



HENDIADYOINS IN CHAGATAI BASED ON GADAYI'S DIVAN

Hayrullah KAHYA*

Abstract

Chagatai Turkish (Cahagatai) is the Islamic Central Asia literary language. Chagatai, also sometimes called Eastern Turkish, improved under the rule of the Timurids (1405-1502) as a continuation of the Karakanids (11-13th century) and Kharazm Turkish (14th century). This Turkish language was used by all Muslim non-Oghuz Turks between 15th and 20th century.

Gadai is a Chagatai poet from the 15th century. Navayi's research on Gadai is considered a significant source by scholars. Gadai's real name has not been unknown, but his estimated date of birth is 806/1403-1404. Only one copy of his Divan has survived. At first, Gadai's Divan published by Eckmann in 1971. According to Turkish language scholar Janos Eckmann, it is said that Gadai was a mighty and powerful poet. Also, Gadai mixes up his language with archaic and Oghuz elements.

In this article, I provided information about Gadai's life and his book the *Divan*, the term of hendiadyoin (*ikileme* in Turkish). I presented various scholars' opinions and my own, concerning to the term of *hendiadyoin*. And, I analyzed *The Divān of Gadā'ī* (1971) by Janos Eckmann to identify the hendiadyoins in his book. To analyze the selected hendiadyoins, I categorized them into 4 different parts: its base of word, etymology, meaning relation, and structure. I have provided examples of hendiadyoins from the Divan to show how they can be represented based on the previously mentioned categories.

Key Words: Gadai, Chagatai, hendiadyoin, Turkish language, Central Asia.

GEDAYİ DİVANINA GÖRE ÇAĞATAYCADA İKİLEMELER

Öz

Çağatay Türkçesi (Çağatayca) 15-20. yüzyılları arasındaki İslâmî Orta Asya Türk yazı dilinin adıdır. Doğu Türkçesi de denen Çağatayca, Timurluların (1405-1502) idaresi altında Harezmi Türkçesinin (13-15. yüzyıllar) devamı olarak inkişaf etmiştir. Oğuzlar dışındaki Müslüman Türkler tarafından kullanılan bu dil, büyük bir edebiyat dili olarak tarihteki yerini almıştır.

Gedai 15. yüzyıl Çağatay edebiyatı şairlerinden biridir. Hayatı hakkında bilinenler ancak Ali Şir Nevayi'nin verdiği bilgilere dayanır. Gedai'nin gerçek adı bilinmese de 806/1403-1404 yılında doğduğu tahmin edilmektedir. Divanının tek nüshası günümüze ulaşmıştır. Bu eser ilk olarak 1971 yılında Eckmann tarafından yayımlanmıştır. Eckmann'a göre kudretli bir şair olan Gedai'nin dilinde Nevayi'de görülmeyen bazı eskicil öğeler ile Oğuzca unsurlara rastlanmaktadır.

Elinizdeki çalışma, Gedai Divanına göre Çağataycadaki ikilemelerin durumlarını ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmada Gedai'nin hayatı ve eseri hakkında bilgi verildikten sonra öncelikle ikileme terimi üzerinde durulmuştur. Çeşitli araştırmacıların terim ile ilgili görüşlerine değinilmiştir. Daha sonra terim ile ilgili kendi anlayışımız ifade edilmiştir. Bu anlayış doğrultusunda da Eckmann'ın Gedai Divanı neşri esas alınarak tespit edilen ikilemeler çeşitli açılardan incelenmiştir. Divandaki ikilemeler ikilemeyi oluşturan kelimelerin türlerine, kökenlerine (etimolojilerine), anlam ilişkilerine ve yapı özelliklerine göre olmak üzere dört ana başlık altında ele alınmıştır. Çalışmada her bir başlık için Divan'dan alınan örnek beyit(ler)e yer verilmiştir. Böylece konunun daha anlaşılır hâle gelmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gedai, Çağatayca, ikileme, Türk dili, Orta Asya.

* Yrd.Doç.Dr., Yıldız Technical University, TURKEY. hayrullahkahya@hotmail.com



INTRODUCTION

Chagatay language developed under the Timurids (1405-1506) and was in use from the beginning of the fifteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century as a continuation of the Karakhanid (11-13th centuries) and Khorazmian Turkic (14th century) literary languages. This literary language took its classical form especially in famous Chagatay poet Navayi's (1441-1501) works (Eckmann, 1988: 211). Eckmann, famous Turkish language scholar, categorized this language into three periods: pre-classical period (first half of the 15th century), classical period (second half of the 15th century to first half of the 16th century), and post-classical period (second half of the 16th century to end of the 19th century) (Eckmann, 1988: 215-216).

Gadai is one of the poets of the pre-classical period of Chagatai from the 15th century. Very little information is known about Gadai's life. Even his real name is unknown. He uses *Gada* as a pseudonym in his poems¹.

In fact, Navayi's research on Gadai is considered a significant source by scholars. Ali Shir Navayi calls him *Mawlana Gadai* in his biographical work, *Macālisu'n-Nafā'is*. According to Navayi's *Macālisu'n-Nafā'is* Gadai was one of the most famous poets in the Abu'l-Qāsim Babur (Timurid, 1422-1457) period. While his date of death is unknown, according to information provided by Navayi, he is estimated to have been born in 806/1403-1404 (Blochet, 1932: 117; Eckmann, 1960: 65; Eckmann, 1971: 1-2; Antoloji, 2000: 435-436; Eraslan, 2001: 120-121 and 438-439).

Gadai collected his poems in a *Divan*, the unique manuscript of which is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, France. It consists of 229 gazals, 2 qasidas, 1 mustazad, and 5 tuyugs. Some of the final pages of the *Divan* are missing. Therefore, scholars are unable to definitively determine who copied the *Divan* as well as where and when the copy was completed (Eckmann, 1971: 4).

The language in which the *Divan* of Gadai is written is Chagatai Turkish. According to Turkish language scholar Janos Eckmann, it is said that Gadai was a mighty and powerful poet. Also, he mixes up his language with archaic and Oghuz elements. These features, that are not seen in Navayi's language, are similar to that used by other poets writing in his time (Eckmann, 1960: 67; Eckmann, 1971: 5).

In spite of some scholars mentioning Gadai's name before, such as Köprülü² and Blochet³, Janos Eckmann is the first scholar to seriously mention Gadai and his *Divan* in an article written in 1960. In this article Eckmann gives some information concerning Gadai's life and includes fifty of Gadai's poems in Chagatai Turkish written in the Arabic script. After this study, in 1962, 1965 and 1967, some scholars in Uzbekistan published articles

¹ According to scholar Hofman, Gadai's choice of pen name in his poems represents an indication of his Sufi tendencies when taking into consideration the meaning of *gada* which means a servant (Hofman, 1969: 71).

² See Köprülü (1945: 293-294).

³ See Blochet (1933: 117).



concerning Gadayi. At last, in 1971, Eckmann published Gadayi's Divan. Two years later after that, in 1973, Gadayi's Divan was also published in Uzbekistan by Uzbek scholar Ahmadvocayev (Antoloji, 2000: 435).

1. WHAT IS HENDIADYOIN?

There is no consensus about the description of hendiadyoin (*ikileme*⁴ in Turkish), a word originated from the Greek language, among scholars. Çağatay describes hendiadyoin as synonyms and antonyms (Çağatay, 1942: 101). Whereas, Hatipoğlu defines it as repetition of same words, synonyms, or antonyms; it has been used in order to strengthen, intensify, or exaggerate the meaning (Hatipoğlu, 1971: 9). This definition is compatible with Korkmaz's viewpoint (Korkmaz, 1992: 82). Definition of hendiadyoin in general dictionaries and glossaries of term is the consensus with Hatipoğlu⁵. Erdem, however, claims that hendiadyoin is synonyms only. He modifies the repetition of same words or antonyms are repetition of the words (*yineleme* in Turkish) (Erdem, 2005: 194). According to Nagy, hendiadyoin is a compound of phrases that two or more words express one notion only⁶ (Nagy, 2004: 1126).

In spite of the most common opinion on hendiadyoin belongs to Hatipoğlu, I agree with Nagy's viewpoint. In addition to this viewpoint, although the hendiadyoin has been not modified; others have been modified yet. One of the reasons that hendiadyoin is a part of the science of style. In fact, the most important thing about that is two or more words express one notion only, and they help to increase the power of the meaning of sentences. And I think compound phrases created with same words are repetition of words (*tekrar* or *yineleme* in Turkish), not hendiadyoin like Erdem's viewpoint.

Hendiadyoins are an image in the language of psychological events based on association (Hatipoğlu, 1971: 25). It seems that sentences are beautified with hendiadyoins according to the nature of emotions (Tuna, 1949: 432). We encounter them in every grammatical form, such as nouns, adverbs, adjectives, verbs, etc. (Çağatay, 1942: 101).

There have been a lot of studies on hendiadyoins⁷ concluding that they could be found at every period of Turkish language history; this shows that they have been an important narrative feature in terms of lexicography and semantics (Sev, 2004: 498).

⁴ In many Turkish studies, the following terms have been used instead of hendiadyoin: *ikileme*, *yineleme*, *ikizleme*, *tekrarlama*, *koşma*, *tekrar grubu*, *katmerleme*, *reduplikasyon*, *söz koşması*, *sözcük koşması* etc. However, I prefer the term *ikileme*, which is common in many studies. Also for more information about additional terms of hendiadyoin in non-Turkish studies, consult Nagy (2004: 1126).

⁵ See *Sözlükler* in www.tdk.gov.tr (A.D. 06.12.2014)

⁶ Tuna defines repetition (*tekrar* in Turkish) similarly. Based on his works, I have found that he thinks repetition (*tekrar* in Turkish) and the hendiadyoin (*ikileme* in Turkish) are the same (Tuna, 1949: 430 vd.).

⁷ One of the oldest studies concerning the hendiadyoins in Turkish language is written by Karl Foy in 1899. In his paper, Foy analyzed the hendiadyoins in Ottoman Turkish in five different topics and also added a hendiadyoins index at the end of his article. Other many scholars, for example Çağatay (1942), Tuna (1949, 1950), Eren (1949), Marchand (1952), Ağakay (1953), Tietze (1966), Hatipoğlu (1971), Ölmez (1997), Yüce (1998), Nagy (2004: 1125-1128), Akyalçın (2007), Aktan



In this study, *The Dīvān of Gadā'ī* prepared by Janos Eckmann in 1971 was utilized in order to identify the hendiadyoins in the Gadāyī's Divan. It is possible that a hendiadyoin can be classified according to its grammatical form, purpose in the sentence, structure, meaning relation, or phonological feature⁸. Similar to Nagy's classification, I analyzed and categorized the selected hendiadyoins from the Divan into four different parts, including its base of word, etymology, meaning realitons, and structure. I have given example(s) of hendiadyoin in the Divan for each part. The first number after the samples in this article is the poem number in the Divan. The number after the colon is the couplet number in this poem.

1.1. HENDIADYOIN DEPENDING ON ITS THE WORD BASIS

1.1.1. VERB-BASED HENDIADYOIN⁹

oynap külüp¹⁰ “playing and laughing” 12:2

Halk huş gülgeşt éterler gonça tég oynap külüp

Künc-î mihnattur dağı mén yıǵlayu hasrat bile

1.1.2. NOUN-BASED HENDIADYOIN

yazı yābān¹¹ “flatland, desert” 117:6

İt kibi mundağ yürütken yazı yābānda ménî

Tınmayın ol ikki şūh āhū qarākıñdur seniñ

1.2. HENDIADYOIN DEPENDING ON ITS THE ETYMOLOGY

1.2.1. Both of them are Turkish

yaḥşı yaman¹² “good and bad” 73:7

Şükr eyle şekve yaḥşı yamandın nédür Gedā

Taḥkīk érür çü her né ki kılsa Hudā kıılır

éy vay “alas!” 155:4

Éy vay ki bu tınmağur u kanlı yaşımđın

Fāş oldı ulus qaşıda asrār-ı nihānım

1.2.2. Both of them are non-Turkish

ārī balī¹³ “yes indeed” 5:1

‘Umr sén ārī balī kim ‘umrdın kélmes vafā

Hūş körünmeydür dağı bir yolu anvā'-ı cafā

1.3. HENDIADYOIN DEPENDING ON ITS THE MEANING RELATIONS

1.3.1. SYNONYMOUS HENDIADYOIN

(2010), Akyaçın (2014) etc., have addressed this issue. Also there are a lot of valuable studies prepared by respected researchers about the hendiadyoins. But, unfortunately, we cannot list all of them here.

⁸ See Foy (1899), Hatipoğlu (1971: 28-60), Çağatay (1942: 105-117), Tuna (1949-1950).

⁹ Transcription of the examples in this study belongs to me, not to Eckmann.

¹⁰ For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1128).

¹¹ For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1129).

¹² For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1129).

¹³ For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1130).



tinmadı tayanmadı¹⁴ “He did not repose” 137:4

Nār yañaqıñ né ‘acāyıb şam‘ érür kim tábına

Tinmadı tayanmadı parvāna tég hayrān köñül

yandım örtendim kül oldum “I extremely burned, turned the ashes” 104:1

Tā felek saldı méni ol közi otluqđın yıraq

Yandım örtendim kül oldum gúşşada baştın ayaq

1.3.2. ANTONYMOUS HENDIADYOIN

kéçe kündüz¹⁵ “day and night” 23:6

Ay yüzüñdin munfa‘ıl ger bolmadı kökte kuyaş

Pas nédindür kéçe kündüz sarğarıp bu ıztırāb

1.4. HENDIADYOIN DEPENDING ON ITS STRUCTURE

1.4.1. Some hendiadyoins have been modified. For example, word positioning in the hendiadyoin might be different:

nétti né boldı¹⁶ “What’s up? What’s going on?” 41:5

Baqmas dağı köñülğa qaşñ bir köz uçıdın

Nétti né boldı her néçe ‘ālī-canāb érür

né boldı nétti “What’s up? What’s going on?” 22:7

Néçe kim çektim saçıñ yañlıq parīşān-ħāllıq

Sormadıñ bir kim né boldı nétti darħānım saña

neylesün nétsün “only that” 77:7

Bulbul-ı gūyā mışılığ sayramay miskīn Gadā

Neylesün nétsün seniñ tég çün gül-i ra‘nāsı bar

ne tadbīr eylesün nétsün “only that” 186:5

Munuñ dék çün musalsal sunbuluñ tolğaş u darhamdur

Né tadbīr eylesün nétsün bégim bolmay köñül gümrāh

1.4.2. Some hendiadyoins might be created by using Persian conjunction *u/ū* between the words. These words do not have to be based from Persian language:

él u ulus “all people” 37:6

Bu şamāyıl birle ger sēn atlanıp çıksañ bu kün

Qalmağay él u ulusğa zarraī parvā-yı ‘īd

barr u baħr “land and sea, everywhere” 33:7

Gerçi yoqtur körk içinde sēn bigin sulţān bégim

Barr u baħr içre meniñ tég bir Gadā bolğay mu hīç

1.4.3. Some hendiadyoins might have been created with more than two words:

mıħnat u dard u ‘azāb “disconsolateness and pain and torture” 65:7

¹⁴ For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1128 and 1130).

¹⁵ For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1131).

¹⁶ For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1132).



Miskîn Gedānı mihnat u dard u ‘azābda

Hıcrān dam-ā-dam öltüredür, bu né hāl érür

guşsa u dard u balā u ranc u mihnat “sorrow and pain and trouble and toil and disconsolateness” 70:3

Furqatıñniñ davlatındın ménde asbāb-ı țarāb

Ğussa u dard u balā u ranc u mihnat barı bar

1.4.4. Only the second word in the hendiadyoin might be taken the inflectional suffix: **ay u illar**¹⁷ “moon and years; very long time” 150:4

Ay u illar her néçe kim sén méni sađınmasañ

Hātırımda yüz u zulfuñ yādıdır bu munça ihtarām

Conclusion

There is no consensus amongst scholars about the description and naming of hendiadyoin. Although there are a lot of terms used in place of *hendiadyoin*, I prefer the common term *ikileme*. Some scholars claim that the hendiadyoin consists of only synonyms. Others describe hendiadyoins in terms of both synonyms and antonyms. Others add to this definition saying that it can also be a repetition of the same words. Some think that a hendiadyoin is a compound of phrases that reflects only one notion.

The most common viewpoint about the hendiadyoin is that it can be a repetition of words, synonyms, or antonyms. However, like Nagy, I believe that a hendiadyoin is a compound of phrases, consisting of different words representing only one notion. This does not mean that compound phrases created with the same words can also be classified as a hendiadyoin. I agree with Erdem’s argument that compound phrases created with the same words would instead be classified as repetition (*tekrar* or *yineleme* in Turkish). Also I think that all of the hendiadyoins have been altered because they are part of the science of style. Hendiadyoin has a lot of different features, but the most important thing about the hendiadyoin is that it must add a sense of exaggeration to a sentence and that it is more than 1 word representing one notion.

In this study, I have examined the hendiadyoins from the Divan and grouped them into 4 different parts: its base of word, etymology, meaning relation, and structure. I have revealed that some hendiadyoins in the Divan are verb-based or noun-based; others are completely composed of Turkish words, non-Turkish words; some are synonyms or antonyms; some have their word positioning altered; some use the Persian conjunction *u/ü*; some have consisted of more than two words, sometimes with only the second word in the hendiadyoin having the inflectional suffix.

Bibliography

¹⁷ For other Chagatai examples at the same structure see Nagy (2004: 1132).



- AĞAKAY, M. A. (1953), “İkizlemeler üzerine”, *Türk Dili*, V. 2/16, p. 189-191; V. 2/17, p. 268-271, Ankara.
- AĞAKAY, M. A. (1954), “Türkçede Kelime Koşmaları”, *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı*, p. 97-104.
- AKTAN, B. (2010), “Dîvânu Lugâti’t-Türk’ün Söz Varlığında Yer Alan İkilemeler”, *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, V. 28, p. 1-12.
- AKYALÇIN, N. (2007), *Türkçe İkilemeler Sözlüğü (Tanıklı)*, Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- AKYALÇIN, N. (2014), “Evaluation in Relation to Structure and Meaning Properties of Turkish Reduplication”, *International Journal of Language Academy*, V. 2/2, p. 183-194.
- ANTOLOJİ (2000), “Gedaî”, *Başlangıcından günümüze kadar Türkiye dışındaki Türk edebiyatları antolojisi (nesir-nazım)*, *Özbek edebiyatı I*, V. 14, p. 435-439, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları (<http://ekitap.kulturturizm.gov.tr/Eklenti/12043,gedaipdf.pdf?0> A.D. 10.12.2014).
- BLOCHET, E. (1932-1933), *Catalogue des Manuscrits Turcs*, V. 1-2, Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale.
- ÇAĞATAY, S. (1942), *Uygurcada Hendiadyoinlar*, (Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi yıllık çalışmaları dergisi 1. sayısının Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı bölümünden ayrı basım), p. 97-145, İstanbul: Cumhuriyet Matbaası.
- ECKMANN, J. (1960), “Çağatay Dili Örnekleri II Gedai Divanından Parçalar”, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, V. 10, p. 65-110, İstanbul.
- ECKMANN, J. (1971), *The Dîvân of Gadā’î*, Indiana University Publications, Uralic&Altaic Series, V. 113, United States of America.
- ECKMANN, J. (1988), *Çağatayca, Tarihi Türk Şiveleri*, (tr.Mehmet Akalın), p. 211-245, Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- EMRE, A. C. (1945), “Yineleme, İkizleme, Katmerleme”, *Türk Dilbilgisi*, p. 541-548, İstanbul.
- ERASLAN, K. (haz.) (2001), *Alî-Şîr Nevayî – Mecâlisü’n-Nefâyis*, V. I (Giriş ve Metin), V. II (Çeviri ve Notlar), Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- ERDEM, M. D. (2005), “Harezmi Türkçesinde İkilemeler ve Yinelemeler Üzerine”, *Bilig*, V. 3, p. 189-225.
- EREN, H. (1949), “İkiz Kelimelerin Tarihi Hakkında”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, V. 7/2, p. 283-286, Ankara.



- ERGİN, M. (2006), “Tekrarlar”, *Türk Dil Bilgisi*, p. 377-379, İstanbul: Bayrak Basım/Yayın/Tanıtım.
- FOY, K. (1899), “Studien zur Osmanischen Syntax, I. Das Hendiadyoin und die Wortfolge *ana baba*”, *Sonderabdruck aus den Mittheilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen* (MSOS), V. 2, p. 105-136, Berlin: Gedruckt in der Reichsdruckerei.
- HATİPOĞLU, V. (1971), *İkileme*, Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- HOFMAN, H. F. (1969), “Gadā”, *Turkish Literature A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*, Section III, Part I, V. 3: D-I, p. 71-73, Utrecht: The Library of the University of Utrecht.
- KÖPRÜLÜ, F. (1945), “Çağatay Edebiyatı”, *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, V. III, p. 270-323, İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- MARCHAND, H. (1952), “Alliteration, Ablaut und Reim in den Türkischen Zwillingsformen”, *Oriens*, V. 5/1, p. 60-69, Leiden: Brill.
- NAGY, É. K. (2004), “Bir Taşla İki Kuş... Çağataycada Hendiadyoin”, V. Uluslararası Türk Dil Kurultayı (20-26 Eylül), p. 1125-1136, Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu.
- ÖLMEZ, M. (2003), “Çağataycadaki Eskiçil Ögeler Üzerine”, *Mustafa Canpolat Armağanı: Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Sempozyumu*, Ankara: Sanat Kitabevi.
- ÖLMEZ, M. (1998), “Eski Uyguca *odug sak* İkilemesi Üzerine”, *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, V. 8, p. 35-47.
- ÖLMEZ, Z. K. (1997), “Kutadgu Bilig’de İkilemeler (1)”, *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı*, V. 7, p. 19-40.
- ÖLMEZ, Z. K. (1998), “Kutadgu Bilig’de İkilemeler (2)”, *60. Doğum Yılı Dolayısıyla Klaus Köhrborn Armağanı*, p. 237-264.
- SEV, G. (2004), “Divanü Lügati’t Türk’te İkilemeler”, *Türk Dili Dergisi*, V. 634, p. 497-511, Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- TİETZE, A. (1966), “Reduplikasyon ve (r) ile Kurulmuş Çift Sözler”, *Reşit Rahmeti Arat İçin*, p. 423-429, Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- TUNA, O. N. (1949), “Türkçede Tekrarlar”, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, V. 3/2-3, p. 429-447, İstanbul.
- TUNA, O. N. (1950), “Türkçede Tekrarlar 2”, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi*, V. 4/1-2, p. 35-82, İstanbul.
- YILDIZ, H. (2011), “Divân-ı Hikmet’te İkilemeler Üzerine”, *Uluslararası Sosyal ve Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi*, V. 1, p. 41-46.
- YÜCE, N. (1998), “İkilemelerdeki İlginç Problemler”, *60. Doğum Yılı Dolayısıyla Klaus Köhrborn Armağanı*, p. 419-447, İstanbul.



AKADEMİK BAKIŞ DERGİSİ
Sayı: 51 Eylül – Ekim 2015
Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi
ISSN:1694-528X İktisat ve Girişimcilik Üniversitesi, Türk Dünyası
Kırgız – Türk Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Celalabat – KIRGIZİSTAN
<http://www.akademikbakis.org>



www.tdk.gov.tr (A.D. 06.12.2014)