekler geldiklerine
5   Gelebilirlerse tabiy
6   İy'edecek bişey bırakmıyca'az ki biz

The words that we immediately observe are iy'etmiş (11 1
and 2); iy'ettik (1.3); iy'edecekler (1.4); İy'edecek (1.6);
tabiy (1.5), bişey (1.6) and bırakmıyca'az (1.6).

Although we know that in colloquial speech iyi may be
pronounced as iy; tabi as tabiy; bir şey as bişey; bırak-
mayacağız as bırakmıyca'az, we may explain the shift from

the standard use to the colloquial use in terms of
phonological deviation.

Therefore, we may say that the poet places the words listed
above into focus by means of writing them as they are used
in colloquial speech which could be explained in terms
of phonological deviation. In the mind of any reader
there arises a question as to the function of such a
deviation which should be accompanied by interpretation.

1.1.2.1.2 Graphological Deviation

There are levels of graphological deviation in poetry
because poetry is deviant even without any further
graphological deviation with its "characteristic line-
by-line arrangement" (Leech 1980, p.47) as opposed to
the writing system employed in prose. Since the
characteristic deviant arrangement is a convention in
poetry, we shall leave it aside and illustrate this
type of deviation with a poem by Behçet Necatigil
(8 p.31) which exhibit graphological deviation at an
extreme level.

EŞYALAR

Eşyaları	uzun zaman	yaşatmak
çocuklar	bilmez	
bilir	bazı kadınlar	önce onları

The reader immediately notices that the foregrounded
linguistic feature in this poem is the graphological
deviation. After a study on the poem, the reader understands
that he can read the poem both on the horizontal axis and
on the vertical axis. This leads the reader to two completely
different levels of interpretation.

1.1.2.1.3 Syntactic Deviation

We have defined syntax as the arrangement of words in a
sentence; therefore, any deviation in the arrangement
of words in a sentence is referred to as syntactic
deviation. Such a deviation is a device that is frequently
employed in poetry. Since syntax is, broadly speaking,
the arrangement of words in a sentence, deviation in
syntax could be found at various levels. The poem
extracted below by Oktay Rıfat (2b, p.232) illustrates
two different levels of syntactic deviation :

SENİ İNİYORUM

1 Seni iniyorum Yüksek Kaldırım'dan

2 Seni dolaşıyorum insanların içinde

3 Düşünüyorum düşünmek boş

4 Seni bakıyorum en iyisi

5 Seni toriklerin mavisine

6 Seni sandal

7 Seni martı

8 Seni Köprü'nün direkleri

9 Seni yoksul kişi boynu bükük

10 Bir kadın geçiyor yanımdan

11 Bir sen varsın senden öte

12 Seni geçiyor

13 Seni gidiyor

The syntactic deviancy that does not escape one's
notice is the use of seni with the verbs iniyorum (1.1):
bakıyorum (1.4): gidiyor (1.13). In ordinary code language
these verbs do not take objects in the accusative case,
whereas, in this poem all of the objects that go with these
verbs are used in the accusative case. Such a deviation
requires interpretation since it is employed to serve a
particular communicative purpose.

Another syntactic deviation that we notice in this poem
is the disconnected syntax as exhibited in lines 5, 6,
7, 8 and 9.

It is through these foregrounded deviations that the poet
places his message into focus.

1.1.2.1.4 Lexical Deviation

The poet in his search for the best expression feels

free to do anything with the vocabulary he has in hand.

He does not hesitate to invent new vocabulary items that

serve his purpose best. This is referred to as "neologism".

If the word is invented only for a specific purpose, then

we call it "nonce-formation". The poem extracted below

written by Can Yücel (6b, p.17) sets an example for

nonce-formation :

SERÇELEME

Çok oldunuz be serçeler

Kapatırım şimdi kapıyı

Dedim

Dinlemediler beni

Ben de kapatmadım kapıyı

Varsın dinlemesinler

The word that is invented only for once is <u>Serçeleme</u>,

thetitle of the poem. The poet takes the adverbial suffix

/-lEmE/ which has limited distribution in the language

(Ex.: şekerleme, tekerleme, balıklama, saçmalama etc.)

and extends it over the lexical item <u>serçe</u>, thus coining

a new word.

The starting point of analysis for this poem could be

nothing but the foregrounded lexical deviation that we

immediately notice in the title. It is only after studying

other foregrounded features in the poem that we understand

the meaning of the coined word. If we do not take the

code language into account, we cannot get the meaning

of the coined word within context.

1.1.2.1.5 Semantic Deviation

What is meant by semantic deviation is "transference of

meaning" in its broadest sense (Leech 1980, p.49). This

is a device that is exploited in poetry to its limits.

Whenever we feel that a specific lexical item is used at a specific slot in the poem to convey a meaning other than the one/s listed in the dictionary, we take it as a signal for semantic deviation. It functions to take the reader from the literal on to the figurative plane. The poem extracted below, written by Can Yücel (6b, p.32) sets a good example for such a deviation :

YARADANA KURBAN

1 Tırnakları uzuyor İstanbul'un

2 Kirli bir masmavi

3 Ama ne kadar yaraşıyor yarabbi

4 Bu tırnaklar bu deli parmaklara

5 Ve ortayla işaret arasında mütemadi bir cigara

6 Giderek minareler oluyorlar

7 Yaşlı bir köprüye rastladım demin

8 Bir diyeceğim yok dedi martılara

9 Başımı döndürmeseler

10 Başımı döndürmeseler böyle

11 Ben de dedim ki Allah'a

12 Feriştâhın gelse yaradamaz bu güzelliği

13 Sen bir turistsin amcabey !

In this poem we notice transference of meaning. In
the first stanza the poet attributes the feature /≠ human/
to Istanbul which is /-human/ in ordinary code. In the
second stanza it is yaşlı bir köprü (11.7, 8, 9 and 10)
that is referred to as a /≠ human/ entity, whereas,
it is, too, /-human/ in code language. The third
stanza, where Allah is referred to as /≠human/, takes
us back to the title Yaradana Kurban which both refers
to Allah and to the /≠ human/ entities.

We see that in this poem semantic deviations are not at
random, but are deliberately chosen to form foregrounded
patterns against the background -the code language. It
is through the reconciliation of code language and context
that the poet communicates with his readers.

1.1.2.1.6 Dialectical Deviation

To put it simply, dialectical deviation is borrowing of features that are typical of certain dialects. In order to take it as a deviation, it should be foregrounded against the dialect that is accepted as standard. The below extracted poem by Can Yücel (6a, p.80) serves to illustrate such a deviation :

GİTMEZ-AYAK

1   Ben bi kadın, kaçarsam, sen n'apan ?

2   Zor bulun başka kadın !

3   Benden güzel yar bulaman,

4   Çorbanı piş'recek,

5   Söküklerini dikecek !

6   Kim serecek döşeğini

7   Kim uv'cak kulunçlar'nı ?

8   Uçarsam Gökovaya,

9   Kalırsan sen ortada,

10 Bulamayın beni n'apan ?

11 Gittiğim yer Cennetâbat,

12 Bulut melek, melek bulut ...

13 Ben uçarsam, sen n'apan ? ..

14 Ya seni bulmazsam orda,

15 Ben erkeksiz, ben sensiz

16 Ben Cennetâbâtta n'apam ! ..

The reader immediately notices the words that signal
dialectical deviation : n'apan (11.1, 10, 13); n'apam (1.16);
bulun (1.2); bulaman (1.3); Bulamayın (1.10); piş'recek (1.4);
uv'cak kulunçlar'nı (1.7). It is through this foregrounded
dialect that the poet communicates. If we write the above
extracted words in Standard Turkish, then we take the
special message out of the poem. Therefore, the starting
point of analysis in this poem could be nothing but a study
on the foregrounded dialectical deviation, of course
accompanied by interpretation.

1.1.2.1.7 Deviation of Register

In stylistics what we mean by register is variety of
language according to function with focus on how the
language expresses the user's emotions. In this sense
poetry as a form of literature is a register in itself.
Therefore, any borrowing of the language from other registers
is referred to as deviation of register. Register
borrowing and register mixing are two forms of deviation
of register that are used by the poets frequently. The
below extracted short poem by Orhan Veli (1, p.93) illustrates
register mixing and register borrowing in a very subtle manner:

AHMETLER

Kimimiz Ahmet Bey
Kimimiz Ahmet Efendi
Ya Ahmet Ağa'yla Ahmet Beyfendi ?

It is the last line that we consider as an example of
register borrowing which naturally results in register
mixing since the question beginning with <u>ya</u> is informal
and conversational and brings up a contrast with the
preceding two statement like lines. As is the case with
other deviations, mixing of register, too, requires
interpretation on the part of the readers.

1.1.2.1.8 Deviation of Historical Period

The poets who make use of deviations at any level of
ordinary language do also feel themselves free to use
the language of the past whenever they find it necessary.
Turkish poetry is full of examples that illustrate deviation
of historical period. The below extracted poem by
Orhan Veli (1, p.149) serves to illustrate such a
deviation :

   KİTABE-İ SENG-İ MEZAR

.. Mesele falan değildi öyle,
   To be or not to be kendisi için ;
   Bir akşam uyudu ;
   Uyanmayıverdi.
   Aldılar, götürdüler.
   Yıkandı, namazı kılındı, gömüldü.

Duyarlarsa öldüğünü alacaklılar

Haklarını helâl ederler elbet.

Alacağına gelince ...

Alacağı yoktu zaten rahmetlinin.

The first thing that the reader notices is the title

of the poem which is a structure borrowed from Persian,

no longer in productive use. The poet's choice of such

a frozen form in the poem requires interpretation on the

part of the reader.

1.1.2.2 Regularity

Although we started our survey on the language of poetry

with deviation, we should note that regularity, too,

constitutes an important dimension of this specific

use of language and is at least as important as deviation.

Regularity, that is to say repetition and parallelism,

requires interpretation as is the case for deviation

1.1.2.2.1 Repetition

Repetition is an important mechanism in poetry that applies

to the language at various levels, such as repetition of

specific sounds, morphemes, lexical items, groups of words,
lines etc. The below extracted poem by Orhan Veli (1, p.174)
illustrates repetition at various levels :

BEDAVA

1 Bedava yaşıyoruz, bedava;

2 Hava bedava, bulut bedava ;

3 Dere tepe bedava ;

4 Yağmur çamur bedava ;

5 Otomobillerin dışı,

6 Sinemaların kapısı,

7 Camekânlar bedava;

8 Peynir ekmek değil ama

9 Acı su bedava;

10 Kelle fiyatına hürriyet,

11 Esirlik bedava ;

12 Bedava yaşıyoruz bedava.

In this poem we find both exact repetition of a particular
line :

       Bedava yaşıyoruz, bedava (11.1 and 12)

which serves to frame the poem; exact repetition of a
lexical item, i.e. bedava (used 12 times 11.1, 2, 3, 4,
6, 7, 9, 11, 12 and the title) which reinforces the message;
and exact repetition of a particular morpheme such as
that of the plural suffix /-lEr/ in the words :

$$\text{otomobi}\underline{\text{ller}} \quad (1.5)$$

$$\text{sinema}\underline{\text{ların}} \quad (1.6)$$

$$\text{Camekan}\underline{\text{lar}} \quad (1.7)$$

used to mark plurality and indefiniteness.

1.1.2.2.2 Parallelism

The use of parallelism in poetry runs hand in hand with
that of repetition. The differece between the two is that
while repetition shows itself on the surface (i.e. as
the repetition of a sound, word, line etc.), parallelism
is a device that functions at the level of underlying
structure. Therefore, for a study on parallelism,
we have to move from the surface to the underlying
structure. The poem extracted below written by Oktay
Rıfat (2b, p.11) illustrates the use of parallel structure :

YILDIZLAR

1 Kitabın yanında defter

2 Defterin yanında bardak

3 Bardağın yanında çocuk

4 Çocuğun yanında kadeh

5 Ve uzakta yıldızlar yıldızlar

In this poem we notice that the lines 1, 2, 3 and 4
are structurally parallel to each other. The underlying
parallel structure is :

Noun ≠ Genitive Suffix Noun ≠ Possessive Suffix ≠ Locative
Suffix Head Noun

A study on foregrounded parallel structures should be
accompanied by interpretation in order to reveal the
communicative value of the poem. As stated by Leech (1980,
p.67) "every parallelism sets up a relationship of
equivalence between two or more elements .... Interpretation
involves some external connection between these elements.
The connection is, broadly speaking, a connection either
of similarity or contrast". In this poem we observe that
the parallel structures are connected to each other
through semantic similarity.

1.1.3 Cohesion

What we mean by cohesion in the stylistic analysis
of poetry is the intra-textual relations of the foregrounded
lexical and grammatical patterns that knit the poem
into a meaningful whole.

Although in Section 1.1.2 above, we studied the concept
of foregrounding and illustrated each foregrounded linguistic
feature with a poem, we could not give a thorough interpretation
of each poem because we knew that there were other foregrounded
features in those poems that had to be considered before
understanding them in their entirety.

An exhaustive study on foregrounded features illustrates
that these features do not occur in isolation but are linked
to each other to form a "network of sequential relations"
(Leech 1970, p.120). After all, in our survey we want
to reveal the communicative value of poetry, therefore
this final stage is indispensable to our study.

Since illustration of cohesion requires an exhaustive
analysis of the foregrounded linguistic features, I will
not illustrate this specific dimension of linguistic
description here with a poem. Please refer to the poems
analysed in Part 2 for illustration of this specific
dimension of analysis.

Summary

In this part I attempted to set the ground for a linguistics-
based analytic approach to poetry for the use of the teacher.

Such an approach presupposes poetry as a form of discourse
through which the poet communicates with his readers,
therefore the aim of such a linguistics-based approach
would be nothing but to reveal the communicative value
of poetry.

Since the material of communication is language, I mainly
discussed the language of poetry in this part with emphasis
on the fundamental stylistic principle of Foregrounding
and its relation to Cohesion and Interpretation. My
intention was to provide the teacher with a methodological
framework.

2. ANALYSES OF POEMS

2.1 İSTANBUL'U DİNLİYORUM

1   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;
2   Önce hafiften bir rüzgar esiyor ;
3   Yavaş yavaş sallanıyor
4   Yapraklar, ağaçlarda ;
5   Uzaklarda, çok uzaklarda,
6   Sucuların hiç durmıyan çıngırakları ;
7   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı.

8   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;
9   Kuşlar geçiyor, derken ;
10 Yükseklerden, sürü sürü, çığlık çığlık.
11 Ağlar çekiliyor dalyanlarda ;
12 Bir kadının suya değiyor ayakları ;
13 İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;

14 İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;
15 Serin serin Kapalı Çarşı ;
16 Cıvıl cıvıl Mahmutpaşa ;
17 Güvercin dolu avlular.
18 Çekiç sesleri geliyor doklardan,
19 Güzelim bahar rüzgarında ter kokuları ;
20 İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı.

21   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;

22   Başında eski âlemlerin sarhoşluğu,

23   Loş kayıkhaneleriyle bir yalı ;

24   Dinmiş lodosların uğultusu içinde

25   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;

26   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;

27   Bir yosma geçiyor kaldırımdan ;

28   Küfürler, şarkılar, türküler, laf atmalar.

29   Bir şey düşüyor elinden yere ;

30   Bir gül olmalı ;

31   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;

32   İstanbul'u dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı ;

33   Bir kuş çırpınıyor eteklerinde ;

34   Alnın sıcak mı, değil mi, biliyorum ;

35   Dudakların ıslak mı, değil mi, biliyorum ;

36   Beyaz bir ay doğuyor fıstıkların arkasından

37   Kalbinin vuruşundan anlıyorum ;

38   İstanbul'u dinliyorum.

Orhan Veli (1, p. 170-171)

2.1.1 An Analytic Guide for the Teacher

We may start our analysis of the poem with a study
on the foregrounded regularities :

1. The most readily noticed regularity in the poem is
the exact and partial repetition of the line İstanbul'u
dinliyorum, gözlerim kapalı; in the first and the last
lines of each stanza. This line is made up of two parts
which as well could be taken as two sentences separated
by a comma. This repeated line serves to frame the
stanzas until the very end is reached where only the
first part is repeated. It is directly linked to the
title of the poem and provides a single frame for the
whole poem.

2. The poet's choice of the continuative participle
suffix /-Iyor/ is a paradigmatic regularity that should
be mentioned. We cannot find a single exception to this
throughout the poem. The use of this specific tense
helps the readers to feel the immediacy of the poet's
experience.

3. Another paradigmatic regularity worth mentioning
is that the verbs are conjugated either in the first
person or the third person singular. A listing of the

finite verbs conjugated in the third person (esiyor 1.2 ;
sallanıyor 1.3 , geçiyor 11.9-27 ; çekiliyor 1.11 ,
değiyor 1.12 ; geliyor 1.18 ; düşüyor 1.29 ; çırpınıyor 1.3
shows that there is action expressed in these verbs, and
it is mainly the feature /ʔ action/ in the verbs that helps
us feel the activity going on in the poem in addition the
poet's choice of the adjectives, adverbs and reduplicative
compounds that serves for the same means.

Now let us make a list of the verbs conjugated in the first
person singular :

> dinliyorum   (repeated 12 times in the first
> and the last lines of the stanzas,
> and once in the title)
>
> biliyorum   (used only in the last stanza
> and repeated twice)
>
> anlıyorum   (used only once in the last stanza)

These verbs set a contrast to those on the previous list
because they are all state-of-being verbs which are exclusive
related to mental processes.

4. Although there are exceptions, we notice a recurrent
use of the plural suffix /-1Er/ throughout the poem which
is again a paradigmatic regularity. It is attached not
only to nouns but also to adverbs .

First let us make a list of the nouns which are used in the plural form :-

gözlerim	(11.1, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 25, 26, 31, 32)
yapraklar	(1.4)
ağaçlarda	(1.4)
sucuların	(1.6)
çıngırakları	(1.6)
kuşlar	(1.9)
ağlar	(1.11)
dalyanlarda	(1.11)
ayakları	(1.12)
avlular	(1.17)
sesleri	(1.18)
doklardan	(1.18)
kokuları	(1.19)
alemler	(1.22)
kayıkhaneler	(1.23)
lodoslar	(1.24)
küfürler	(1.28)
türküler	(1.28)
şarkılar	(1.28)
laf atmalar	(1.28)
eteklerinde	(1.33)
dudakların	(1.35)
fıstıkların	(1.36)

The poet's excessive use of the plural suffix /-lEr/ creates
a general atmosphere which is extended over his use of the
indefinite article <u>bir</u> in front of the nouns used in the
singular. Before listing the adverbs used in the plural
let us make a list of the singular nouns that function
parallel to the poet's use of the plurals :

<u>bir</u> rüzgar   (1.2)

<u>bir</u> kadının   (1.12)

<u>bir</u> yalı   (1.27)

<u>bir</u> yosma   (1.27)

<u>bir</u> şey   (1.29)

<u>bir</u> gül   (1.30)

<u>bir</u> kuş   (1.33)

<u>bir</u> ay   (1.36)

The only definite noun in the poem is İstanbul in contrast
to the general scenes delineated through the excessive
use of the plural suffix /-lEr/ and the indefinite article
<u>bir</u>. What makes İstanbul definite other than the fact
that it is a name of a specific city and it has a unique
referent is the use of the accusative suffix /-YI/ that
follows.

The nominals that function as adverbials of place and
are used in the plural are :

uzaklarda   (1.5 used twice)

yükseklerden   (1.10)

Here again the poet escapes from giving definite information
and prefers to use the plural suffix /-lEr/ to intensify
distance.

5.   Before studying the foregrounded irregularities we
should also examine the syntactic regularities which are
worth noticing under the heading of regularities.   The
poet's use of the simple (N ⁄ V) construction is an
example to that.   It is used only twice in reverse order
as (V ⁄ N) for the poetic effect.

Those used in the reverse order are :

        sallanıyor yapraklar   (11.3 and 4)

        değiyor ayakları   (1.12)

Other than these two examples, we see that the rest is
used in the regular order of (N ⁄ V) construction :

rüzgar	esiyor	(1.2)
kuşlar	geçiyor	(1.9)
ağlar	çekiliyor	(1.11)
çekiç sesleri	geliyor	(1.18)
yosma	geçiyor	(1.27)
bir şey	düşüyor	(1.29)
kuş	çırpınıyor	(1.33)
ay	doğuyor	(1.36)

It is true that through the use of the simple (N $\not$ V)
construction the poet does not leave us at a loss and
is rather specific as to what goes on in various scenes
throughout the poem. But an overall evaluation of the
poem shows us that what is achieved in the poem through
the use of the simple (N $\not$ V) construction is parallel
to that achieved through the excessive use of the plural
suffix /-1Er/ and the indefinite article <u>bir</u>. It is the
regular use of the above-mentioned specific linguistic
items that we owe for the delineation of the landscape
in general references.

6. There is also syntactic regularity in the poet's
recurrent use of the NP which is further divided into
(Modifier $\not$ Noun) construction :

durmıyan	çıngırakları	(1.6)
serin serin	Kapalıçarşı	(1.15)
cıvıl cıvıl	Mahmutpaşa	(1.16)
güvercin dolu	avlular	(1.17)
eski	alemler	(1.22)
loş	kayıkhaneler	(1.23)
dinmiş	lodoslar	(1.24)
beyaz ..	ay	(1.36)

We observe that some of the modifiers listed above are derived in various ways which need to be briefly explained.

> durmıyan : V root <u>dur</u> ≠ negative suffix /-mE/
> ≠ de-verb substantive derivational
> suffix /-yEn/
>
> dinmiş : V root <u>din</u> ≠ participle suffix /-mIş/
>
> serin serin : reduplicated form of the adjective <u>serin</u>
>
> cıvıl cıvıl : Another reduplicated form: The base <u>cıvıl</u> is not used by itself as an adjective.

If we exclude the <u>durmıyan çıngırakları</u> from our list for a moment, we notice that the poet creates a peaceful atmosphere by his choice of the modifiers... <u>Durmıyan çıngırakları</u> which has the feature /≠ disturbing sound/ needs further attention because the poet in a way neutralizes the disturbing aspect of the sound through his use of the adverb of place <u>uzaklarda çok uzaklarda</u> (1.5). The same technique is again used in line 24 where the /≠ disturbing sound/ feature of <u>lodosların uğultusu</u> completely diminishes with the use of the modifier <u>dinmiş</u>.

7. The syntactic parallelism of the VP as (... Adverb ≠ Verb ..) or (... Verb ≠ Adverb) is also worth mentioning. Let us make a list of the adverbs in relation to the verbs they modify which, of course, make a better sense with their subjects :-

> <u>hafiften</u> bir rüzgar esiyor (1.2)
>
> <u>yavaş yavaş</u> sallanıyor yapraklar (11.3 and 4)
>
> kuşlar geçiyor ... <u>sürü sürü</u>
>
> <u>çığlık çığlık</u> (11.9 and 10)

We should give a brief description of the adverbs listed above :

hafiften	:	hafif ≠ ablative suffix /-dɛn/ which is also used for adverbial formation.
yavaş yavaş	:	reduplicative compound. The base <u>yavaş</u> could as well be used as an adverb on its own but its meaning is emphasized after reduplication.
sürü sürü çığlık çığlık	)))	The base forms <u>sürü</u> and <u>çığlık</u> are nouns. Aftar reduplication they enter into new syntactic distribution and function as adverbs.

The first two adverbials, that is hafiften and yavaş yavaş
directly take us to the peaceful atmosphere of the poem.
We hear the gentle blow of the wind and the sound of the
leaves moving but that does not at all disturb us.
The third and the fourth adverbials (sürü sürü, çığlık çığlık)
seem to set a contrast in this peaceful setting at the
first glance. But that is not right. We immediately
realize that the birds fly at a distance from us :

        Kuşlar geçiyor, derken ;

        Yükseklerden, sürü sürü, çığlık çığlık (11.9-10)

To place our interpretation on a wider scale, we may say
that the poet's choice of adjectives, adjectivals and
adverbs all complement to the general peaceful atmosphere
created in the poem.

8. Other syntactically parallel structures that do not
escape our notice are :

        Serin serin Kapalıçarşı   (1.15)

        Cıvıl cıvıl Mahmutpaşa   (1.16)

and

        Alnın sıcak mı, değil mi, biliyorum (1.34)

        Dudakların ıslak mı, değil mi, biliyorum (1.35)

We know that the use of parallel structure in poetry needs interpretation other than its rhetoric emphasis and memorability. There is double emphasis on the conveyed meaning through the repetition of the exact syntactic structure.

We are aware that the foregrounded irregularities, that is to say deviations, are at least as important as the foregrounded regularities for the understanding of the poem :

8. Right after we read the title, there arise a question in our minds as to the ordinary code reference of the lexical item İstanbul. What warns us is its being the object of the verb dinliyorum. Such a verb does not necessarily require its object to have the feature /≠ human/ but there is a requirement for its having the semantic feature /≠ sound/ . As the name of a city, İstanbul does not have the feature /≠ sound/.

The title of the poem where the deviation is presented to us for the first time is a part of the constant element that is repeated eleven times if we do not include its repetion in the title and the final line of the poem, constantly asking us to be cautious of the deviant use within the context.

While moving through foregrounded regularities, in the
fifth stanza we observe a shift from the general to the
specific. It is signalled through the recurrent use
of the indefinite article bir (bir yosma 1.27 ; bir şey 1.29;
bir gül 1.30) which is also a reflection of singularity.

The /≠ singular/ feature established in stanza 5 is carried
over to the final stanza, the climax of the poem, where
it is attributed to the second person "you" who is introduced
in the poem for the first time. The lines :

> Alnın sıcak mı, değil mi, biliyorum (1.34)
>
> Dudakların ıslak mı, değil mi, biliyorum (1.35)
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Kalbinin vuruşundan anlıyorum (1.37)

make us feel that the "I" and the "you" are very close
to each other. So close that whatever we learn about
the "you" is through the sense of touch of the first peson,
the "I". With the information we get from the above extracted
lines, we attribute the feature /≠ human/ to the "you".
If we further relate the linguistic expressions alnın (1.34),
dudakların (1.35) and kalbinin vuruşu (1.37) to eteklerin (1.33)
an ambiguous word in the first reading, we feel ourselves

on safe grounds in saying that the "you" has also the
feature /≠ female/.

After the shift from the general to the specific,
from the plural to the singular, from the third person
to the second person and after specifying the "you" with
the features /≠ human/ and /≠ female/, we understand
why the poet attributes the feature /≠ sound/ to
İstanbul. The 'you' hid behind the words alnın , dudakların
and kalbinin vuruşu is İstanbul.

2.1.2 Questions to Stimulate Class Discussion

1. - Is there any exact repetion in the poem which
       can be taken as the constant element ? What is
       its function ?

2. - Make a list of the verbs used throughout the
       poem. Is there any regularity as to the tense ?
       What does this show us ?

    - Can you further group these verbs ? (Take the
       personal suffixes into consideration.)

    - Do you notice any foregrounded deviation in the
       subject of the verbs ? What could be the reason
       for the deviant use ? (Use of the verb dinliyorum
       with İstanbul)

3. - Make a list of the nouns that are used in the plural. How does it contribute to the poem ?

   - Make another list of the nouns that are used in the singular. What is the function of the indefinite article <u>bir</u> used in front of the singular nouns ?

   - How do you relate the excessive use of the plural suffix /-lEr/ and the indefinite article <u>bir</u> to each other ?

4. - Can you find any syntactic regularity in the poem? Make separate lists for the regularities that you notice at the different levels .

   - How do you interpret the poet's choice of simple constructions in the poem ?

5. - Are there any parallel syntactic structures in the poem ? Make a list of them.

   - What is your interpretation for the use of the parallel syntactic structure ?

6. - Who are the participants in the poem ?

   - Is there an addresser and an addressee ?

   - Who is the second person singular "you" in the last stanza ? What kind of linguistic evidence can you give in the poem for your choice ?

2.2   NAAT

1   Bir elim bulut

2   Bir elim toprak


```
        D           D           D
        Ö           Ü           Ö
       N           Ş           N
        E           E           E
         R           N           R
        E           B           E
          K           İ           K
                     R
                      Y
                     A
                      P
                       R
                       A
                       K
```


3   Sana bin kez söyledim be evlâdım

4   Dişlerinle tırnaklarını yiyeceğine

5   Gözlerinle gökyüzünü yesen ya

                                    Can Yücel (6b, p.56)

2.2.1 An Analytical Guide for the Teacher

We shall start our analysis with a study on the linguistic

features that are foregrounded.

1. What immediately strikes our attention is the
foregrounded deviancy in the arrangement of the words
in the middle part of the poem. Rather than using the
letters for writing, the poet uses them to draw a picture
before our eyes. After noticing that the picture is drawn
by letters, we further notice that these letters are
put together to form meaningful words. The first and
the third words are DÖNEREK both facing the line in the
middle which is written continuously as DÜŞEREİFYAFFAH.

If we are to make an immediate interpretation for the
graphological deviation, we may say that the letters
are used both to form words -group of words- and also to
draw a picture that reflects the meaning of these words.

2. Another thing that we notice, but this time only
after reading the poem, is the mixing of register in
the first two and the last three lines.

First let us make separate lists for the pronouns and
the personal -possessive suffixes used in the two distinct
parts of the poem to determine the addressers.

In the first part we have the first person singular
possessive suffix /-Im/ that is attached to the word
el (11.1 and 2).

In the last three lines, we notice the use of the first
person singular personal suffix /-YIm/ in the word söyledim
(1.3) and the first person singular possessive suffix
/-Im/ in the word evladım (1.3). The rest are :

> Sana (1.3-second person singular personal
> pronoun used as the object)

> dişlerinle (1.4 - second person singular
> possesive suffix /-In/)

> gözlerinle (1.5 - second person singular
> possessive suffix /-In/)

> tırnaklarını (1.4 - second person singular
> possessive suffix /-In/

> yesen (1.5 - second person singular personal
> suffix)

The picture we have in hand is that in the first part
the addresser is the first person singular "I". There
is not addressee. In the last part, we have both an
addresser, again first person singular "I", and an
addressee, second person singular "you".

Although the addressers both in the first two and the last
three lines are the first person singular pronoun "I"
which has Ø modification in the poem, we notice that the
referents of the "I"s are not the same. What makes us
feel so is the shift to informal speech in the second
part of the poem in contrast to the first part which is
comparatively formal. It is the use of the second person
singular "you", the informal "you", the choice of the
words bin kez (1.3), be (1.3), evladım (1.3),and yesen ya
(1.5) that makes the speech colloquial.

3. Yet another foregrounded linguistic feature in the
poem is the use of the word NAAT in the title. It is
not a lexical item that is used in daily speech. It is
hard for us to find its meaning in Turksih-English
dictionaries. Therefore, the students should be provided
with its meaning by the teacher. In Metinlerle Türk ve
Batı Edebiyatı (1966, p.XLI) Naat is given as the name
of the religious musical piece composed by Itrî for
Mevlana Celaleddin Rumi. The students should also know
that the whirling dervishes start performing their
service after "Naat" is played.

It is only after this information is given that the
deviations at various levels start to be meaningful.

At this point it is quite impossible not to relate the
graphological deviation in the middle of the poem to
the title. It is after "Naat" that the whirling
dervishes take their positions as stated in the lines

<div align="center">

Bir elim bulut   (1.1)

Bir elim toprak   (1.2)

</div>

which exemplify perfect symmetry, and start their
service as seen in the middle part of the poem. The "I"
in the last three lines of the poem is just a spectator.

2.2.2   Questions to Stimulate Class Discussion

1. -   What is the most striking foregrounded deviancy
        in the poem ?

    -   Is there any parallelism between the deviant
        arrangement of the letters and the meaning of
        the words composed by these letters ?

    -   What kind of image does the graphological deviation
        create in your mind ?

2. -   Who is the addresser and who is the addressee in
        the poem ?

- Do you think that the referents of the "I"s
  in the first two and the last three lines are
  the same ?

- Can you base your assumption on linguistic
  evidence ?

- What is the striking difference between the
  first two and the last three lines of the poem ?
  (Formal and informal aspect of the language used.)

3. - What is the meaning of the word NAAT ? (Most probably
     the students will not be able to know its meaning,
     the teacher is expected to provide the students
     with the meaning of this specific lexical item.)

   - Can you link the foregrounded deviations in the
     poem to each other and give a broad interpretation
     of the poem after being supplied with the meaning
     of the word NAAT ?

   - Can you make interpretations at different levels
     since actually there is no mention of whirling
     dervishes in the poem ?

2.3   GİDERAYAK

1   Handan, hamamdan geçtik,

2   Gün ışığındaki hissemize razıydık;

3   Saadetinden geçtik,

4   Ümidine razıydık ;

5   Hiç birini bulamadık ;

6   Kendimize hüzünler icadettik,

7   Avunamadık ;

8   yoksa biz ...

9   Biz bu dünyadan değil miydik ?

Orhan Veli (1, p.155)

2.3.1   An Analytical Guide for the Teacher

A study on the foregrounded regularities that predominate in linguistic expression will serve for our understanding of the poem.

1.   We immediately observe the paradigmatic regularity in the use of the past tense suffix /-dI/ and the auxiliary postclitic verb /-YdI/ both denoting past.

Those which have the past tense suffix /-dI/ are :

geçtik	(11.1 and 3)
Bulamadık	(1.5)
icadettik	(1.6)
avunamadık	(1.7)

The auxiliary postclitic verb /-ydI/ follows :

razıydık	(11. 2 and 4)
.. dünyadan değil miydik	(1.9)

What is placed into focus through the recurrent use
of both of the suffixes cited above that denote past
in isolation is the non-immediacy of experience that is
carried to the present within the whole context.

2. Another paradigmatic regularitiy that is as readily
noticeable as the regularity in tense is the exclusive
use of the first person plural personal suffix /-k/
that occurs after the tense suffix /-dI/ and the auxiliary
suffix /-ydI/. We do not need to give a separate
list since the one given above in item 1 for the paradigmatic
regularity in tense will also serve our purpose here.

The excessive use of the first person plural suffix /-K/
is linked to the twice repeated personal pronoun biz (11.8-9),
first person possessive suffix in hissemiz (1.2), and the
first person plural reflexive pronoun kendimiz (1.6)
used in the emphatic sense. It is the repetition of the
first person plural suffixes and the pronouns that makes
us aware of the presence of the first person singular pronoun
"I" who hides himself behind the "we"s.

3. We do observe that both parallelisms and regularities
in syntactic structure are as important as paradigmatic
regularities in the poem. Parallel syntactic structure
is exhibited in lines 1-2 and 3-4 :

> Handan hamamdan geçtik, (1.1)
> Gün ışığındaki hissemize razıydık ; (1.2)
> Saadetinden geçtik, (1.3)
> Ümidine razıydık ; (1.4)

The semicolons at the end of the second and the fourth
lines mark the end of two distinct ideas patterned
syntactically as :

> NP (in the ablative case) Verb (1.1)
> NP (in the dative case) Verb (1.2)
> NP (in the ablative case) Verb (1.3)
> NP (in the dative case) Verb (1.4)

and connected to each other through both semantic and
syntactic similarity. While the parallelism between
the first and the second two lines is that of similarity,
the equivalence between the parts, that is to say the relation
of the first line to the second and the relation of the
third line to the fourth, is based on semantic antinomy.

It is only after provoking the attention of the readers
in the first four lines through the use of syntactic and
semantic similarity between the first and the second two
lines and the semantic contrast between the main clauses
of the compound sentences that the poet moves on to the
fifth line where the expectancy of the reader is satisfied.
In contrast to the elaborately worked out first four lines,
the fifth line is given in a very concise form and manner.
But this does not at all come to mean that the balance
in the poem is infringed. The line

            Hiç birini bulamadık ;   (1.5)

is the head line of a further foregrounded regularity,
studied in Item 4, that semantically counterbalances
the first part.

4. As mentioned in Item 3 above, the fifth line with its structure (.... Vroot ≠ -/YE/ abilitative mode ≠ /-mE/ negative suffix ≠ /-dI/ past tense suffix ≠ /-k/ first person plural suffix) is the starting point of a further syntactic regularity in the poem :

Hiç birini bulamadık , (1.5)

Avunamadık ; (1.7)

The poet reinforces the fifth line, the natural outcome of the first four lines, by means of repeating the succinct negative structure. It is through these negative statements that the reader is led to the last line of the poem where the poet poses "th question" in the negative form in harmony with the preceding negative statements.

5. All of the foregrounded regularities and parallelisms studied up to now mark the grammatical cohesion in the poem which is interrelated to the lexical cohesion that is studied in the following section.

As stated in Item 3 above, while the compound sentences presented on the first and the second two lines exhibit both syntactic and semantic parallelism, the main clauses of the compound sentences are interconnected through semantic

contrast. If we examine the lexical items used in the contrastive parts, we observe that they follow two different paths. On the one hand we have

han, hamam   (1.1)

saadet   (1.3)

and on the other

gün ışığındaki hisse (1.2)

ümit   (1.4)

Although han, hamam (1.1) and saadet (1.3) are semantically quite distinct from gün ışığındaki hisse (1.2) and ümit (1.4), we notice that the poet's choice of the verbs (... geçtik used for vazgeçtik on lines 1 and 3 and .... razıydık on lines 2 and 4) serves to neutralize the opposing polarity of the two groups of lexical items.

After establishing the lexical equilibrium between the opposing poles, the poet strengthens the lexical cohesion with his preference of the repeated negative suffix /-mE/ and the negative particle değil in substantive predication ; bulamadık (1.5) ; avunamadık (1.7) ; biz bu dünyadan değil miydik (1.9) which can further be linked to hiçbirini (15) used to reinforce the following negative verb bulamadık and to yoksa (1.8) used in harmony with the negative suffix and particles.

To conclude, we may say that it is the cohesion of grammatical
and lexical foregrounding in the poem that makes us
aware of the "I" behind the "we"s -the "I" who in his
final stage of life -better to say Giderayak - realizes
that the life he has led did not pay him back what it
owed. The parallel syntactic structures connected to
each other through both similarity and contrast and the
lexical items used in the syntactic structures all mark
that the humble expectations of the "I" were never
satisfied ant that it is the unfulfilled humble expectations
which lead the "I" to the ultimate question

$$\text{Yoksa biz ....} \qquad (1.8)$$

$$\text{Biz bu dünyadan değil miydik ?} \quad (1.9)$$

2.3.2 Questions to Stimulate Class Discussion

1. - Make a list of the verbs used in the poem.
   - Do they exhibit any regularity in tense ?
   - How do you interpret the poet's choice of this
     specific tense ?

2. - Do you notice regularity in the use of the personal
     suffix ?
   - What are the personal pronouns, the possessive
     and the personal suffixes used in the poem ?

- Do you think that the poet refers to a group
  of people by his use of biz ?

- What is the difference between biz and bizler ?

- Can you find other examples where biz , in colloquial
  use, replaces ben in Turkish ?
  (Ex.: bizim hanım; bizim kitap ..)

3. - Are there any parallel syntactic structures in
     the poem ? Make a list of them.

   - Are these parallel syntactic structures connected
     to each other through similarity or contrast ?

   - Do you notice any further regularity in syntactic
     structure ? Make a list of these regular syntactic
     structures.

   - Please give linguistic description of the words
     bulamadık (1.5) and avunamadık (1.7). What is
     the difference between bulmadık and bulamadık ?

   - How do you relate the regularity in syntactic
     structure to that of parallelism in syntactic
     structures that you listed above ?

   - What is your interpretation of the foregrounded
     parallel syntactic structures and regularity
     in syntactic structure ?

4. - Do you observe any cohesion in the choice of lexical
     items ? Make separate lists for the lexical items
     that run on different paths.

   - Are they really contrastive sets of lexical items?
     If not, how does the poet neutralize them ?

2.4 ŞEYİST

1   Biz talebeyken şeydik

2   İyi arkadaştık şeylen

3   Biliyorsunuz şeylen şey olunmaz

4   Ben şeyi bitirince babam

5   Şey dedi Şey partisine girdim

6   Zaten Şeyle evlenmiştim

7   Şey şeye gidelim dedi gittik

8   Şeysiz de olmuyor döndük

9   İki şeyim oldu büyüdüler

10   Doktor sende bişey var diyor şimdi

11   Tabiy bende bişey var : sayamadığın kadar

12   Kimse dokunamaz benim şeyime

13   Çünki ben bişeyim

14   Herşey de bişeydir ama

15· Ben başka bişeyim

16   Ben Şeyim

                                    Can Yücel (6a, p.88)

2.4.1 An Analytic Guide for the Teacher

The foregrounded regularity, better to say irregularity,
in the poem lies in the extended reiteration and distribution
of the lexical item şey . It is well known by the native
speakers, and as well by foreigners who start learning

Turkish as a second language, that this lexical item
has a wide usage in the language as an "all-purpose"
substantive (Lewis, p.77). Since we do accept that it
is commonplace to use it in the daily language, what
creates the deviancy in the poem is its mushrooming
in various syntactic slots with a range of suffixation.

A study both on the syntactic distribution and the
suffixation of the şey's which cannot be separated
from a study on lexical cohesion will give us hints
as to the nature of the lexical items that could take
the place of the filler words -the şey's. There is
no need to mention that if the poem is used in such
a manner, it is full of potential for classroom discussion.

1. We may start our analysis by listing the şey's
that are used in substantive predication. The listing
is as follows :

şeydik	(1.1)
şey olunmaz	(1.3)
bişeyim	(1.13 and 15)
bişeydir	(1.14)
şeyim	(1.16)

The linguistic description of the items listed above
is as follows :

    şeydik : şey ≠ /-YdI/ (auxiliary postclitic suffix

          denoting past) ≠ /-k/ (first person plural

          suffix)

    şey olunmaz : şey ol- (root of the auxiliary verb

          olmak) ≠ /-In/ (reflexive suffix) ≠ /-mE/

          (negative suffix) ≠ /-z/ (aorist suffix

          after negative suffix)

    bişeyim : bişey ≠ /-Im/ (first person predicate

          inflectional suffix)

    bişeydir: bişey ≠ /-dIr/ (predicate emphatic suffix

          that occurs mostly after substantives)

    şeyim   : şey ≠ /-Im/ (first person predicate

          inflectional suffix)

The morphological study that we have done above shows
that the şey's can only be replaced by substantivals
which is parallel to its usage in daily language.

2. A listing of the remaining şey's used in the poem is
extracted below :

    şeylen   (1.2 and 3)

    şeyi   (1.4)

şey	(used twice on line 5 and once on line 7)
şeyle	(1.6)
şeye	(1.7)
şeysiz	(1.8)
şeyim	(1.9)
bişey	(1.10 and 11)
şeyime	(1.12)

The linguistic description of the items listed above
is as follows :

şeylen : şey ≠ /-YlEN/ (colloquial alternant of
/-YlE/ which is a concomitive postclitic)

şeyi : şey ≠ /-YI/ (accusative suffix)

şey : Şey (substantive used in the nominal
case)

Şeyle : şey ≠ /-YlE/ (concomitive postclitic
suffix)

şeye : şey ≠ /-YE/ (dative suffix)

şeysiz : şey ≠ /-sIz/ (privative suffix)

şeyim : şey ≠ /-Im/ (first person possessive
suffix)

bişey : bişey (substantive used in the nominative
case)

şeyime : şey ≠ /-Im/ (first person singular
possessive suffix) ≠ /-YE/ (dative
suffix)

The morphological study of the linguistic expressions
cited on the preceding page again reveals that the _şey_'s
can only be replaced by substantivals.

What is intended to be achieved in items 1 and 2 above
is only to specify the general syntactic class of words
that can best be substituted for _şey_ used in the poem.
As mentioned above, our study discloses that _şey_ is used
exclusively to be replaced by words that belong to the
general syntactic class of substantivals. It is really
too general a picture. In order not to fall into traps,
we should try to narrow the borders of the syntactic class
and try to learn more about the nature of the words
that can take the place of the _şey_'s .

At this point, it is inevitable for us not to bring another
dimension into our study. It is that of lexical cohesion.

3. A study on lexical cohesion is crucial for the
understanding of the poem in its entirety. If the _şey_'s
are replaced by other words before studying the lexical
cohesion in the poem, the result would be unsatisfactory.
Although the students are free to choose whatever word
they want to use, they should keep in mind that their
version should be parallel to the original one at the
level of COHERENCE. Otherwise, the commanding tone of
the poem would be "nonsense".

The starting point would be an attempt to group the
şey's that most likely seem to refer to the same
linguistic item. After establishing the semantic cores,
that is to say the şey's that most likely seem to refer
to the same linguistic item, it is easy to trace various
other semantic connections that are either directed
into or out of the core. This approach would, in the
final stage, bring to surface the lexical cohesion between
the şey's used in the poem.

i) The exact repetion of the şeylen's in lines 2 and 3,
which is a foregrounded paradigmatic regularity, obliges
us to put a question mark next to them and make an
investigation in their immediate environment. Our study
reveals that there is a semantic connection between the
lines on which they appear :

    İyi arkadaştık şeylen (1.2)

    Biliyorsunuz şeylen şey olunmaz (1.3)

The third line is given as an extra information which
cannot be semantically disconnected from the second line.
It is the word Biliyorsunuz (1.3) that makes one feel
that he should refer to the preceding line in order to have
a better understanding. After establishing the semantic

link between the two lines, an evaluation of the fact
that the şeylen's have both the same form and the
same function makes one think that they should be
semantically connected to each other.

The exact repetition of the two şeylen's and the established
semantic connection between them serve to be one of the
semantic cores in the poem which is linked to other
linguistic expressions in the environment.

One of the links is between the şeylen's and the şevdik (1.1).
What determines the link is the semantic unity in the
first two lines as the outcome of the repetition of the
past tense postclitic /-ydI/ and the first person plural
suffix /-k/ in the words şevdik and arkadaştık which is
extended over the pronoun biz on the first line . We
also owe to the choice of the lexical items talebeyken (1.1)
and arkadaştık (1.2) for the semantic link between şevdik
and şeylen's.

Yet another semantic link that does not escape one's
notice is between the şeylen and şey on the third line.
What should be taken into consideration before substituting
a word for şey, apart from the semantic relation between

şeylen and şey, is the presence of the aorist suffix
/-z/ in the auxiliary verb olunmaz which could be equated
with the function of the continuative participle suffix
/-Iyor/ in Biliyorsunuz that make the line

> Biliyorsunuz şeylen şey olunmaz

sound like a proverb.

After unwinding the grammatical and lexical cohesion
between the şey's on the first three lines, one can
draw a semantic link between the word talebeyken (1.1)
and şeyi bitirince (1.4) very easily. The two şey's
on the fifth line cannot be separated from this set of
lexical cohesion because the fifth line is a continuation
of the fourth one :

> Ben şeyi bitirince babam (1.4)
>
> Şey dedi şey Partisine girdim (1.5)

Although we notice that şey is repeated twice on the
fifth line, their appearance on different syntactic
slots does not give way to confusion.

ii) There is foregrounded lexical cohesion between the
capitilized Şeyle (1.6) and şey (1.7). It is the context

that determines the semantic link between the two :

    Zaten şeyle evlenmiştim   (1.6)
    Şey şeye gidelim dedi gittik (1.7)

What gives us a hint as to the nature of the word that may
take the place of şeyle on line 6 is the choice of the
verb evlenmiştim that follows it. This specific verb
requires its object to have the concomitive postclitic
/-YlE/ attached to it and requires its object to have
the feature /+ human/ if not used figuratively. It is
the juxtaposition of the object şeyle and the subject
şey within that specific context that makes one think
that the referent of the object in (1.6) and the subject
in (1.7) are the same.

There are further lexical links that branch from this
semantic core . One connection is between :

    Zaten şeyle evlenmiştim   (1.6)
and
    iki şeyim oldu büyüdüler   (1.9)

and another connection is between :

    Şey şeye gidelim dedi gittik (1.7)
    şeysiz de olmuyor dündük   (1.8)

What primarily gives us hints as to the nature of the
word that can take the place of şeyim (1.9) is the
choice of the verbs oldu and büyüdüler after the
presentation of evlenmiştim on line 6. It is again the
choice of the verbs on lines 7 and 8 that give us hints
for the choice of the words that can be substituted for
şeye (1.7) and şeysiz (1.8).

iii) The exact repetion of the bişey's on lines 10 and
11 is another foregrounded paradigmatic regularity
that urge us to investigate whether the semantic relation
between these lexical items is tight or not. The lines
on which they appear are :

      Doktor sende bişey var diyor şimdi (1.10)
      Tabiy bende bişey var: sayamadığın kadar (1.11)

Their appearance in exactly the same syntactic slot in
the lines that exhibit partial syntactic parallelism
makes us think that there should also be semantic
connection between the two. It is noticed that the
first part of line 11 is just a confirmation of what
is stated on line 10. Therefore, the probability of their
being referred to the same linguistic item is very high.

The lexical cohesion between the bişey's may as well
be extended over the lexical item şeyime on line 12 :

Kimse dokunamaz benim şeyime   (1.12)

Although a change in the structure of the word is
immediately noticed, this change does not have the potential
to disconnect the semantic coherence between the lines 10,
11 and 12.

iv) The exact repetition of the bişeyim's on lines 13
and 15 is another foregrounded paradigmatic regularity:

Çünki ben bişeyim   (1.13)

......

Ben başka bişeyim   (1.15)

It is immediately observed that the bişeyim's which
appear in the same syntactic slot are parts of two lines
that exhibit partial parallelism in syntax. Under the
light of linguistic evidence, we may say that the bişeyim's
on lines 13 and 15 are most likely the same or are very
closely connected.

We may further extend the lexical cohesion between the
bişeyim's over the bişeydir on line 14 and şeyim
on line 16. In order to trace the lexical cohesion between
these items we should evaluate them within their context :

Çünki ben bişeyim   (1.13)

Herşey de bişeydir ama(1.14)

Ben başka bişeyim   (1.15)

Ben şeyim   (1.16)

Although we have come up with four different groups
of şey's centered around very tightly knitted semantic
cores, we should not leave our study at that because
we know that these groups are not in isolation, but are
very closely connected to each other. At this point we
should make a change at the level of our study
and try to investigate what establishes the general
cohesion in the poem apart from the cohesion between
the şey's.

4.   At the moment we detach ourselves from the study
on şey's, what immediately strikes our attention is
the presence of the first person "I" in almost every
line of the poem. Al listing of the lexical items in
which the first person is present is as follows :

First person singular pronoun : Ben 11.4,13
        15 and 16.
First person singular predicate inflectional
    suffix: /-YIm/ girdim 1.5 ; evlenmistim 1.6 ;
        bişeyim 1.13 and 15 ; şeyim 1.16

Nominal inflectional suffix : /-dE/ locative

<u>sende</u> 1.10 (refers to the first person);

<u>bende</u> 1.11

The presence of the first person is also reflected in the use of the first person plural pronoun <u>Biz</u> 1.1, and the first person plural predicate inflectional suffix /-k/ <u>şeydik</u> 1.1; <u>arkadaştık</u> 1.2; <u>gittik</u> 1.7; <u>döndük</u> 1.8 .

It is interesting to see that the careful reader easily manoeuvres among the network of <u>ŞEY</u>'s present in each line of the poem. It is for sure the perfect cohesion in the poem that helps the reader not to lose his track. But it should not be forgotten that cohesion is the mastery of the <u>ŞEYİST</u> who proves to be a perfect knitter of <u>ŞEY</u>'s.

2.4.2 Questions to Stimulate Class Discussion

1. - Can you give a linguistic description of the suffixes attached to <u>ŞEY</u>'s ?

    - What is the general syntactic class of the <u>ŞEY</u>'s ?

2. - Do you think that the SEY's are used freely, or
      is there cohesion between them ?

    - Can you base your answer to the above question
      on linguistic evidence ?

    - Try to group the SEY's that most likely seem
      to refer to the same linguistic item. (If such
      connections can be established we may call them
      semantic cores either out of or into which other
      less tight semantic connections can be traced.)

    - Do you think there is a tight semantic connection
      between the sevlen's on lines 2 and 3 ?

    - What makes you think so ?

    - Can you relate the sevdik on line 1 and sev on line
      3 to the seylen's on lines 2 and 3 ?

    - Try to find other semantic links that branch off
      from the tightly connected seylen's on lines 2 and 3.

      (Sey's on lines 4 and 5) Why do you extend the
      lexical cohesion over the lines 4 and 5 ? (the
      presence of the verb bitirince on line 4 that may
      be linked to talebeyken on line 1 - from line 4
      we skip to line 5 because these two lines form
      a single sentence)

    - What features can you attribute to the lexical
      item Seyle ? (Consider the verb evlenmistim
      that follows.)

- Is there any semantic connection between
  the biṣeyim's on lines 10 and 11 ? What
  makes you think so ?

- Can you further extend the lexical cohesion
  between the biṣeyim's over the biṣeydir on line
  14 and ṣeyim on line 16 ?

3. - Is there any foregrounded regularity in the poem ?
     (Presence of the first person "I" in almost every
     line of the poem .)

   - Can you make a list of the words in which the first
     person "I" is present ?

4. - What is the function of the suffix /-ist/ in
     ṢEYİST (the title of the poem)

   - How do you relate the title to the poem ?

5. - Please substitute other words for the ṢEY's
     used throughout the poem and rewrite the poem.

6.   -   Below you will find a copy of this poem filled
in by a foreigner who knows Turkish at the advanced
level. Please read it carefully and make a criticism
of it.

BENİST

Biz talebeyken zekiydik

İyi arkadaştık zekayla

Biliyorsunuz aptallıkla dost olunmaz

Ben fakülteyi bitirince babam

Harika dedi Aydınlık Partisine girdim

Zaten Kurucusuyla evlenmiştim

Şeker Bodruma gidelim dedi gittik

Parasız da olmuyor döndük

İki yavrum oldu büyüdüler

Doktor sende bi anormallik var diyor şimdi

Tabi bende dertler var : sayamadığın kadar

Kimse dokunamaz benim derdime

Çünki ben başkayım

Herşey de başkadır ama

Ben başka başkayım

Ben Benim

2.5 TREN SESİ

1   Garibim ;

2   Ne bir güzel var avutacak gönlümü

3   Bu şehirde,

4   Ne de bir tanıdık çehre ;

5   Bir tren sesi duymaya göreyim

6   İki gözüm,

7   İki çeşme.

                                    Orhan Veli (1, p.153)

2.5.1 An Analytical Guide for the Teacher

In this poem we cannot find a single example of linguistic
deviance. Therefore we shall start our analysis with a
study on the foregrounded regularities.

1. The absence of an overt personal or possessive pronoun
is a regularity in the poem which is directly linked to
the paradigmatic regularity in the exclusive use of the
first person singular suffix /-yIm/ and the first person
singular possessive suffix /-Im/. Let us make a list
of the words that have either the personal or the possessive
suffix :-

Garibim   (1.1)

gönlümü   (1.2)

göreyim   (1.5)

gözüm   (1.6)

On the first line of the poem we are presented with the

word Garibim that can further be divided into two

morphemes : that of garip-and either /-İm/ the possessive

suffix, or /-YIm/ the personal suffix. If we concentrate

solely on this word, that is to say out of context, we

cannot know whether the suffix functions as a personal

or a possessive suffix since the stress is not marked

on the word.

An examination of the other linguistic items on the list

given above would serve to clarify the ambiguity.

The second word on our list is gönlümü (1.2). Even without

hearing the stress we know that it is the possessive suffix

/-İm/ that follows the root gönül first of all because

the vowel that precedes the final consonant in the root

is deleted when the possessive suffix /-İm/ is attached

to the root. If the suffix that followed were the personal

one, the word would be gönülüm, not gönlüm. Another evidence

that immediately helps us to be certain as to the suffix

is the presence of the accussative suffix /-YI/ that

follows the possessive suffix. The grammar does not allow the accussative suffix to follow the personal suffix on predicates.

The next word on the list that follows gönlümü is göreyim (1.5). It is this time the personal suffix /-YIm/ that is attached to the auxiliary of the compound construction duymaya göreyim. Göreyim, functioning as the auxiliary of the verb duymaya, can be divided into gör (root) ≠ /-YE/ (optative participle suffix) ≠ /-YIm/ (first person personal suffix). The verb that carries the meaning is duymaya. It is made up of the verb root duy ≠ /-mE/ (negative suffix) ≠ /-YE/ (optative participle suffix). The auxiliary of the compound verb imposes a sense of repeated experience upon the verb that precedes it.

Gözüm (1.6), the last word on our list, is presented as a part of the idiom

İki gözüm,   (1.6)

İki çeşme.   (1.7)

It is the first person possessive suffix /-İm/ that follows the root göz.

Coming back to where we started, we may say that the
suffix attached to the word çarip (1.1) is not the
first person possessive suffix but the first person
predicate suffix /-YIm/ since it has become clear that
whatever is said in the poem refers to the first person
presented on line 1.

2. The poet's recurrent use of the indefinite article
bir is another paradigmatic regularity that immediately
attracts the attention of the readers :

> bir güzel   (1.2)
>
> bir tanıdık çehre   (1.4)
>
> bir tren sesi   (1.5)

In all of the three occurrences listed above, we notice
that bir is given as a part of a NP, the constituents
of which are different in each case :

> bir güzel : bir güzel (adjective used as a
>   noun) 1.2
>
> bir tanıdık çehre : bir tanı- (verb root) ≠
>   /-dIk/ (verbal nominal suffix)
>   çehre (head noun that is modified)1.4
>
> bir tren sesi : bir tren (Ø genitive suffix)
>   ses≠ /-I/ (third person singular
>   possessive suffix)

The function of bir's in all three cases is to mark   ....
indefiniteness.

The common factor in the three NP's cited on the preceding page is that the head nouns exclusively refer to either /+ human/ or /-human/ third person singular entities given in general reference in contrast to the first person introduced to us on the first line of the poem.

3. The repetition of iki on lines 6 and 7 is another foregrounded paradigmatic regularity which is juxtaposed with the recurrent use of the indefinite article bir. Its use in the idiomatic expression :

İki gözüm   (1.6)

İki çeşme   (1.7)

which also exhibits a parallelism in the syntactic structure, serves both to consolidate a strong position to the bir's in the foreground and to emphasize the presence of the "I" in the poem taking us back to where we started - to Garibim .

4. For a better understanding of the recurrent use of the bir's we should also examine the parallel syntactic structure

Ne bir güzel var avutacak gönlümü (1.2)

Ne de bir tanıdık çehre;   (1.4)

An immediate interpretation of the repetition of the
indefinite article _bir_ is given in Item 2. Here we
have the chance to study the _bir_'s in the parallel
syntactic structure from a distance and see that the NP's

> bir güzel   (1.2)
>
> bir tanıdık çehre   (1.4)

which are taken to the foreground by means of employing
inverted order of words, are parts of the parallel
syntactic structure that is made negative by the use
of the correlative conjunction _ne_ ..... _ne de_.

Now we may extend the borders of the immediate interpretation
and say that what is emphasized through the use of the
parallel negative syntactic structure and the repetition
of the indefinite article _bir_ is that this particular
use does not only foreground specific objects of personal
desire in the general framework of reference but also
indicates the absence of such objects.

5.   Foregrounded lexical cohesion is also readily noticeable
in the poem and cannot be easily separated from the
foregrounded grammatical cohesion. Everything in the poem
in a way feeds back the first line of the poem, that is _Garibim_.

The lexical cohesion is between Garibim (1.1) , bir güzel (1.2 given in negative construction) ; tren sesi (title and 1.5) and the idiomatic expression iki gözüm, iki çeşme (11.6 and 7).

It is the parallel syntactic structures on lines 2 and 4 that function as a bridge between the beginning and the end of the poem. It takes us from Garibim on the first line attibuting the feature /≠ lonaliness/ to it and links it to the lines 5, 6 and 7, enriching the semantic field of the word garibim with the feature /≠ state of melancholy/.

In short it is clear that each paradigmatic and syntactic regularity, together with the use of the parallel syntactic structures, contributes to the construction of the poem. The poem is a work of perfect coherence which extends as well over the choice of the lexical items . It is neither possible for the whole nor for the parts to be evaluated and interpreted properly if the relation between the parts is not well established.

2.5.2 Questions to Stimulate Class Discussion

1. - Identify the suffix on Garibin (1.1).

    - Make a list of the words in the poem that are
      either predicate personal or possessive ?
      How do you know that they are predicate personal
      or possessive ?

    - What is the root of the word gönlümü ?

    - Can you find any other examples in which the
      vowel that precedes the final consonant in the
      last syllable is deleted when the possessive suffix
      is added ?

      (Ex.: karın- karnın ; burun - burnun ; göğüs -
      göğsün ; ağız - ağzın ; resim - resmin ; vakit -
      vaktin ....)

    - Can you make any generalizations ?

    - Now add the predicate personal suffix to the roots
      of the words that you have found. What happens ?
      Is there any change in the medial vowel of the
      final CVC (consonant - vowel - consonant) syllable ?

2. - Can you replace the compound verb duymaya göreyim
      on line 5 with a single verb ? Is there any change
      in meaning ?

- Can you find other compound verbs which are
  conjugated with the auxiliary görmek ?
  (Ex.: başlamaya görmek ; düşneye görmek ; istemeye
  görmek ; ağlamaya görmek .....)

- What do you think is the function of the constant
  element görmek ?

3. - What is your interpretation for the recurrent
      use of the indefinite article bir in the poem ?

    - Make a list of the NP's that have the indefinite
      article bir .

    - Can you give a linguistic description for the
      expression tanıdık on line 4 ? What is the
      root of it ? Does it function as a verb ?

4. - What is the meaning of the idiom iki gözüm, iki
      çeşme (11.6 and 7)? What feature do you attribute
      to the first person in the poem after reading
      the last two lines ?

    - How do you interpret the juxtaposition of bir
      and iki in the poem ?

5. - Are there any parallel syntactic structures in the
      poem ?

- Concentrate on the negative syntactic structure
on lines 2 and 4. Are they connected to each
other through similarity or contrast ? How does
this fit into the broad interpretation of the
poem ?

6. - What semantic features can you assign to the word
garibim presented on the first line of the poem
other than the features you mentioned in the
fourth question above ? What linguistic evidence
can you find in the poem to support the features
you attribute to garibim ?

- Can you find lexical items in the poem that are
semantically connected to each other ?

- Can you relate your interpretation of lexical
cohesion to that of grammatical cohesion in the
poem ?

3. CONCLUSION

The claim of the foregoing study is that if poetry is
properly incorporated to TFL programmes as an aid, it
would contribute to the development of the communicative
competence of the students.

The most recent approaches to FL teaching emphasize
that the development of communicative competence through
poetry entails an awareness towards the language used
in poetry. Therefore, in the first part of this study
I attempted to discuss this special use of language
with emphasis on the fundamental stylistic principle
of foregrounding and its relation to interpretation and
cohesion. This would presumably prepare the setting
for a linguistics-based analytic approach to poetry for
the use of the teacher in TFL classes.

In the second part of the foregoing study, I attempted
to illustrate how the method proposed in Part 1 could
be put to work by the teacher for classroom purposes.
After having worked on the five poems analysed in this
part, it is expected from the teacher to have noticed
the importance of the linguistically foregrounded
regularities and irregularities for the interpretation
of the poems. To be more specific, by the end of this

part, the teacher should have realized the importance
of the participle suffix /-Iyor/, the plural suffix
/-1Er/, the indefinite article bir and the semantic
associations of the verb dinlerek for an interpretation
of the poem "İstanbul'u Dinliyorum". In "Saat", the
teacher should have noted the significance of the
graphological deviation and register mixing for an
understanding of the poem. Those linguistic features
that should have been noted in "Giderayak" were the
past tense suffix /-dI/, the auxiliary postclitic verb
/-YdI/, first person plural suffix /-k/ and the negative
suffix /-mE/ for an "initial assault" into the text.
In "Seyist", the teacher is expected to have noticed the
importance of the range of substantives, whereas, those
linguistic features to be analysed in "Tren Sesi" were
the first person personal suffix /-YIm/, possessive suffix
/-Im/, the indefinite article bir and the negative
construction ne .... ne (de) for an interpretation of the
poem.

I believe that if the teacher keeps in line with the
methodological framework proposed in Part 1 and applied
in Part 2, he would, then be able to direct the attention
of the students on the language used in poetry and make
the students aware of how they use their knowledge of

the language for interpretation of the poems (Widdowson 1980, p.162). Through such an approach the teacher would help the students develop an awareness to language which is actually one of the major purposes of all language teaching. The students, if guided properly by their teacher, will, for sure, be able to make use of the insights they gain in the classroom while studying poetry in understanding of any use of language. Therefore, poetry should be incorporated to TFL programmes.

APPENDIX :   Some Suggested Poems

(Numbers refer to the sources given on
page 112)

Group I :   Poems that illustrate the use of participle
Suffixes

Continuative Participle Suffix /-Iyor/

FENA ÇOCUK (1)

Mektepten kaçıyorsun,
Kuş tutuyorsun.
Deniz kenarına gidip
Fena çocuklarla konuşuyorsun,
Duvarlara fena resimler yapıyorsun;
Bir şey değil,
Beni de baştan çıkaracaksın.
Sen ne fena çocuksun !

Orhan Veli

ESKİLER ALIYORUM (1)

Eskiler alıyorum
Alıp yıldız yapıyorum
Musikî ruhun gıdasıdır
Musikîye bayılıyorum

Şiir yazıyorum

Şiir yazıp eskiler alıyorum

Eskiler verip musikîler alıyorum

Bir de rakı şişesinde balık olsam

                    Orhan Veli

KAVRUK İNCİR (4)

Yağmur yağıyor sarkmış telefon teline,

Üstüne yapıda unutulmuş malanın,

Kavruk incirin çocuklara küskün,

Ve gizlenmiş karganın kakırdan sesine,

Yağmur yağıyor teneke evin üstüne

Bel ağrısı saman ve tavlalarla dolu,

Üstüne çingenelerin mimoza satan,

Yağmur yağıyor ıslanmış köpek kokulu.

                    Melih Cevdet Anday

DOKUNMATİK (6b)

Görmüyor musun

Su içiyorum

Şiir yazıyorum

Ne dokunuyorsun

                    Can Yücel

DURMADAN (7)

Biz bir şey büyütüyoruz
Bilmeden bilerek durmadan
Bir balık suda
Havada bir kuş büyütüyoruz

Gündüzleri büyütüyoruz gecenin içinde
Geceleri gündüzün
Anamızı babamızı çocuğumuzu büyütüyoruz
Bir ağaç büyütüyoruz bir yerde

Akla gelmez seviler büyütüyoruz
Duyularımızın sarmaşığında
Kedimizi köpeğimizi
Ölümümüzü büyütüyoruz dizimizin dibinde

                    Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

Aorist Participle Suffix /-Ir/

KAPALI ÇARŞI (1)

Giyilmemiş çamaşırlar nasıl kokar bilirsin,
Sandık odalarında;
Senin de dükkanın öyle kokar işte.
Ablamı tanımazsın,
Hürriyette gelin olacaktı yaşasaydı;
Bu teller onun telleri,
Bu duvak onun duvağı işte.

Ya bu camdaki kadınlar ?

Bu mavi yeşil fistanlı..

Geceleri de ayakta mı dururlar böyle ?

Ya şu pembezar gömlek ?

Onun da bir hikayesi yok mu ?

Kapalı Çarşı diyip de geçme ;

Kapalı Çarşı,

Kapalı kutu.

Orhan Veli

ANLATAMIYORUM (1)

Ağlasam sesimi duyar mısınız,

Mısralarımda;

Dokunabilir misiniz

Gözyaşlarıma, ellerinizle ?

Bilmezdim şarkıların bu kadar güzel,

Kelimelerinse kifayetsiz olduğunu

Bu derde düşmeden önce.

Bir yer var biliyorum ;

Her şeyi söylemek mümkün ;

Epiyce yaklaşmışım, duyuyorum ;

Anlatamıyorum.

Orhan Veli

ZURNA (2)

Hem tespih satarım
Hem kağıt oynarım
Hem de zurna dinlerim
Çalan olursa
Sıkıntıya gelemem
Avareyim avare

Oktay Rıfat

BİLİRSİNİZ (7)

Siz ölümlü olduğunuzu bilirsiniz
Bir gün ota ağaca böceğe
Suya toprağa karışacaksınız bilirsiniz
Bir gün gelecek
Adınızı bilen de bulunmayacak
Bilirsiniz

Bilirsiniz de

Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

NE YAPARSIN (7)

Sen benim yerimde olsan ne yaparsın
Her akşam delicesine sevdalı
Her sabah bir gemiyim
Uzak yerlere giderim

Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

Presumptive-Past Participle Suffix /-mIş/

ILLUSION (1)

Eski bir sevdadan kurtulmuşum ;

Artık bütün kadınlar güzel ;

Gömleğim yeni,

Traş olmuşum ;

Sulh olmuş.

Bahar gelmiş.

Güneş açmış.

Sokağa çıkmışın, insanlar rahat ;

Ben de rahatım.

                    Orhan Veli

BİR TAŞ ATARSIN (5)

Bir taş atarsın, taş nereye düşerse

Mutlaka bir köşebaşıdır

Çünkü yüreğin daralmıştır ve kıştır

Kullanılmamış bir sicim gibi ir soğuk

İşte bak her kestaneciye sapsarı bir köşebaşı

                              kalmıştır.

Şimdi bir şamandıra denizin yüzünde

Durulmamış bir anı gibi kendini kalmıştır.

İçimizde biriyle konuşan yaprak bolluğu

yalnızlık bir başına kalmıştır.

                    Edip Cansever

Past Participle Suffix /-dI/ and Auxiliary
Postclitic Suffix /-YDI/

KİTABE-İ SENG-İ MEZAR (1)

Tüfeğini deppoya koydular,
Esvabını başkasına verdiler.
Artık ne torbasında ekmek kırıntısı,
Ne hatrasında dudaklarının izi ;
Öyle bir rûzigâr ki,
Kendi gitti,
İsmi bile kalmadı yadigâr.
Yalnız şu beyit kaldı,
Kahve ocağında, el yazısı le
"Ölüm Allahın emri,
Ayrılık olmasaydı."

                    Orhan Veli

GÜZEL HAVALAR (1)

Beni bu güzel havalar mahvetti,
Böyle havada istifa ettim
Evkaftaki memuriyetinden.
Tütüne böyle havada alıştım,
Böyle havada aşık oldum;
Eve ekmekle tuz götürmeyi

Böyle havalarda unuttum ;
Şiir yazma hastalığım
Hep böyle havalarda nüksetti ;
Beni bu güzel havalar na vetti.

Orhan Veli

BİR KIŞ GECESİ (2)

Bir kış gecesi geldi odama
Bağdaş kurdu sedire
Kahvemi içti
Ateşe baktı ocaktaki
Sonra gitti geldiği gibi

Oktay Rıfat

ONDÖRT (6a)

Em. OPG. Gürler'e

Karakaşlı bir bulut geldi, geldi, geldi, geldi...
"Gürledi, ama yağmadı" değil,
yağmadı; ama gürledi gitti.

Can Yücel

BELAYI AŞK (7)

Her işimi yoluna koymuştum
Tam ev bark sahibi olacağım sıra
Şimdi gelmezse ne zaman gelir
Bana huzur bir daha
Kendime bir de iş bulmuştum
Üstelik

Böyle zamansız nerden karşıma çıktın

                        Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

Future Participle Suffix /-YECEk/

HÜRRİYETE DOĞRU (1)

Gün doğmadan,
Deniz daha bembeyazken çıkacaksın yola.
Kürekleri tutmanın şehveti avuçlarında ,
İçinde, bir iş görmenin saadeti,
Gideceksin ;
Gideceksin ırıpların çalkantısında.
Balıklar çıkacak yoluna, karşıcı ;
Sevineceksin.
Ağları silkeledikçe,
Deniz gelecek eline pul pul ,
Ruhları sustuğu vakit martıların,
Kayalıklardaki mezarlarında,

Birden,

Bir kıyamettir kopacak ufuklarda.

Deniz kızları mı dersin, kuşlar mı dersin ,

Bayramlar seyranlar mı dersin, şenlikler dü -
                                         düşler mi ?

Gelin alayları, teller, duvaklar, donanmalar mı ?

Heeeey !

Ne duruyorsun be at kendini denize ;

Geride bekleyenin varmış, aldırma ;

Görmüyor musun, her yanda Hürriyet ;

Yelken ol, kürek ol, dümen ol, balık ol, su ol ;

Git gidebildiğin yere.

                   Orhan Veli

Necessitative Participle Suffix /-mELI/

AĞAÇLAR VE KUŞLAR (7)

Ne yağmurdan korkmalı

Ne hatıralardan

Her sabah sokakta başlamalı

Ağaçlar ve kuşlarla yaşamaya

                   Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

Optative Participle Suffix /-YE/

XXXVI (2b)

Uykuların cumbası

Kaşın bakalım

Yürü bakalım kamçıların gecesinde

Hadi bakalım

Oktay Rıfat

YAVUZ (2b)

Bi dolu gözleri havada

Kuşlar geliyor kuşlar denizi yara yara

Oktay Rıfat

Conditional Participle Suffix /-sE/

AĞACIM (1)

Mahallemizde

Senden başka ağaç olsaydı

Seni bu kadar sevmezdim.

Fakat eğer sen

Bizimle beraber

Kaydırak oynamasını bilseydin

Seni daha çok severdim.

Güzel ağacım :

Sen kuruduğun zaman

Biz de inşallah

Başka mahalleye taşınmış oluruz .

Orhan Veli

İSKELE (2b)

Denize baksam

Kayığın hatırı kalır

Ağaca baksam

Bulutun

Peki ya iskele

Oktay Rıfat

Group II : Miscellaneous

Indefinite Article bir

ÖLÜM (2a)

Bir çam gibi boylu

Bir boğa gibi güçlü

Bir bardak kadar sarıydı

Ama ölüm

Ayırt etmeden kırar insanları .

Oktay Rıfat

BİR KAÇ KUŞ (4)

Pencerenin önünde dopdolu bir arsa ,

Gizlenmiş gibi ortasında kentin ,

Tamirhaneler vardı sağlı sollu ,

Geçen ay doğmuş kediler, çaycı, akasya ,

Bir yerleri bozulmuş arabalar gelir ,

Elleri belinde kadınlar ve ustalar ,

Sonra bir mescit, bir kilise ve gökyüzü ,

Ötede bulutlar, bir kaç kuş, tasa .

                    Melih Cevdet Anday

SEÇEMİYORDUM İYİ (5)

Seçemiyordum iyi

Bir göl kenarı mıydı yoksa

Unutulmuş bir ormanın bitimsizliği mi

Değildi

Saydamdı, naylonumsu bir yerdi

                    Edip Cansever

Plural Suffix /-lEr/

ALTIN DİSLİM (1)

Gel benim canımın içi, gel yanıma ;

İpek çoraplar alayım sana ;

Taksilere bindireyim,

Çalgılara götüreyim seni.

Gel,

Gel benim altın dişlim ;

Sürmelim, ondüle saçlım, yosmam ;

Mantar topuklum, bobstilim, gel.

Orhan Veli

BAYRAMLIK (6a)

Koyunlar keçiler ve koçlar için

Ne kadar bayramsa Kurban Bayramı

Bu barış var ya, bu barış

Cephedekiler için o kadar barış

Can Yücel

SFENKS (7)

Gökte bulutlar uçar

Kavaklar solur sazlar

Günler uykuda geçer

Kasabadaki yazlar

Erir evler güneşte

Camı sarmış külrengi

Bilgelikler susuşta

Konuşan Sfenks sanki

Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

Diminutive Suffixes /-cIk/ and /-cEğIz/

MAVİ GÖZLÜ DEV

MİNNACIK KADIN VE

HANIMELLERİ   (3)

O mavi gözlü bir devdi.

Minnacık bir kadın sevdi.

Kadının hayali minnacık bir evdi,

                      bahçesinde ebrulii

                        hanımeli

                          açan bir ev.

Bir dev gibi seviyordu dev.

Ve elleri öyle büyük işler için

                hazırlanmıştı ki devin,

yapamazdı yapısını

                çalamazdı kapısını

bahçesinde ebruliiii

                hanımeli

                açan evin.

O mavi gözlü bir devdi.

Minnacık bir kadın sevdi.

Mini minnacıktı kadın.

Rahata açıktı kadın

          yoruldu devin büyük yolunda

ve "elveda !" deyip mavi gözlü deve,

girdi zengin bir cücenin koluna

  bahçesinde ebruliii

   hanımeli

    açan eve

Şimdi anlıyor ki mavi gözlü dev

dev gibi sevdalara mezar bile olamaz,

Bahçesinde ebrulii

   hanımeli

   açan ev ...

    Nazım Hikmet

CANKURTARANLA (6a)

Yardın be cancağzım

Yardın sonunda şu beyoğlu trafiğini

İlkyardım pamuklarıyla

    o ölümcül acelenden

Korna çiçekleri açıyor şimdi

     yaralarının üzerinde

Ölen yok sen gibi güzel

Sınıfsal ecelinden

    Can Yücel

Negative Word <u>Değil</u> and Negative Suffix /-mE/

<u>DEĞİL</u> (1)

Bilmen ki nasıl anlatsam ;
Nasıl, nasıl size derdimi !
Bir dert ki yürekler acısı,
Bir dert ki düşman başına.
Gönül yarası desem ...
Değil !
Ekmek parası desem ...
Değil !
Bir dert ki ...

Dayanılır şey değil.

           Orhan Veli

<u>YALNIZLIK ŞİİRİ</u> (1)

Bilmezler yalnız yaşamıyanlar,
Nasıl korku verir sessizlik insana ;
İnsan nasıl konuşur kendisiyle ;
Nasıl koşar aynalara,
Bir cana hasret,
Bilmezler.

           Orhan Veli

KUŞ GİBİ (2b)

Kuş gibi uçarım yollarda
Koluma takınca karımı
İçimden geldi mi dinlemem
Beline atarım elimi

Cennet taamından lezzetlidir
Birlikte yediğimiz ekmek peynir
Üzülsem gönlümü alsa
Dünyalar benim olur

Uyku girmiyor gözüme
Karım olalı beri
Bir sabah vakti yazdım bu şiiri
Okudum kendisine

Oktay Rifat

Some Question Words and Interrogative
Suffix /-mI/

SON TÜRKÜ (1)

Kaybolmak üzre suyasdüşen bilezik
Bak bütün kırışıklar silindi sudan.
Son saatimde mi uyandım uykudan,
Neden boş geçen yıllardan içim ezik ?

Durdu beni ölüme götüren kervan.
Eski şarkı söyleniyor rüzgârda.
Duydum ki sevmeyi bilen dudaklarda
Benim ilâhilerim hâlâ okunan.

Sevgilim... Ellerime dokunaraktan..
Beni çağıran bir eda var sesinde.
Bu muydu insanlara son nefesinde
Görüneceğinden bahsedilen şeytan ?

Sular çekilmeye başladı köklerde
Isınmaz mı acaba ellerinde kan ?
Ah ! Ne olur bütün güneşler batmadan
Bir türkü daha söyleyeyim bu yerde.

                    Orhan Veli

MEYHANE (1)

Madem ki sevmiyorum artık,
O halde, her akşam
Onu düşünerek içtiğim
Meyhanenin önünden
Ne diye geçeyim ?..

                    Orhan Veli

TENEZZÜH (1)

Böyle gece yarısından sonra,

Ne diye ışık yanar bu dağ evinde ?

Ne yaparlar acaba içerdekiler ?

Konuşurlar mı, tombala mı oynarlar ?

Belki o, belki bu ..

Konuşurlarsa ne konuşurlar ?

Muharebeden mi, vergilerden mi ?

Belki de hiçbir şey yapmazlar ;

Çocuklar uyumuştur,

Efendi gazete okur ;

İyâli dikiş dikmektedir.

Onu da yapmazlar belki de.

Kimbilir,

Belki de yazılmaz

Ne yaptıkları.

                    Orhan Veli

SEVDAYA MI TUTULDUM ?? (1)

Benim de mi düşüncelerim olacaktı.

Ben de mi böyle uykusuz kalacaktım.

Sessiz, sedasız mı olacaktım böyle ?

Çok sevdiğim salatayı bile

Aramaz mı olacaktım ?

Ben böyle mi olacaktım ?

                    Orhan Veli

Compound Verbs

AYRILIŞ (1)

Baka kalırım giden geminin ardından ;
Atamam kendimi denize, dünya güzel ;
Serde erkeklik var, ağlıyamam.

Orhan Veli

MACERA (1)

Küçüktüm, küçücüktüm ,
Oltayı attım denize ;
Bir üşüşüverdi balıklar,
Denizi gördüm.

Bir uçurtma yaptım, telli duvaklı
Kuyruğu ebem kuşağı renginde ;
Bir salıverdim gökyüzüne ;
Gökyüzünü gördüm.

Büyüdüm, işsiz kaldım, aç kaldım ;
Para kazanmak gerekti ,
Girdim insanların içine,
İnsanları gördüm.

Ne yardan geçerim, ne serden

Ne denizlerden, ne gökyüzünden ama ...

Bırakmıyor son gördüğüm,

Bırakmıyor geçim derdi.

Oymuş, diyorum, zavallı şairin

Görüp göreceği.

Orhan Veli

BİR ŞARKI İCAT ETSEM (2k)

Bir şarkı icat etsem

Hem hazin hem neşeli bir şarkı

Gece gündüz söylesem

Dağlara denizlere karşı

Bir şarkı icat etsem

Sade hazin de olsa olur

Bir şarkı icat etsem

Belki dinleyen bulunur

Bir şarkı icat etsem

Dökmek için sevgilime içimi

Bir şarkı icat etsem

Hem söylesem hem gitsem

Oktay Rıfat

İNKANSIZ (7)

İnsanı hiç bir şey alıkoymamalı
Yürümekten ve düşünmekten
Ama memuriyetin ve avareliğin
Bir arada olması imkânsız

Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

Idiomatic Expressions

BENİM YARİM (2b)

Benim yârim iki dirhem bir çekirdek
Hoppa mı hoppa
Rakı içer
Kadeh kırar
Benim yârim sırasında benden hovarda
Kavuniçi mendil
Markalı çanta
Benim yârim çıtkırıldım
Benim yârim alafranga

Oktay Rıfat

GENÇ KIZ (2a)

Yaşı on altıya basınca
Dul bir karının
İpsiz oğlunu sevdi
Yemeden içmeden kesildi
Bir sıkıntı böğründe bir daralma
Varacak da oğlana
Başı göğe erecek
Ne ot ne ocak

Oktay Rıfat

Correlative Conjunctions   ne   ne (de)
                            hem   hem (de)

BAYRAK (1)

Ey bir muharebe meydanında
Avuçları kanımla dolu,
Kafası gövdemin altında,
Bacağı kolumun üstünde,
Cansız uyuyan insan kardeşim !
Ne adını biliyorum,
Ne günahını.

Orhan Veli

DEĞİŞİK (6a)

Başka türlü birşey benim istediğim,
Ne ağaca benzer, ne buluta benzer ;
Burası gibi değil gideceğim memleket,
Denisi ayrı deniz, havası ayrı hava;
Nerde gördüklerim, nerde o beklediğim kız,
Rengi başka, tadı başka.

                    Can Yücel

SEVDA PEŞİNDE (7)

Seni her zaman düşündüm
Biliyorum güzelsin
Ama ne tanıdım
Ne gördüm

                Sabahattin Kudret Aksal

GÖRÜNÜ (4)

Şaşırdım, dümdüzdü görünü,
Cansız bir kağıdın üstünde gibi,
Ardı yok, ne pürtük, ne oylum,
Ağaç değil mi bu, duvar, yağmur değil mi ?
Ters yüz ettim, başaşağı getirdim,

Elimle dokundum sonra, bilmiyorum ki,

Hem yaşıyordum, hem yaşamıyordum,

Yeşil gibi, dikey gibi, ses gibi.

Melih Cevdet Anday

LIST OF POETRY SOURCES

(1)   Bezirci, Asım ed. Orhan Veli, Istanbul : Gözlem
             Yayınları, 1982.

(2a)   Rıfat, Oktay, Çobanıl Şiirler, Istanbul : Koza
             Yayınları, 1976.

(2b)   Rıfat, Oktay, Yaşayıp Ölmek - Aşk ve Avarelik Üstüne
             Şiirler, Istanbul: Adam Yayıncılık, 1982.

(3)   Aydemir, Aydın ed. Nâzım, Ankara: Tisa Matbaacılık (no
             date given)

(4)   Anday, Melih Cevdet, Ölümsüzlük Ardında Gılgamış,
             Istanbul: Adam Yayıncılık, 1982.

(5)   Cansever, Edip, Sevda ile Sevgi, Istanbul: Koza
             Yayınları, 1977.

(6a)   Yücel, Can, Şiir Alayı, Istanbul: Yazko Yayınları,
             1982.

(6b)   Yücel, Can, Rengâhenk, Istanbul: Yazko Yayınları,
             1982.

(7)   Aksal, Sabahattin Kudret, Şiirler, Ankara: Türkiye
             İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1979.

(8)   Necatigil, Behçet, Kareler Aklar, Ankara: Bilgi Bası -
             mevi, Seri No 238 (no date given)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banarlı, Nihad Sami, <u>Metinlerle Türk ve Batı Edebiyatı</u>
Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1966.

Banguoğlu, Tahsin, <u>Ana Hatlarıyla Türk Grameri</u>, Istanbul :
Dergah Yayınları, 1979.

Bright, J. A., Mc Gregor, G. P., <u>Teaching English as a</u>
<u>Second Language</u>, London : Longman, 1970.

Brunfit, C. J., Johnson, K., <u>The Communicative Approach</u>
<u>to Language Teaching</u>, London : Oxford University
Press, 1981.

Crystal, David, <u>A First Dictionary of Linguistics and</u>
<u>Phonetics</u>, London : Andre Deutsch Ltd., 1980.

Crystal, David, Davy, Derek, <u>Investigating English Style</u>,
London : Longman, 1980.

Enkvist, N. E., Spencer, J., Gregory, M. J., <u>Linguistics</u>
<u>and Style</u>, London : Oxford University Press,
1964.

Ergin, Muharrem, <u>Türk Dil Bilgisi</u>, Istanbul : Minnetoğlu
Yayınları, 1972.

Fowler, Roger, 'Linguistic Theory and The Study of
    Literature' in Essays on Style and Language, ed.
    R. Fowler, New York : The Humanities Press,
    pp. 1-26, 1966.

Gencan, Tahir Nejat, Dilbilgisi, Istanbul: Türk Dil Kurumu
    Yayınları, 1966.

Halliday, M. A. K., 'Descriptive Linguistics and Literary
    Studies' in Linguistics and Literary Style, ed.
    D. C. Freeman, New York : Rinehard and Winston,
    pp. 57-72, 1970.

Lado, Robert, Language Teaching, New York : McGraw Hill
    Inc., 1964.

Leech, G. N., A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry, London :
    Longman, 1980.

Leech, G. N., 'Linguistics and Figures of Rhetoric' in
    Essays on Style and Language, ed. R. Fowler, New York :
    The Humanities Press, pp. 135-156, 1966.

Leech, G. N., "This Bread I Break' Language and Interpretation"
    in Linguistics and Literary Style, ed. D. C. Freeman,
    New York : Rinehard and Winston, pp. 119-128, 1970.

Lewis, G. L., Turkish Grammar, London: Oxford University
    Press, 1967.

Mukarovsky, Jan, 'Standard Language and Poetic Language'
in Linguistics and Literary Style, ed. D. C. Freeman,
New York : Rinehard and Winston, pp.40-56, 1970.

Pincas A., ed. English Literature for EFL, London :
University of London, Institute of Education,
1980.

Rodger, Alex, 'Linguistic Form and Literary Meaning' pp.80-98,
'Linguistics and the Teaching of Literature' pp.176-216,
in Applied Linguistics and the Teaching of English,
ed. H. Fraser and W. R. O'Donnell, London: Longman,
1969.

Sebüktekin, Hikmet, Turkish - English Contrastive Analysis,
The Hague : Mouton and Co. N.V., 1970.

Sevgen, Cevza - Faker, Saliha, 'Comparative Stylistic
Analysis of Poetry at the Introductory Level' in
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi, Istanbul : Reprint
No. 1077, Vols. 8-9, 1980-1981.

Spencer J., Gregory M., Linguistics and Style, London :
Oxford University Press, 1964.

Spitzer, Leo, 'Linguistics and Literary History' in Linguistics
and Literary Style, ed. D. C. Freeman, New York:
Rinehard and Winston, pp. 21-39, 1970.

Thorne, J. P., 'Generative Grammar and Stylistic Analysis'
in New Horizons in Linguistics, ed. J. Lyons, London:
Penguin Books, 1980.

Widdowson, H. G., Explorations in Applied Linguistics,
London : Oxford University Press, 1980.

Widdowson, H. G., Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature,
London : Longman, 1979 (a).

Widdowson, H. G., 'Stylistics' in Techniques in Applied
Linguistics, ed. J. P. B. Allen and S. Pit Corder,
London : Oxford University Press, 1979 (b).

Widdowson, H. G., Teaching Language as Communication,
London : Oxford University Press, 1979 (c).