Book Review

Zeyrek, D., and Özge U. (Eds). *Discourse Meaning: The view from Turkish.* 2020. De Gruyter Mouton. 284 pages. ISBN 9783110678925

Gülsüm Atasoy

ORCID:0000- 0002-5931-4499

Toros University, Department of English Translation and Interpreting, Mersin

gulsumatasoy@hotmail.com

1 Overview of the book

Although Turkish discourse has been investigated for four decades (Tura, 1981, 1986; Dede, 1986; Erguvanlı-Taylan, 1986; Enç, 1986; Oktar, 1997; Uzun and Huber, 2002; İşsever, 2003; Göksel and Özsoy, 2003; Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 2006; Erk-Emeksiz, 2010; Yüksel and Bozşahin, 2002; Ruhi, 2003; Yıldırım, et. al. 2004; Küntay, 2002; Turan, et al., 2012; Zeyrek, 2014, 2019; Özge et. al. 2016; Uzun, 2018; Zeyrek and Kurfalı, 2018) and these studies have been published in linguistic conference proceedings, journals, and books, the present volume "Discourse Meaning: The view from Turkish" is the first publication dedicated to Turkish discourse. This volume is unique in giving impetus to Turkish discourse by bringing together researchers' experience from various theoretical and applied perspectives.

In addition to an introduction written by the two editors, the present book includes nine chapters all focusing on discourse structure and discourse meaning from different frameworks or theoretical perspectives. These nine chapters fall into four thematically organized parts: (i) *Negation in discourse* involves two chapters that explore the discourse negation via ne…-sI structures in Turkish (Chapter 1), and common ground management and inner negation in the case of *hani* (Chapter 2). (ii) *Discourse functions of reference* includes four chapters investigating case marking and forward and backward discourse function (Chapter 3), an analysis of Turkish referring expressions in a situated dialog context (Chapter 4), the development of demonstratives in Turkish children's narratives as the first signs of discourse structuring (Chapter 5), and referential

form, word order and emotional valence in Turkish pronoun resolution in physical contact events (Chapter 6). (iii) *Subjectivity in discourse* has two chapters that focus on the discourse functions of the -mIş-DIr pattern (Chapter 7), and subjectivity and objectivity in Turkish casual connectives: results from a first corpus study on *çünkü* and *için* (Chapter 8). Finally, (iv) *Assessment of discourse-annotated corpora* involves one chapter assessing the validity and reliability of Turkish Discourse Bank (Chapter 9). Each part offers methodologically different solutions for the research gap identified in the studies in that they use examples from naturally occurring discourse, data gathered in experimental conditions, as well as computerized and annotated corpora. In other words, this book not only introduces the range of discourse-relevant research questions addressed by Turkish scholars but with Chapter 9, it also aims to contribute to the annotation science from the perspective of Turkish discourse.

Part I, *Negation in Discourse* deals with specific negative forms in Turkish in terms of what they contribute to discourse meaning.

In Chapter 1, Hasan Mesut Meral focuses on discourse negation via the structure ne…sI in Turkish casual conversations, as in the example below. This structure involves a wh-item *ne* 'what' followed by a nominal expression which carries the third singular possessive marker -sI.

(1)

      A:*Uyu-yor-sun.*
        sleep-prog-2sg
        'You are sleeping.'
      B: *NE uyu-ma-sı, çalış-ıyor-um!*
        WHAT sleep-*mA-sI* study-prog-1sg
        'NO (what do you mean by sleeping?), I am studying.

Although the structure is negative, ne…sI does not include grammatical negation but expresses a strong denial, strong objection and a subsequent rectification. The author argues that special linguistic forms and intonation are the main tools that reveal negation in this structure. Meral analyzes this structure in terms of: (i) the argumentative discourse mode involving a strong objection to the original statement; (ii) a tri-partite discourse structure involving an expectation, then a strong objection followed by a rectification of the denied information; (iii) descriptive vs. metalinguistic negation, showing the dual nature of this structure following Horn (1985). Meral shows the potential interactions between the formal strength of the utterances and their pragmatic correspondences; moreover, he reveals the way how strong negation and strong contrast determine discourse structuring and discourse mode in casual conversation and reveals the nature of the semantic-pragmatic interface in Turkish.

In Chapter 2, Akar, Öztürk, Göksel and Kelepir focus on the semantic and pragmatic properties *hani*, a discourse partiticle that manages the common

ground. The authors reveal that *hani*-constructions with wh-intonation have a strong semantic parallelism with negative polar questions arguing that semantically, both of these constructions involve a negation and a question operator, as in the constructed dialogue of *hani* use below (Akar, Öztürk, Göksel and Kelepir (2020: 71):

(2)

A: *Bugün sana gel-e-mi-yor-um.*
today you-DAT come-OPT-NEG-IPFV-1SG
'I cannot come to your place today.'

B: *Hani ban-a yardım ed-ecek-ti-n?*
hani I-DAT help -FUT-COP.PAST-2SG
'Weren't you going to help me?' (I thought you were going to help me.)

A: *Ed-ecek-ti-m ama anneanne-m hastalan-dı.*
Do-FUT-COP.PST-1SG but grandmother-POSS get.sick-PST
On-a bak-ma-m gerek-iyor.
She-DAT look.after-NMLZ-1SG need(.ed)-IPFV
'I was going to, but my grandmother got sick. I need to look after her.'
(A: # *Hayır ed-e-mi-yeceğ-im.*
no do-ABIL-NEG-FUT-1SG # 'No, I can't.')

However, the two structures differ pragmatically as *hani* constructions are used for triggering an account from the hearer for the perceived change of behavior or expectation, rather than a simple confirmation or rejection in spoken discourse.

Part II *Discourse Functions of Reference* deals with how reference operates in Turkish.

In Chapter 3, Özge and von Heusinger report a corpus search and annotation study investigating the discourse functions of Differential Object Marking (henceforth DOM), which is manifested as an optional accusative case on indefinite direct objects. They show that Turkish DOM is associated with specificity, presuppositionality and wide scope behavior with respect to other sentence operators, and it is related with different properties of discourse prominence, such as backward discourse-linking function and forward discourse-linking function. An example can be given from the authors' sample text for the backward (3A) and forward (3B) linking functions below:

(3)

A: Neymiş, **işkence olaylarının** Komisyon'da tartışılması turizmimizi olumsuz yönde etkilermiş. CHP Milletvekili **bir işkence olayını** gündeme getiriyor.
'Imagine a Human Rights Commission with members uncomfortable with discussing **torture incidents**. Their reason is that this would badly affect tourism. An MP from CHP brings up **a torture incident**.'

B: [“Alevi-Bektaşi Düşüncesi ve Çağdaşlık” konulu **bir paneli]** yöneteceğiz. Dileğimizi geri çevirmeyerek *bu panele* katılmayı kabul eden değerli dostlarla birlikte Bektaşi değerlerinin çağdaşlık ölçülerine uyumunu tartışacağız.

'We will direct [**a panel titled** “Alevi-Bektaşi thought and modernity”]. Together with friends who kindly accepted to attend *this panel*, we will discuss how thoughts of Haci Bektas go with modernity.'

Sentence (3A) introduces a set type referent comprised of incidents of torture in the second sentence. In the following sentence, it is picked as one of these incidents by an accusative-marked indefinite *bir işkence olayın-ı* (‘a torture incident-Acc’). Thus, receiving a ‘partitive-same’value, DOM functions as a backward discourse linking. On the other hand, in sentence (3B), there is an accusative-marked direct object (e.g. *panel-i* (‘panel-Acc’)). In the discourse following the indefinite, there are two expressions anaphoric to the case-marked indefinite object. Therefore, receiving the anaphoric value, DOM functions as a forward discourse linking in sentence (3B).

The authors searched DOM tokens in a 21M corpus and annotated them with respect to their backward and forward discourse functions so that they can test these two functions on case marking. Contrary to previous proposals and the authors' assumptions regarding backward and forward linking, they do not observe any discourse function in either direction in their data set.

In Chapter 4, Büyüktekin, Çakır, and Acartürk investigate the relationship between the use of demonstratives and the gaze patterns of the participants collaborating in a situated dialog environment. The authors' goal is to explore whether an investigation of the demonstratives *bu* ‘this’, *şu* ‘that’, *o* ‘it’ from a situated and distributed perspective would provide a comprehensive framework and enable a better understanding of the cognitive processes underlying reference generation and resolution. Their findings reveal systematic interactions between gaze patterns of the participants and the use of demonstratives. In particular, the results underline the fact that the gaze is a significant visual cue that is temporally linked to demonstrative use. The results indicate that demonstrative use is a joint activity engaging the speaker and the listener.

In Chapter 5, Zeyrek and Bilgiç examine the development of the use of demonstratives both deictically and anaphorically in Turkish children's narratives. The authors' aim is to understand the early signs of coherence and discourse structuring via the acquisition of the demonstrative system examining demonstrative pronouns and spatial adverbs. At a general level, the findings show that three- and four-year-old children's use of demonstratives differ from five- and six-year-old children's use both qualitatively and quantitatively. Their study shows that the younger the children are, the higher their deictic reliance is; moreover, children's use of demonstratives in the anaphoric mode increases with age. The authors argue that at around five, in addition to the parallel development of plot enrichment and the anaphoric use of demonstratives, Turkish children

both use demonstratives in the anaphoric mode more often and also they become more productive with more plot components (introduction of the characters, the temporal and locational information) in their narratives. The authors consider these parallel developments as signs of developing reference maintenance displaying early signs of discourse structuring.

In chapter 6, Özge and Evcen examine the effect of information structure (in SOV versus OSV), the type of anaphoric expression (zero versus overt pronouns) and the verb valence (positive valence versus negative valence) on the interpretation of ambiguous pronouns in the context of casually linked clauses involving physical contact action verbs. (see examples below from Özge & Evcen (2020:173-174)):

(4)
A: SOV, Zero/Overt pronoun, Positive-valence verb
   Bahar Ceren-i öp-üyor çünkü (o) dakmuk.
   Bahar-nom Ceren-acc kiss-prog-3sg because (she) dakmuk 'Bahar is kissing Ceren because she is dakmuk.'
   Kim dakmuk? Bahar Ceren
   'Who is dakmuk?

B: SOV, Zero/Overt pronoun, Negative-valence verb
   Bahar Ceren-i tekmel-iyor çünkü (o) dakmuk.
   Bahar-nom Ceren-acc kick-prog-3sg because (she) dakmuk 'Bahar is kicking Ceren because she is dakmuk.'
   Kim dakmuk? Ceren Bahar
   'Who is dakmuk?

(5)
A: OSV, Zero/Overt pronoun, Positive-valence verb
   Bahar-ı Ceren öp-üyor çünkü (o) dakmuk.
   Bahar-acc Ceren-nom kiss-prog-3sg because (she) dakmuk 'Ceren is kissing Bahar because she is dakmuk.'
   Kim dakmuk? Bahar Ceren
   'Who is dakmuk?
B: OSV, Zero/Overt pronoun, Negative-valence verb
   Bahar-ı Ceren tekmel-iyor çünkü (o) dakmuk.
   Bahar-acc Ceren-nom kick-prog-3sg because (she) dakmuk 'Ceren is kicking Bahar because she is dakmuk.'
   Kim dakmuk? Ceren Bahar
   'Who is dakmuk?

The authors manipulate the verb valence between positive (e.g., kiss) and negative (e.g., kick) to see whether/how the valence information may influence the interpretation of ambiguous pronouns. Thus, they manipulate the type of

referential expression (zero, overt), word order (SOV, OSV), and the verb valence (positive, negative). While the first two factors were manipulated between-subjects, the last factor was manipulated within-subjects. In doing this, they hold the type of coherence relation constant by employing reason clauses connected by 'because', which is followed by a non-sense word *dakmuk*. By doing this, they aim to test whether the participants resolved the pronoun *she/he* to the subject entity or the object entity without directly asking who the pronoun refers to but by asking them to decide who the referent for the nonsense word is.

In this experimental study, the authors argue that the topic shifting mission of the overt pronoun may change according to the context and in relation to this, they show that in the positive valence event, the overt pronoun shifts the topic from the subject to the object whereas in the negative valence events, it keeps the topic constant. One of the key findings of this study is that the general expectation of linking the null pronoun to the subject (topic) referent while linking the overt pronoun to the object (nontopic) referent is not an across-the-board situation but it is modulated by multiple factors such as word order, the type of anaphoric expression and the verb valence among others.

Part III, *Subjectivity in Discourse* deals with how subjectivity functions in discourse with the following identified studies.

In chapter 7, Aksan, Demirhan and Aksan present the quantificational distribution of the -mIş-person-DIr multi-morpheme unit from the corpus data. The authors extract collocations of this pattern and analyze its role as a stance marker with a corpus-based approach using Turkish National Corpus v3.0 (TNC). The paper is inspired by the pioneering work of Tura (1986b), the first author to describe the contextual functions of the morpheme sequence generated by -DIr (the generalizing modality participle) and a number of preceding tense, aspect and modality affixes. Example (6B) below shows that the presence of -DIr generates modal reading (Aksan, Demirhann& Aksan, 2020:192):

(6)
A: *Emlak Bankası ev-ler-i satışa çık-mış.*
   Emlak Bank house-PL-ACC go on sale-mIş-PRF
   'Evidently, Emlak Bank apartments went on sale.'

B: *Bu gün Ekim'in 1'i. Emlak Bankası ev-ler-i satışa çık-mış-tır*
   This day October first. Emlak Bank *house-PL-ACC go on sale-mIş-GM*
   'Today is October 1st. Emlak Bank apartments must have gone on sale.'

In (6A) *-mIş* encodes the psychological stance of the speaker towards the experience (information new for unprepared minds) and in (6B) the addition of -*DIr* changes the inference from physical evidence to an inference from known facts, that is, a deduction asserted with less than perfect confidence in factuality due to lack of evidence. Thus, *-DIr* functions as an expression for generic

properties of entities (information given for knowing minds) that hold for all times.

The study also underlines the emerging stance-taking interpretations of the -mIş-person-DIr pattern from TNC concordances with 1st and 2nd persons of the verbs *sevmek* 'to like, to love', *görmek* 'to see', *düşünmek* 'to think' and various modal adverbs. The authors identify the -mIş-DIr multi morpheme collocation patterns and their distributions in discourse.

In chapter 8, Çokal, Zeyrek and Sanders examine the causal discourse connectives *çünkü* 'because' and *için* 'for/since' in academic discourse and narrative discourse with the purpose of investigating whether these discourse connectives tend to occur in objective or subjective discourse. Given that corpus-based studies on certain European languages show that some causal connectives express subjective versus objective meanings, the authors study *çünkü* (a conjunction) and *için* (a postposition) empirically with the aim of exploring whether they display results consistent with studies on European languages. A corpus is compiled and annotated by two of the authors. The results of a logistic mixed regression model illustrate that *çünkü* is more likely to express subjective relations, whereas *için* is more likely to express objective relations. Genre did not influence the propositional attitudes of these connectives. The authors conclude that a division of labor between subjective and objective relations in several European languages is also displayed in Turkish through the use of *çünkü* and *için* with the exception of speech act relations (e.g., a question, advice, command, or promise) that are mainly expressed by *için*.

In Part IV, *Assessment of discourse-annotated corpora*, Chapter 9, Sevdik-Çallı and Zeyrek present an assessment of the integrity of annotations of Turkish Discourse Bank 1.0. (TDB), the first discourse-annotated corpus of Turkish. The authors argue that for the reusability of annotated corpora with confidence, corpora should be evaluated using various statistical methods. The authors present a two-way methodology in order to evaluate TDB via two approaches: The Overall Approach and the Common Approach. The overall approach measures inter- or intra-annotator agreement over all annotated discourse relations. The common approach measures inter- and intra- agreement by considering an intersection of the discourse use of the connectives and can be used together with extra evaluators, namely precision, recall, and F1-measure to understand how individual annotators coded the data. By using Kappa statistic, the authors calculate inter-annotator agreement, intra-annotator agreement, and the agreement of annotators with the gold standard. They propose to compute the standard measures of precision, recall, and F1 to aid the Common Approach. All in all, the authors show that TDB 1.0 annotations are valid and reliable, which implies the annotation schema is reproducible.

2   Evaluation

This volume stands out for its success in unifying researchers' experience from multiple theoretical and applied perspectives on the issue of discourse structure in Turkish. It contains original studies on discourse-level units showing the elaborate and complex interaction between micro-level linguistic units and discourse structure in the language. As a whole, the chapters incorporate research from diverse linguistic phenomena investigated for the first time or issues that have been previously investigated but this time with a new perspective. In this volume, besides a variety of topics on Turkish discourse and meaning, a researcher can find various theories, methods and approaches applied to the examination of discourse. Each chapter allows readers to be updated with the most recent issues and their methodology enabling them to understand the latest background knowledge in the field. There are several strong points worth highlighting about this edited volume. First, it is the first time that Turkish discourse is focused in a book from various perspectives. Second, the studies are complementary; they provide an overview of a specific theory and detailed descriptions of discourse meaning and structure in Turkish. Last but not least, corpus-based studies offer a new look on the previously studied topics. All these points will obviously allow this volume to be a guide for those who are working or are planning to work on Turkish discourse.

The impressive scope of the issues covered makes this volume valuable for researchers and students interested in discourse research. The book is an invaluable reference for those interested in discourse analysis in terms of different frameworks addressing research questions that revolve around issues raised by Turkish. From an educational point of view, the book is commendable for its organization and lucid explanations with abundant examples. The chapters cover each point step by step, which makes it easy to follow for students of discourse analysis. All the chapters follow a systematic organization: a chapter opens with an abstract followed by an introduction giving information on the theoretical background of the topic under investigation. After a discussion of important studies in the literature, the methodology is introduced, followed by the analysis. The results are presented together with discussions and concluding remarks. This volume has not only been designed to meet the needs of researchers and students who need to keep up with the latest studied issues and methodologies of discourse structure and discourse meaning in Turkish, but it also includes introductions to the topic as well as summaries of the latest developments in the field.

In summary, this volume, *Discourse meaning from the view of Turkish* edited by Zeyrek and Özge, is not only an invaluable reference for researchers, instructors, graduate students, that is, principally for those interested in discourse analysis and those who would like to investigate further into these issues, but also an illuminating source in the field of discourse analysis, its teaching, and the use of corpora in discourse studies.

References

Akar, D., Öztürk,B., Göksel, A. & Kelepir, M. (2020). Common ground management and inner negation in one: The case of *hani*. In Zeyrek, D. & U. Özge (eds.). *Discourse meaning: The view from Turkish* (pp. 57-80). Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton.

Aksan, M. Demirhan, U. U., & Aksan, Y. (2020). Corpus evidence and discourse functions of the -mış-Dir pattern. In Zeyrek, D. & U. Özge (eds.). *Discourse meaning: The view from Turkish* (pp. 189-222). Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton.

Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N. (2006). An analysis of Turkish interjections in the context of reactive idea framing. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* [*Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Letters*] *23*(1). 19–32.

Dede, M. (1986). Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish verbal sentences. In Dan I. Slobin & Karl Zimmer (Eds.), *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*, (pp. 147–164). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Enç, M. (1986). Topic switching and pronominal subjects in Turkish. In Dan Isaac Slobin & Karl Zimmer (Eds.), *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*, (pp. 195–209). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (1986). Pronominal versus zero representation of anaphora in Turkish. In Dan Isaac Slobin & Karl Zimmer (Eds.), *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*, (pp. 209–233). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Erk-Emeksiz, Z. (2010). Negation in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları/Journal of Linguistic* Research 2, 1–16.

Göksel, A. & Özsoy, S. (2003). *dA*: A focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* 11. 1143–1167.

Horn, L. R. (1985). Metalinguistic negation and pragmatic ambiguity. *Language 61*. 121–174.

İşsever, S. (2003). Information structure in Turkish: the word order–prosody interface. *Lingua* 113 (11). 1025–1053.

Küntay, A. (2002.) Development of the expression of indefiniteness: presenting new referents in Turkish picture-series stories. *Discourse Processes 33*, (pp. 77–101).

Oktar, L. (1997). Söylemsel artgönderim örüntülerinde iletişimsel etkenler [Communicative factors in coreference patterns in discourse]. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları/Journal of Linguistic Research 8*, (pp. 127–132).

Özge, D. & Evcen, E. (2020). Referential form, word order and emotional valence in Turkish pronoun resolution in physical contact events. In Zeyrek, D. & U. Özge (eds.). *Discourse meaning: The view from Turkish* (pp. 165-188). Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton.

Özge, U. & von Heusinger, K. (2020). Case marking and forward and backward discourse function. In Zeyrek, D. & U. Özge (eds.). *Discourse meaning: The view from Turkish* (pp. 81-102). Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton.

Özge, U, Özge, D. & von Heusinger, K. (2016). Strong indefinites in Turkish: Salience structure and referential persistence. In Anka Holler & Katja Suckow (Eds.), *Empirical perspectives on anaphora resolution,* (pp.167–191). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Ruhi, Ş. (2003). Interactional markers in Turkish: A corpus-based perspective. *Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi [Journal of Linguistics and Literature] 10*(2), 1–7.

Tura, S. S. (1981). "Yes, he hasn't," and a few other not's in Turkish. In Danny K. Alford, Karen Ann Nunold, Monica A. Macaulay & Jenny Walter (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, (pp. 317–327). Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Tura, S. S. (1986). Definiteness and referentiality in Turkish non-verbal sentences. In Dan I. Slobin & Karl Zimmer (Eds.), *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*, 165–194. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Turan, Ü., Zeyrek, D. & Bozşahin, C. (2012). Söylem ve bağdaşıklık ilişkileri [Discourse and dependency relations]. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları/Journal of Linguistic Research* 2012/II. 41–67.

Uzun, L. (2018). Neden bağlayıcılarının öznellik ile ilişkisi Türkçe yazılı derlem tabanlı bir tartışma [A corpus-based study on the relationship of causal connectives with subjectivity in Turkish]. In Yeşim Aksan & Mustafa Aksan (Eds.), *Türkçe'de yapı ve işlev: Şükriye Ruhi armağanı* [Structure and function in Turkish: In memory of Şükriye Ruhi], (pp. 145–170). Ankara: BilgeSu Yayıncılık.

Uzun, L. & Huber, E. (Eds.). (2002). *Türkçe'de bilgi yapısı ve bilimsel metinler* [Information structure in Turkish and academic texts]. Essen: Verlag Die Blaue Eule.

Yıldırım, S., Kılıçaslan, Y. & Aykaç., R. E. (2004). A computational model for anaphora resolution in Turkish via centering theory: an initial approach. In *International Conference on Computational Intelligence,* (pp. 124–128).

Yüksel, Ö. & Bozsahin, C. (2002). Contextually appropriate reference generation. *Natural Language Engineering 8*(1), 69–89.

Zeyrek, D. (2019). Discourse structure: The view from shared arguments in Turkish Discourse Bank. In Sumru Özsoy (ed.), *Word order in Turkish*, (pp. 287–306). Dordrecht: Springer.

Zeyrek, D. & Kurfalı., M. (2018). An assessment of explicit inter-and intra-sentential discourse connectives in Turkish Discourse Bank. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Christopher Cieri, Thierry Declerck, Koiti Hasida, Hitoshi Isahara, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Asuncion Moreno, Jan Odijk, Stelios Piperidis, Takenobu Tokunaga, Sara Goggi & Hélène Mazo (Eds.) Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2018, May 7–12, Miyazaki, Japan, (pp. 4023–4029). European Language Resources Association.

Zeyrek, D. (2014). On the distribution of contrastive-concessive discourse connectives *ama* (but/yet) and *fakat* (but) in written Turkish. In Pirkko Suihkonen & Lindsay J. Whaley (Eds.), *On diversity and complexity of languages spoken in Europe and North and Central Asia,* (pp. 251–273). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gülsüm Atasoy

Gülsüm Atasoy completed her PhD at Mersin University in 2018. Her PhD is on the corpus-driven description of the Turkish aspectual adverbials. She worked as a researcher in the project "Building a national corpus of Turkish", supported by Turkish National Science Foundation grant (108K242), Project director: Prof. Dr. Yeşim Aksan. She currently works at Toros University. Her research interests include corpus linguistics, semantics, aspect, Turkish structure and collostructional analysis and has published papers on building specialized corpora, aspectual adverbials, corpus-based discourse analysis, and corpus-based lexical semantics. Her latest paper is on the collostructional analysis of Turkish purpose clauses.