

On Morphosyntactic Patterns of Cohesion in Azeri Turkish Narrative

Mostafa Shahiditabar¹
Mohammad Dabir-Moghaddam*²

Received: 2019-11-23 | Revised: 2020-01-22 | Accepted: 2020-02-22

Abstract

This study aims to apply Halliday's (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) concept of cohesion using Dooley and Levinsohn's (2001) model of morphosyntactic pattern to Azeri Turkish narratives in an attempt to uncover narrative and morphosyntactic pattern relation. The corpus contains eleven short stories in Azeri Turkish. Findings of the study revealed that echoic utterance as a subtype of the morphosyntactic pattern may be used to mark the narrative peak. Also, there is a violation of morphosyntactic pattern in the corpus. This violation uses the historical present to draw the audience into a climatic situation. The study shows that echoic utterances can be regarded as links in a chain, functioning like cohesive ties in the text. The pragmatic notion, dramatic development, narrative peak, meaning construction, and implicature are also expressed by echoic utterances. Moreover, these discourse-pragmatic structuring constituents have been found to appear at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of narratives to provide a basis for relating a sentence to its context or

¹ PhD. Candidate of Linguistics, Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran; mostafa_shahiditabar@atu.ac.ir

² Professor of Linguistics, Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran (Corresponding Author); dabirmoghaddam@atu.ac.ir

mental representation, make the hearer accompany the narrator during the whole story and maintain the unity of the narrative.

Keywords: discourse, Azeri Turkish language, narrative, cohesion, functional linguistics, morphosyntactic pattern

Introduction

Cohesion is a key concept in scientific fields of chemistry, computer science, geology, social policy, and linguistics. In spite of its simplicity at first glance, many people, even highly educated ones, will tell you that they have a vague idea of what the term is about. Some believe that cohesion is integrity, whereas others believe that cohesion is unity. What is cohesion, then? Fundamentally, the term is, in linguistics, concerned with GRAMMAR and MORPHOLOGY (Crystal, 2003), GRAMMAR and SEMANTICS (Richards & Schmidt, 2002) or with DISCOURSE (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). It is apparent that people have been talking cohesively for thousands of years, yet in many ways, we are only beginning to understand the complex nature of this aspect of human language. If we ask what the nature of linguistic cohesion is, we quickly realize that this question has no simple answer and is way too broad to be answered immediately. Unless we restrict ourselves to cohesion concerned with one of the subfields in linguistics, we cannot hope to make progress in answering the broader question of the above-mentioned aspect of human language. To this end, the current paper aims to study cohesion concerned with DISCOURSE.

According to Halliday, discourse structure is used to refer to the structure of some postulated unit larger than the sentence, for example, the paragraph, or some larger entity such as the episode or the topic unit. The concept of cohesion is set up to account for the relation in discourse. It refers to the range of possibilities that exist for linking something with what has gone before (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In other words, in discourse, dependency of some element on another is defined as cohesion. This paper tries to explore cohesion in Azeri Turkish, with the aim of contributing to a broader understanding of the nature of morphosyntactic behavior.

Cohesion is the use of linguistic means to signal coherence (Brown & Yule, 1980, Grimes, 1975, Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The coherence of a text is determined by how the interpreter of the text can link the sentences together to form a conceptual unit and interpret it within a single mental representation. In other words, the term is not a direct property of the text but is instead what the interpreter can do with the text (Roberts, 2009). Languages choose different types of cohesive ties as linguistic signals of coherence. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) present a list of common types of cohesion as follows:

- Descriptive expressions which allude to entities mentioned earlier in the text
- Identity, including repetition (whole or partial), lexical replacement, pronouns, other pro-forms, substitution, ellipsis
- Frame reference

- Lexical relations, including hyponymy (type of), part-whole, collocation, synonyms, generals, opposites
- Morphosyntactic patterns (consistency of inflectional categories, echoic utterances, discourse-pragmatic structuring)
- Signals between propositions
- Intonation patterns

The above list presented by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) is largely taken from Halliday (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) and Brown and Yule (1980). A review of the literature shows that there has been no attempt by far to empirically apply Dooley and Levinsohn's model of morphosyntactic pattern - one of the subtypes of common types of cohesion - to Azeri Turkish. This study is, therefore, the first attempt to apply Halliday's concept of cohesion using Dooley and Levinsohn's model of morphosyntactic pattern to Azeri Turkish narrative in an attempt to uncover narrative and morphosyntactic pattern relation. In line with this aim, the following research questions will be considered: 1. How is morphosyntactic pattern related to narrative?, 2. Is there any violation of morphosyntactic pattern in Azeri Turkish? If yes, Why?

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature indicates that morphosyntax has been investigated in some languages and dialects in different parts of the world from numerous perspectives. Some studies have been carried out on morphosyntactic features of English like studies on Late Modern English (Widlitzki, 2018), Zimbabwean English (Marungudzi, 2016), Northern English (de Haas, 2011), African American English (Washington & Craig, 2002), internet English (Rumšienė, 2010), and English worldwide (Szmrecsanyi & Kortmann, 2009). Some other works are about morphosyntactic features of other languages like Indonesian (Nurhayati et al., 2018), Persian (Haresabadi et al., 2018, Sameri & Karimi-Doostan, 2019, Shokouhi & Kipka, 2003), Mara (Arden, 2010), Chinese (Li, 2001), and Korean (Yang, 1994). In the same vein, a number of studies have been conducted on bilingual morphosyntax as Igbo and English (Akinřemi, 2016), Spanish and English (Ebert, 2014), German and English (Ganić, 2015), and Lari and English (Sadighi & Rostampour, 2013). Morphosyntax and its interface with other subfields of linguistics are also addressed in the literature such as studies done on morphosyntax and semantics (Francez & Koontz-Garboden, 2017) and morphosyntax and word-formation (Padrosa Trias, 2010). Some other areas like neurolinguistic analysis of morphosyntax (Coulson et al., 1998, Christodoulou, 2015,), discourse markers, areal features such as the Balkan Sprachbund (Olga, 2006), and synchronic and diachronic morphosyntax are also important in the literature.

Regarding Turkish, nevertheless, specifically Turkish morphosyntactic patterns, no specific work has been done. Yet, some studies have been conducted on Turkish cohesion. It seems that the majority of the previous studies had adopted Halliday and Hasan's (1976) methodology in analyzing

cohesion in different Turkish texts. A review of the literature reveals that Turkish short stories within the context of emotions (Aydın, 2012), a comparative study of English and Turkish cohesion (Tanrıöver, 2011), a comparative study of Uzbek origin immigrant students and Turkish students's cohesion (Coşkun, 2011), and use of cohesion devices in Turkish in narrative texts written by primary education students (Coşkun, 2005) are significant works in the literature among others. In addition to these works, there are also some studies on Turkish foreign language learners (Akpınar, 2010, Genç et al., 2010, Karatay, 2010).

Elsewhere, Güven (2014) studied stories of Mustafa Kutlu in terms of the notions of cohesion and coherence. The paper showed that there were five subheadings of the notion of cohesion as transfer, commutation, elliptical expressions, elements of connection, and word coherence. The study proved that, in Kutlu's stories, ellipsis was the most commonly used tool while commutation was the least frequent one. Aydın (2012) studied Turkish short stories titled "Nerede İnsan Varsa Orada Umut Vardır, Kedi Ağaca Çıktı and Hazır Olun Fırtına Geliyor" within the context of emotions. The paper showed that grammatical and lexical cohesive devices such as anaphora, cataphora, ellipsis, reiteration, junctions, and collocation were used to maintain grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion which constitute the microstructure of the text. Similarly, Tanrıöver (2011) studied the use of anaphoric expressions and referential senses in Turkish and English short stories. This paper reported that Turkish, as a pro-drop language, contains extremely high elliptical use of nouns, pronouns, verbs, and possessives in written and spoken language. Also, Turkish makes extremely frequent use of lexical cohesion items in comparison with English - that is, "while 208 lexical cohesion items were determined in four Turkish short stories, only 150 lexical cohesion items were found in four English short stories" (Tanrıöver, 2011, p. 307). The paper highlighted that English short stories gained great importance in comparison with Turkish short stories in terms of referential and anaphoric class of nominal substitution. Also, English short stories had 133 possessive pronouns while this number was just 10 in Turkish. Coşkun (2011) evaluated texts written by Uzbek origin immigrant students and Turkish students living in Hatay in terms of the use of cohesion devices (ellipsis, conjunctions, lexical cohesion, reference, substitution).

Regarding Turkish foreign language learners, Karatay (2010) studied the written skills of the pre-service Turkish teachers. This study reached the conclusion that students can use conjunctions at medium level in their papers - that is, they are not at a sufficient level in using conjunctions that signify time-order, comparison-contrast, exemplification, and condition. The paper demonstrated that the students who are skilled at using cohesives are also good at composing a coherent text. This study considered discourse patterns in an argumentative text by Turkish foreign language learners majoring in English Language Teaching. It showed that there were significant differences between the identification of some sub-categories of grammatical cohesion in the study such as ellipsis-substitution and conjunction on the one hand and lexical

cohesion, namely superordinate-hyponym and repetition on the other hand. Genç et al. (2010) studied the types and functions of repetitions in the narrations of Turkish speakers of French. The paper concluded that there were various types and functions of repetitions. It highlighted that Turkish speakers of French employed repetitions both at word and group levels with the aim of stalling and/or repairing previous utterances. The study also suggested that either for stalling or repairing, group level (GL) repetitions were observed to be employed more frequently compared to word level (WL) repetitions.

The current paper is aimed to study morphosyntactic patterns in Azeri Turkish (the language spoken predominantly in Iran, Azerbaijan and some other countries) as the first attempt to apply Halliday's (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) concept of cohesion using Dooley and Levinsohn's (2001) model of morphosyntactic pattern to the language to uncover narrative and morphosyntactic pattern relation in an attempt to understand linguistic cohesion in a deep sense.

Research Framework

The seminal work of Halliday and Hasan (1976) provided a framework on cohesion that caught the interest of many scholars, leading to many works conducted on cohesion analysis. In this respect, many researchers have attempted to study numerous features of this textual relation in discourse. One of the recent viewpoints is that of Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) that was mainly taken from the well-known treatment of cohesion by Halliday and Hasan, as amplified by Brown and Yule (1980). Lexical replacement, pronouns, substitution, ellipsis, lexical relations such as hyponymy and collocation have been issues of great concern in the literature (Roberts, 2009).

There are three types of patterns, namely consistency of inflectional categories, echoic utterances, and discourse- pragmatic structuring according to Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) for morphosyntactic cohesion. Morphosyntactic patterns offer many opportunities for cohesion. Three types of patterns are illustrated below:

Consistency of inflectional categories: a sequence of clauses and sentences can show CONSISTENCY/IDENTITY OF INFLECTIONAL CATEGORIES (e.g., tense marking, as in the following example):

(1) Beş baş taza nal-lan-mış qatır çık-dı-lar yol-a.
Gör-dü-lər uzaq-dan bir qaraltı gəl-ir¹.

Five number new horseshoe-INF- PPS mule go out-PAST-PL way-DCM.
See- PAST-PL far-ABL one shadow come-PRE.

'Five newly horseshoed mules started up a journey. They saw a large shadow coming from afar.'

¹ The reason for not transcribing Turkish examples (in this article) is to follow the method of presenting examples of this language in international linguistic sources in English, which are brought to the Turkish script (for instance, see Comrie 1997 & 1989)

and at the end of a narrative in Azerbaijani in this study. Moreover, finding the reasons behind Azerbaijani discourse-pragmatic structuring is very important in discourse studies.

Method and Material

The current study determines morphosyntactic pattern's application in Azeri Turkish narratives using Dooley and Levinsohn's model of discourse structure (2001).

Corpus

Eleven short stories in Azeri Turkish were chosen as the corpus of the current study from Ajdari Qizilkechi (1394, 1397), Nemət (2017), Hamidekhu (2012), and Hariri Akbari (2010). The short stories are Dəvə ilə Qatırlar 'Camel and mules' (Hariri Akbari, 2010), Atyatın 'Atyatin' (Hamidekhu, 2012), Cırtıdan 'Dwarf', Tülkünün şahlığı 'Kingdom of fox', Qaraçuxa 'Fortune', Məlikməmməd nağılı 'Fairy tale of Malikmammad', Qarınənə və buz 'Grandma and ice', Bənövşənin nağılı 'Fairy tale of Viola' (Nemət, 2017), Gecənin qoynunda 'The heart of night', Sulduz və Ulduz 'Sulduz and Ulduz' (Ajdari Qizilkechi, 1394), and Gari körpüsü 'The old lady's bridge' (Ajdari Qizilkechi, 1397).

The corpus of the present study consists of a total of 6741 words including Cırtıdan 'Dwarf' 990 words, Tülkünün şahlığı 'Kingdom of fox' 416 words, Bənövşənin nağılı 'Fairy tale of Viola' 160 words, Qarınənə və buz 'Grandma and ice' 167 words, Dəvə ilə Qatırlar 'Camel and mules' 308 words, Atyatın 'Atyatin' 1071 words, Gecənin qoynunda 'The heart of night' 390 words, Qaraçuxa 'Fortune' 368 words, Məlikməmməd nağılı 'Fairy tale of Malikmammad' 2528 words and Gari körpüsü 'The old lady's bridge' 343 words.

Procedure

Each story with its English translation was studied at the initial step. Then, Azeri Turkish morphosyntactic patterns were explored in detail.

Data Analysis and Discussion

The results of the study regarding morphosyntactic patterns in Azeri Turkish are presented in this section:

Consistency of Inflectional Categories Analysis

Since inflectional morphemes modify the tense, aspect, mood, person, or number of a verb, or the number, gender, or case of a noun, adjective,

or pronoun, consistency of inflectional categories refers to the mentioned categories. Take the following example from *Dəvə ilən Qatırlar* ‘Camel and mules’ (Hariri Akbari, 2010):

(4) Beş baş taza nal-lan-mış qatır çıx-dı-lar yol-a.
Gör-dü-lər uzaq-dan bir qaraltı gəl-ir.

Five number new horseshoe-INF- PPS mule go out-PAST-PL way-to.
See- PAST-PL far-from one shadow come-PRE.

‘Five newly horseshoed mules started up a journey. They saw a large shadow coming from afar.’

Adding *-lar* to the stem *çıxdı* to form *çıxdılar* and to the stem *gördü* to form *gördülər*, adding *-dı* to *çıx* to form *çıx-dı* and *-dü* to *gör* to form *gör-dü* and consistency of *beş* ‘five’ with *-lar* and *-lər* (Turkish plural suffixes) are all examples of consistency of inflectional categories. Or in *Atyatın* ‘Atyatın’ (Hamidekhu, 2012), a story about an Ardabili boy who visits his grandparents, an example of consistency of inflectional categories is presented in the following:’

(5) Atyatın-gil Ərdəbil-ə gecə yetiş-di-lər.

Atyatın-’s Ardabil-DCM night arrive-PAST-PL.
‘Atyatın’s family arrived Ardabil at night.’

Yol-lar-ı-nı gözlə-(y)ən büyük-nənə-si ilə baba-sı
qapı döy-ül-cəyin
Way- PL-IND-ACC wait-PRPT grand-mother- PC.3Sg and father- PC.3Sg
door knock-get- as soon as

çıx-CS qız-lar-ı Tər-lan-ı, balaca nəvə-lər-i
Atyatın-ı bağır-lar-ın-a bas-dı-lar.
come out-PPS daughter-PL-DET Tarlan-IND little grandchild-PL-DET
Atyatın-IND heart-PL-DET-to push-PAST-PL
‘Their grandparents who were waiting for them went out as soon as they heard someone knocking on the door and hugged them.’

Ağac-ın dal-ın-da gizlə-nən Laçın, birdən çıx-ıb bacısı-
qız-ın qucaqla-dı
Tree-IND behind-IND- LOC hide-PRPT Lachin, suddenly pop- CS sister-
PC.3Sg-daughter-DET hug-PAST.Sg.

“Çox gec gəl-d-uz.
Very late come-PAST-3pl

Hamı ged-ib yat-dı.
All go-CS sleep-PAST

Pişikbala dayan-mış-dı ha’ o-da get-di yat-di” de-di.
kitten stand-PPS-PAST EMPH it-too go-PAST sleep-PAST say-
PAST

'Lachin who was hiding behind the tree hugged her niece and said: You are very late. All (people) went to bed. The kitten was waiting too. It went to bed too.'

Şam ye- (y)-ib çox de-(y)ib gül-ən-dən sonra Atyatın-ı yuxu apar-dı.

Dinner eat-CS very speak- CS laugh- PRPT-ABL after Atyatın-ACC sleep take-PAST.

'After eating dinner and having fun, Atyatın fell asleep.'

Present participle (PRPT) -ən is used to modify the verb in gözlə-(y)ən and gizlə-nən. Or adding -lar and -lər to the words yetiş-di-lər, Yol-lar-ı-nı, qız-lar-ı, nəvə-lər-i, bağır-lar-ın-a and bas-dı-lar shows consistency of inflectional categories in this text. The consistency is inevitable while forming tense in the text. To form, for example, the simple past tense in Azeri Turkish, infinitive suffix is removed from the verb to find the base form, the appropriate tense suffix is added and finally, the appropriate personal suffix is added. This process is consistent in the current text as it is seen in these verbs: yetiş-di-lər, bağır-lar-ın-a bas-dı-lar, qucaqla-dı, and yuxu apar-dı. Also, using present perfect suffix (PPS) is helpful for the consistency of the text as in çıx-ib, ged-ib, ye- (y)-ib, and de-(y)ib. Of course, the tense suffix -miş is a common suffix used in Azeri Turkish to show present perfect as in yazmışam - 'I have written' or in görmüşəm - 'I have seen' containing a vowel harmony. It should be mentioned that tense suffix -miş is sometimes replaced with the suffix -(y)ib as in yazıb(dır) - 'he/she has written'. In these forms, the third person suffix -dır is optional with these alternative forms.

There are some sentences in the corpus that indicate the inconsistency of inflectional categories. In other words, even though the consistency of inflectional categories is one of the main features of cohesion in the narrative, there are some sentences found in the corpus that have violated the consistency of inflectional categories. Take the following example from Cırtan 'Dwarf' (Nemət, 2017) where, at the end of the story, the main protagonist wants to wake his friends up and save their lives by sending the giant on a wild goose chase:

(6) Cırtan tez yoldaş-lar-ı-nı oyad-ib **de-di:** bu dev biz-i ye-mək **istə-(y)ir.**

Dwarf soon friend-PL-IND-ACC wake up- PPS say-**PAST**. 3Sg this giant we-ACC eat-INF **want-PRES**.

'Dwarf woke his friends up soon and said: this giant is going to eat us up.'

Mən bir fırıldaq-la yubad-ib **saxla-mış-am.**

I one cheat-with postpone-PPS **stop-PPS-1Sg.**

'I have postponed it with some tricks.'

Ayaq-a **qalx-ın** qaç-ma-lı-(y)ıq. Siz **cıx-ın** mən-də həməən **gəl-im.**

Foot-to **stand-2p.IMP** run-INF-IND-PL You **go out-2p.IMP** I-too right now **come-2p. IMP.**

'Hurry up, we need to scape. You go out, I will join you right now.'

In this example, *dedi* 'said' is past but *istə-(y)ir* 'wants' is present. Furthermore, *saxla-mış-am* 'I have postponed' is present perfect while *qalx-ın* 'stand up', *cıx-ın* 'go out' and *gəl-im* 'I come' are present. As it is seen in this example, an event in the narrative that took place in the past is introduced in the present tense which is called the 'historical present', which violates the consistency of inflectional categories. Since the dwarf succeeded in cheating the giant, the example given above is the climax of the story and the historical present is used to draw the audience into a climatic situation. This is in line with Roberts's (2009) findings in adding vividness to the climax in *Māhi siāh=e kuçulu* 'little black fish' in Persian.

To sum up, consistency of inflectional categories proves helpful in cohesion - that is, inflectional morphemes link everything with what has gone before in narratives. In some cases, this consistency is violated. The violation is can be linked to climatic developments in the narrative.

Echoic Utterances Analysis

In *Gecənin qoynunda* 'The heart of night' (Umudoğlu, 2016), as the title suggests, the word night is echoed during the whole story. The main reason is that the whole story is about night and the narrator uses echoic utterances, mainly words or phrases about the night, to develop his narrative. In this story, if we consider the whole narrative as a *misbahah*, then 'night' functions as a string of the *misbahah*. In other words, the echoic utterances are like cohesive ties in the text.

In *Cırtdan* 'Dwarf', the same significant role of echoic utterances is inevitable as well. The main reason is getting the attention of children and keeping them involved in the story. The frequency of echoic utterance in this text is reported in Table 1:

Table 1.
The Frequency of Echoic Utterance in Cırtdan 'Dwarf'

Sentences	Frequency	Percentage
Kim yatıb kim oyaq? 'Who is asleep? Who is awake?'	4	33.33%
Hami yatıb cırtdan oyaq. 'Everyone is asleep except the dwarf'	4	33.33%
Cırtdan niyə oyaq? 'Why is the dwarf awak?'	4	33.33%
Total	12	100%

Some examples of echoic utterances of *Cırtdan* 'Dwarf' text are as follows:

(7) Kim yat-ıb kim oyaq?
Who sleep-PPS who awake?

'Who is asleep? Who is awake?'

Hami yat-ib cırt dan oyaq.
All sleep-PPS dwarf awake.
'Everyone is asleep except the dwarf'

Cırt dan niyə oyaq?
Dwarf why awake?
'Why is the dwarf awake?'

Cırt dan qardaş gə ged-ək.
Dwarf brother come go-1p.IMP
'Dwarf, hey boy! Let's go'

In this text, a pair of echoic utterances, Kim yatıb kim oyaq? 'Who is asleep? Who is awake?' and Hami yatıb cırt dan oyaq. 'Everyone is asleep except the dwarf', a dialog between a giant and a dwarf- the main protagonist, are used, playing a different role in comparison with those of other echoic utterances included in the narrative. This dialog is about sleeping and the Cırt dan 'Dwarf' story is one of the traditional bedtime stories in Azeri Turkish language and culture.

Considering both the dialog between the giant and the main protagonist about sleeping and the fact that this story is told to a child at bedtime to prepare the child for sleep, we can conclude that the mentioned echoic utterances of the giant and the dwarf associate sleeping and stimulate and reinforce kids' identification with the main protagonist to sleep. This is in line with what Dickson notes "The bedtime story is a definite institution in many families. It deserves to be so in all. Beginning with the nursery rhymes, the stories will gradually broaden in theme, and if their dramatic possibilities are at all realized by the story-teller, the children will broaden in their conception of the lives and feelings of others" (2012, p. 34). In other words, echoic utterances, as one of the subtypes of morphosyntactic devices, have a pragmatic implication in this narrative.

In Tülkünün şahlığı 'Kingdom of fox' text (Nemət, 2017), lion, the the king of the jungle recites three sentences (questions) (Gözlərim qızardımı? 'Have my eyes turned red?', Tüklərim biz-biz oldumu? 'Have I gotten goosebumps?', and Ağzım köpükləndimi? 'Am I frothing at the mouth?') and the fox confirms them using echoic utterances. After the death of the lion, the fox wants to become the king of the jungle. He then goes for hunting and tries to imitate the way the lion used to hunt by repeating the king's three well-known questions. But as soon as he wants to hunt, his pray (a horse) kicks him and what happens to the fox is 'his eyes turn red, he gets goosebumps and he froths at the mouth'. In this text, the three mentioned sentences are echoed by the three characters of the story. Firstly, the lion says these sentences. Then, they are echoed by the fox. In the next part of the narrative, these sentences are echoed by the fox and finally, they are echoed by a jackal twice. These echoic utterance are listed in Table 2.

Table 2.
The Frequency of Echoic Utterance in Tülkünün şahlığı 'Kingdom of fox'

Phrase	Frequency	Percentage
Gözlərim qızardımı? 'Have my eyes turned red?'	5	33.33%
Tüklərim biz-biz oldumu? 'Have I gotten goosebumps?'	5	33.33%
Ağzım köpükləndimi? 'Am I frothing at the mouth?'	5	33.33%
Total	15	100%

Echoic utterances play a significant role in this narrative. These echoic utterances hold the text together and make it meaningful. They function as cohesive ties in this text. Moreover, echoic utterances are used to mark a dramatic development. When the jackal uses echoic utterances by saying that 'fox's eyes turn red, he gets goosebumps and he froths at the mouth', the narrator has used these utterances to mark a narrative peak. This finding is in line with Margetts's (2015).

In Qaraçuxa 'Fortune' (Nemət, 2017), two utterances (Hara gedirsən? 'Where are you going?', Qaraçuxamı(n) tampaqa/dalınca. 'To find my fortune') are echoed by the main protagonist, a wolf, a farmer, and a queen 6 times. In this text, echoic utterances are used to give unity, purpose, and meaning to the narrative. Or in Məlikməmməd nağılı 'Fairy tale of Malikmammad' (Nemət, 2017), sentences like Belədə iş olarmış? 'what the hell is going on?', Oğlan ox-kamanı götdü? 'The boy took his bow and arrow', Alma dərildi 'The apple is picked', and sentences about the killing of the giant are echoed.

In this text, different echoic utterances are used with different implications. For example, at the beginning of the story, when the king wonders where the thief of the apple has gone for several days, his sentence 'Belədə iş olarmış? 'What the hell is going on?' is echoed. This echoic utterance is used to show that the king worries about an important event. In other words, this echoic utterance conveys a broader meaning than simply that of the words on the page. It can be said that echoic utterances give us some meanings even though they are neither expressed nor strictly implied. Technically speaking, one of the applications of echoic utterance is implicature. Another echoic utterance is used in this text when the prince and his older brothers want to take their bows and arrows. This echoic utterance reinforces the previous one since the boys want to find the thief and obey the unwritten command of the king. Another echoic utterance is when the apple is picked. This utterance shows the repetition of the apple being picked daily and is used to show the intricate situation the boys face. As it is seen, these echoic utterances are like links in a chain and each plays its specified role. One of the other echoic utterances refers to the killing of the giant by the main protagonist. He kills not simply one but rather some giants and a dragon during the story. Killing of the antagonist by the protagonist is not a new phenomenon in fairy tales but using echoic utterances for killing the antagonist(s) by the protagonist in this narrative indicates the power of the main protagonist and difficulty of the protagonist's job in an attempt to create dramatic feelings.

In a 30-line narrative named *Qarınənə və buz* 'Grandma and ice' (Nemət, 2017), an echoic utterance, *güclü* 'vigorous' is used 21 times as shown in Table 3. Other echoic utterances are: *qarınənə* 'grandma': 6 times, *buz* 'ice': 4 times, *günəş* 'the sun', *bulud* 'cloud', *yağış* 'rain', *göy ot* 'grass', *qoyun* 'sheep', *canavar* 'wolf', *çoban* 'shepherd', *siçan* 'mouse', *pişik* 'cat': each 3 times, and *mirili-mir-mow* 'meow': 2 times. It should be mentioned that being one of the well-known rhythmic bedtime stories in Azeri Turkish, *Qarınənə və buz* 'Grandma and ice' is a definite institution in many Azeri Turkish families. As Dickson (2012, p. 34) cites, beginning with 'the nursery rhymes, the stories will gradually broaden in theme', *Qarınənə və buz* 'Grandma and ice' has some features of nursery rhymes but is narrated as a bedtime story. In this narrative, echoic utterances can be considered as the skeleton of the story since they are like the body that forms the supporting structure of the narrative.

Table 3.

The Frequency of Echoic Utterance in Qarınənə və buz 'Grandma and ice'

Word	Frequency	Percentage
<i>güclü</i> 'vigorous'	21	35%
<i>qarınənə</i> 'grandma'	6	10%
<i>buz</i> 'ice'	4	6.66%
<i>günəş</i> 'the sun'	3	5%
<i>bulud</i> 'cloud'	3	5%
<i>yağış</i> 'rain'	3	5%
<i>göy ot</i> 'grass'	3	5%
<i>qoyun</i> 'sheep'	3	5%
<i>canavar</i> 'wolf'	3	5%
<i>çoban</i> 'shepherd'	3	5%
<i>siçan</i> 'mouse'	3	5%
<i>pişik</i> 'cat'	3	5%
<i>mirili-mir-mow</i> 'meow'	2	3.33%
Total	60	100%

To sum up, echoic utterances are not found in all the stories mentioned in the corpus. Among them, only *Gecənin qoynunda* 'The heart of night', *Cırdan* 'Dwarf', *Tülkünün şahlığı* 'Kingdom of fox', *Qaraçuxa* 'Fortune', *Məlikməmməd nağılı* 'Fairy tale of Malikmammad' and *Qarınənə və buz* 'Grandma and ice' contain echoic utterances. In addition, echoic utterances are similar to links in a chain and function like cohesive ties in the text. The pragmatic notion, dramatic development, narrative peak, meaning construction, and implicature can be expressed through echoic utterances. They also show some features of the main protagonist.

Discourse-Pragmatic Structuring Analysis

A glance at the corpus reveals that all the stories consist of discourse-pragmatic structuring. For instance, in *Bənövşənin nağılı* 'Fairy tale of Viola' (Nemət, 2017), *Qış* 'Winter' is the name of a boy whose name is used ironically to indicate the coldest season of the year. He is in love with *Bənövşə*, a truly

beautiful girl, whose name is associated with beauty and the birth of spring in Azeri Turkish culture. However, *Bənövşə* is in love with *Yaz* 'spring'. Winter is the last but spring is the starting season of the year in Azeri Turkish culture, and spring, *Yaz*, is used as point of departure in this narrative. Or in *Məlikməmməd nağılı* 'Fairy tale of Malikmammad', the following examples are used as discourse-pragmatic devices:

(8) Bir-i var-mış bir-i yux-mış, bir padşah var-mış, ...
 One-IND be-PPS one-IND no-PPS one king be-PPS
 'Once upon a time, there was a king, ...'

a rhythmic utterance :

Az ged-ib **uz** ged-ib, dərə-təpə **düz** ged-ib, bir...
 A bit go-PPS correct go-PPS valley-hill right go-PPS one ...
 'After passing the valleys and hills, a ...'

Siz-ə kim-ABL de-(y)im? ...- dan.
 You-to who-from say- PRES-1sg? ...- from
 'I tell to you about whom? About...'

A discourse marker to provide a sense of where something is in relation to something else.

Bəli...

Yes ...

'yes' (to show that the narrator wants to go ahead)

İl öt-dü ay dolan-dı, gün-lər-in bir gün-ü...
 Year finish-PAST month turn-PAST, day-PL-IND one day-IND...
 'Years finished, months passed, one day' literally means 'after a while'

a rhythmic utterance:

Yer **uç-du** yer-ə **keç-di**, güy-dən üç alma düş-dü,
 Ground crack-PAST ground-to enter-PAST sky-ABL three apple fall-
 PAST
 bir-i mən-im, bir-i sən-in, bir-i-də yer-ə keç-di.
 one-IND I- PC.1sg one-IND you- PC.2sg one-IND-also ground-to pass-
 PAST

'Ground cracked, it went into the ground, three apples fell, one for me, one for you and one went into the ground'.

This utterance is used at the end of the kids' bedtime stories in Azeri Turkish families by the narrator to finish the story.

As can be viewed, in *Biri varmış biri yuxmuş, bir padşah varmış, ...*, 'Once upon a time, there was a king ...', 'Once upon a time' designates an initial element which cohesively anchors the subsequent clause. The six examples given above regarding the point of departure serve at least two functions. Firstly, they play the role of an element that cohesively anchors the subsequent clause(s) to something which is already in the context as Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) maintain. Secondly, our narrative can be imagined as a polygon. Each of

these phrases is like one side of a hexagon that completes our six-sided polygon. In other words, our polygon, here our narrative text which has six sides, is misshaped if any of its sides is missed. It is exactly in line with Halliday and Hasan's definition of cohesion: When the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another, cohesion occurs (1976). These sentences are devices that link the narrator with the hearer. It means that they facilitate empathy. For example, in *Sulduz və Ulduz* 'Sulduz and Ulduz' (Ajdari Qizilkechi, 1394), the narrator says: *Sizə uşaqların ata-anasından xəbər verim* 'Let me inform you about the kids' parents'. With this sentence, the narrator facilitates empathy with the hearer. Another point is that these phrases are fixed and can be used in any bedtime story. For instance, in *Garı körpüsü* 'The old lady's bridge' (Ajdari Qizilkechi, 1397), the narrative starts with *Qədim zamanlarda ...* 'A long time ago...'. It also has *Daha nə başınızı ağrıdıym* 'Not to talk your ear off.' (a discourse filler in Azeri Turkish used by the speaker to show humbleness and respect), as well as *Günlər ötü, vaxt-vədə yetişdi* 'After a while, ...'. It can be argued that these constituents appear at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the story to provide a basis for relating a sentence to its context or mental representation, make the hearer accompany the narrator during the whole story, and maintain the unity of the story.

Conclusion

To answer the research question 'How is morphosyntactic pattern related to narrative?', the findings of the study indicated that echoic utterances are used to mark dramatic developments in some narratives. This means that echoic utterances as a subtype of the morphosyntactic pattern may be used to mark the narrative peak. Regarding the other question, i.e., 'Is there any violation of morphosyntactic pattern in Azeri Turkish? If yes, Why?', it was observed that there is a violation of morphosyntactic pattern in the corpus. Violation of inflectional categories happens in Azeri Turkish. This violation picks the historical present to draw the audience into a climatic situation.

As for the efficiency of Dooley and Levinsohn's (2001) model, comparing the results of the present study with the results of a similar research done on Persian (Ahangar et al., 2015) demonstrates that Dooley and Levinsohn's opinion is applicable in both languages. This finding gives us an insight into a broader understanding of the nature of morphosyntactic behavior - that is, the consistency of inflectional categories as the most frequent device used in the corpus proves helpful in maintaining cohesion. In other words, inflectional morphemes link everything with what has gone before in the narrative. For instance, the participle *-ən* is used to modify the verb in some cases in the corpus or *-lar* and *-lər* (Turkish plural suffixes) are added to nouns or simple past tense can be formed by removing infinitive suffixes and adding the appropriate tense suffix. These are all examples of inflectional categories that are consistent in the corpus of the current paper. With respect to the violation of morphosyntactic pattern, as discussed earlier, in some cases, the consistency of inflectional

categories is violated. Regarding echoic utterances, it was revealed that some narratives in Azeri Turkish are replete with echoic utterances, as they provide a basis for relating a sentence to its context or mental representation on the one hand, and make the hearer accompany the narrator during the whole story, specifically when the hearers are kids and need to follow the narrator on the other hand. This finding can mean that both echoic utterances, as this study suggests, and discourse-pragmatic structuring, as proposed by Ahangar et al. , play important roles in making texts cohesive, one in Azeri Turkish narratives and one in Persian radio and TV talks. In fact, echoic utterances can be viewed as links in a chain functioning like cohesive ties in the text. The pragmatic notion, dramatic development, narrative peak, meaning construction, and implicature can also be presented by echoic utterances. Considering discourse-pragmatic structuring, it was seen that these constituents appear at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of narrative to provide a basis for relating a sentence to its context or mental representation, make the hearer accompany the narrator during the whole story and maintain the unity of the story.

References

- Ahangar, A. A., Taki, G., & Rahimi, M. (2015). A study of morpho-syntactic patterns: A cohesive device in some Persian live sport radio and TV talks. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 7(2), 1-24.
- Ajdari Qizilkechi, M. (2015). *Sulduz və ulduz*. Danizchin.
- Ajdari Qizilkechi, M. (2018). *Garı körpüsü*. Danizchin.
- Akinreṃi, I. I. (2016). Structural patters and strategies of codeswitching in Igbo-English bilingual discourse. *Studies in African linguistics*, 45(1&2), 1-25.
- Akpınar, K. D. (2010). Identifying discourse patterns: A case study with Turkish foreign language learners. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics ELT Research Journal*, 1(4), 255-277.
- Arden, M. (2010). *A phonetic, phonological, and morpho-syntactic analysis of the Mara language* (Unpublished MA thesis). San Jose State University, California.
- Aydın, İ. (2012). İlköğretim 8. Sınıf Türkçe ders kitabı'nın 'Duygular' temasında yer alan okuma metinlerine metindilbilimsel bir yaklaşım. *Turkish Studies International Periodical For the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 7(3), 381-407.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1980). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Christodoulou, C. (2015, November). *Morphosyntactic illusions in down syndrome: The role of phonetics/phonology*. Paper presented at 39th Boston University Conference on Language Development, Boston.
- Comrie, B. (1997). Turkic languages and linguistic typology. *Turkic Languages* 1, 14-24.
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology* (2nd ed). The University of Chicago Press.
- Coşkun, E. (2011). Cohesion in compositions of Turkish and immigrant students. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(2), 892-899.
- Coşkun, E. (2005). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin öyküleyici anlatımlarında bağdaşıklık, tutarlılık ve metin elementleri* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

- Coulson, S, King, J. W., & Kutas, M. (1998). Expect the unexpected: Event-related brain response to morphosyntactic violations. *Language and cognitive processes*, 13(1), 21-58.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics & phonetics* (5th ed). Blackwell Publishing.
- de Haas, N. K. (2011). *Morphosyntactic variation in Northern English: The northern subject rule, its origins and early history*. LOT.
- Dickson, M. S. (2012). *Vocational guidance for girls*. ULAN Press.
- Dooley, R. A. , & Levinsohn, S. H. (2001). *Analyzing discourse: A manual of basic concepts*. SIL International.
- Ebert, S. (2014). *The morphosyntactax of Wh-questions: Evidence from Spanish-English code-switching* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Illinois, Chicago.
- Francez, I., & Koontz-Garboden, A. (2017). *Semantics and morphosyntactic variation*. Oxford University Press.
- Ganić, M. (2015). *The influence of English on German: A morphosyntactic analysis* (Unpublished B A thesis). University of Rijeka, Croatia.
- Garvin, P. L. (1963). Czechoslovakia. In A. S. Thomas (Ed.), *Current trends in linguistics* (pp. 499-522). Mouton.
- Genç, B., Mavaşoğlu, M., & Dada, E. (2010). Types and functions of repetitions in the narrations of Turkish speakers of French. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4(2), 216-224.
- Grimes, J. E. (1975). *The thread of discourse*. Mouton.
- Güven, A. Z. (2014). The cohesive and coherence in Mustafa Kutlu's stories. *International Journal of Language Academy*, 2(4). 599-609.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Hamidekhu, A. (2012). *Atyatın*. Savalanigidlari.
- Haresabadi, F., Shirazi, T. S., Ebadi, A., Dastjerdi Kazemi, M., Ghayoumi, Anaraki, Z., & Maleki Shahmahmood, T. (2018). Identification of high-frequency morphosyntactic structures in Persian-speaking children aged 4-6 Years. *A qualitative research. Iranian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 43(4), 386-392.
- Hariri Akbari, M. (2010). *Feuilleton: A glance at Azeri Turkish culture*. Yaran.
- Karatay, H. (2010). Bağdaşıklık araçlarını kullanma düzeyi ile tutarlı metin yazma arasındaki ilişki. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(13), 373-385.
- Li, W. (2001). *The morpho-syntactic interface in a Chinese phrase structure grammar* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada.
- Margetts, A. (2015). Person shift at narrative peak. *Language*, 91(4), 755-805.
- Marungudzi, T. (2016). *Some morphosyntactic features and variety status of Zimbabwean English: A corpus-based study* (Unpublished PhD thesis). North-West University, South Africa.
- Nemət, V. (2017). *Göydən üç alma düşdü: Azərbaycan şifahi xalq nağılları və əfsanələri (Qaradağ bölgəsi)*. Cild 1. Bahardox.
- Nurhayati, D. A. W., Djatmika, R., S., & Tri, W. (2018). Exploring Indonesian interface on morpho-syntactic properties by Javanese speakers: A case study of English lecturers and students' interaction in two colleges in East Java, Indonesia. *Socail Science & Humanities*, 26, 257-282.
- Olga, M. T. (2006). *Balkan Sprachbund morpho-syntactic features*. Springer.
- Padrosa Trias, S. (2010). *Complex word-formation and the morphology-syntax interface* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of langauge teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Longman.
- Roberts, J. R. (2009). *A study of Persian discourse structure*. In Cooperation with Behrooz Barjasteh Delferooz and Carina Jahani. Uppsala Universitet.

- Rumšienė, G. (2010). Morphosyntactic developments in internet English: Statistical analysis. *Studies about Languages*, 17, 53-57.
- Sadighi, F., & Rostampour, M. (2013). A contrastive analysis of inflectional markings of English and Lari dialect verbs: Morphosyntactic properties vs. phonological clitics. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(4), 793-800.
- Sameri, M., & Karimi-Doostan, G. (2019). Embedded tense interpretation and sequence of tense in Persian. *Lingua*, 226, 1-19.
- Shokouhi, H., & Kipka, P. (2003). A discourse study of Persian *rā*. *Lingua*, 113(10), 953-966.
- Szmrecsanyi, B., & Kortmann, B. (2009). The morphosyntax of varieties of English worldwide: A quantitative perspective. *Lingua*, 119, 1643-1663.
- Tanrıöver, A. S. (2011). Referential senses and anaphoric relations in Turkish and English written texts. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15(2), 307-320.
- Washington, J. A., & Craig, H. (2002). Morphosyntactic forms of African American English used by young children and their caregivers. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23, 209-231.
- Widlitzki, B. (2018). *Morphosyntactic variation and change in late modern English: A sociolinguistic perspective* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen, Germany.
- Yang, B. (1994). *Morphosyntactic phenomena of Korean in role and reference grammar: Psych-verb construction, inflectional verb morphemes, complex sentences, and relative clauses*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). State University of New York at Buffalo.

Appendix

Abbreviations

- 1p.IMP = first person singular imperative
- 2p.IMP = second person plural imperative
- ABL = ablative case marker
- ACC = accusative case marker
- CS = coordinative suffix =CS
- DAT = dative
- DCM = dative case marker
- DET = determiner
- EMPH = emphasis
- IND = indefinite
- INF = infinitive
- LOC = locative case marker
- PC = pronominal clitic
- POSS = possessive
- PRES = present
- PPS = present perfect suffix
- PRPT = present participle