



Word Order in Reporting Clauses

Aktarma Tümcelerinde Sözcük Dizilişi

Emre Türkmen¹ 



ABSTRACT

The reporting clauses convey thoughts or statements in different forms with quotations included. In traditional grammar, these sentences are classified under nested compound sentence structures, and the quotations and metaphrases correspond to the reported clause. The reporting clause is the whole sentence that includes the reported clause combined with the predicate of the main sentence. The present study claims that it is immensely possible to trace the examples of reporting clauses in the same order and comprising a differing number of components through the historical texts in Turkish. It mainly focuses on and aims to point out the similar structures constituting reporting clauses in Turkish. For this purpose, various examples of reporting clauses in two different word order patterns such as object-verb, subject-verb-object are extracted and examined from three widely known historical texts in Turkish: Kutadgu Bilig, Dede Korkut Stories, and The Campaign Narrative of Tiryaki Hasan Pasha. Undoubtedly, the word order of reporting clauses in Turkish is not restricted to these two orders. In order to draw a more vivid depiction of the phenomenon this paper is based on the multiple forms of reporting clauses, yet limits itself to these two word orders. As a result, this study provides a detailed description of word order phenomena of similar structures in the aforementioned sources, which were written in different epochs and fields of Turkish literature. In this sense, this study serves to improve our understanding of the broader range of issues around word order in reporting clauses.

Keywords: Syntax, word order, reporting clause, reported clause, quotation

ÖZET

Aktarma tümceleri, düşünülene ya da söyleneni içerdikleri alıntılar ile çeşitli biçimlerde aktaran tümcelerdir. Geleneksel dil bilgisinde iç içe birleşik cümle yapısına karşılık gelen bu tümcelerdeki alıntılar, aktarılan tümce; aktarılan tümcenin ana cümle yüklemine bağlanmış şekli de aktarma tümcisidir. Bu çalışma Türkçenin benzer dizilişteki aktarma tümcesi örneklerini tarihî metinlerinde belirlemenin mümkün olduğu ve bu örneklerin sürdürülebilir olduğu iddiasını taşır. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmada aktarma tümcesi kuruluşlarında benzer üyeli dizilimlere dikkat çekilmekte, Türkçenin aktarma tümcesi üretiminde izlediği benzer yapıların gösterilmesi hedeflenmektedir. Bu hedef doğrultusunda *Kutadgu Bilig*, *Dede Korkut* ve *Tiryâki Hasan Paşa Gazavâtı* gibi Türkçenin farklı saha ve dönem metinlerinden sırasıyla iki unsurlu Nesne + Yüklem [NY], üç unsurlu Özne + Yüklem + Nesne [ÖYN] dizilişleri ile bir sınırlamaya gidilerek söz dizim temelinde benzerlik gösteren tümce örnekleri ortaya konmaya çalışılmıştır. Elbette ki Türkçe aktarma tümcesi üretimi bu iki diziliş ile sınırlı değildir. Ayrıntılı bir inceleme ve detaylandırma hedefiyle çalışma iki farklı diziliş ile sınırlandırılmış, örneklerin belirlenmesinde nitel araştırma yöntemlerinden doküman incelemesi yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Sonuç olarak bu çalışma, Türkçenin farklı saha ve dönem metinlerindeki eserlerinden belirlenen benzer söz dizimsel özelliklerin ayrıntılı bir incelemesini sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sözdizimi, sözcük dizilişi, aktarma tümcesi, aktarılan tümce, alıntı

¹Res. Assist. PhD. Karadeniz Technical University, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Graduate Institute of Social Sciences, Trabzon, Türkiye

ORCID: E.T. 0000-0001-8823-1310

Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:

Emre Türkmen,
Karadeniz Technical University, Department of Turkish Language and Literature, Graduate Institute of Social Sciences, Trabzon, Türkiye
E-mail: emreturkmen@ktu.edu.tr

Submitted/Başvuru: 16.10.2023

Revision Requested/Revizyon Talebi: 15.11.2023

Last Revision Received/Son Revizyon: 29.11.2023

Accepted/Kabul: 05.12.2023

Published Online/Online Yayın: 27.12.2023

Citation/Atf: Türkmen, E. (2023). Word order in reporting clauses. *TUDED*, 63(2), 655-665.
<https://doi.org/10.26650/TUDED2023-1189961>



1. Introduction

One of the foundational means to understand the functioning of language is to discover how speaker-agent and hearer-recipient communicate through the use of sentences. What one tries to express also shapes the constituent structures in one's utterances. A sentence, by which we may express various feelings or thoughts, may also be used to report previously uttered sentences. Reporting clauses are one such example of these constructions. In Turkish, it is possible to trace the similar word order patterns in reporting clauses. The study aims to show the examples of reporting clauses in the same order and comprising a differing number of components through the analyses and scrutiny of various carefully selected historical texts. Hereby, the main question is whether or not historical samples and contemporary standard Turkish exhibit identical patterns of reporting clauses. In this way, it aims to show that examples are sustainable from historical texts to the present. Since the primary purpose of the present study is to clarify and articulate the construction of the reporting clause through historicity in the Turkish language, in such context, it will be applied to syntactic analysis in the framework of the diachronic linguistic method. As a result of the review, the reporting clause is not an alien origin construction, and its syntactic variety is also sustainable in Turkish.

In section 2, I will mention the definitional foundations of the reporting clause. In section 3.1, I will describe the methodology used in the historical comparison. In section 3.2., I will analyze the word order variation in report clauses in Turkish historical contexts. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Definitional Foundations

A reporting clause is a type of mixed-construction sentence which reports some utterance or thought in various ways. The quote or conveyed clause is called the reported clause in these sentences. A reporting clause is composed of the main sentence that is constructed with the *verbum dicendi* and a statement or a phrase functioning as a nested sentence in the main sentence, or a quotation and a full statement serving the same function. In other words, a reporting clause is as a whole in which it is positioned internally to the reported clause (e.g. "Kim bilir?" dedi ihtiyar ["Who knows?" said old men] KK: 326). In Turkish linguistic studies, there are various classifications about a sentence such as structure, meaning, and construction. Thereby, the basic sentence and compound sentence remain types of sentences according to their structure, and the reporting clause is defined in traditional studies as a nested compound (i.e., a clause in a clause) which is a kind of compound sentence. In other words, traditional studies recognize reporting clauses as nested compound sentences. Reporting clauses have been labelled as internal sentences, being introduced to the main clause via certain verbs, and being flanked with quotation marks under the title of the nested compound sentences (see, for example, Ergin 2013; Özkan & Sevinçli 2013).

According to Erguvanlı (1984, p. 72), there are three types of embedded clauses in terms of their surface properties: morphologically marked embedded clause, syntactically marked

embedded clause, and embedded clause neither syntactically nor morphologically marked. According to this view, we can define a reported clause (i.e., conveyed clause) in two ways, syntactically marked and neither syntactically nor morphologically marked in Turkish. For example:

- (1) Ali “*Ne zaman Trabzon’a gel-ecek-sin?*” **diye** sor-du.
Ali when Trabzon-DAT come-FUT-2SG **saying** ask-PST
“When will you come to Trabzon” asked Ali.
- (2) Ali di-yor **ki** “*Ne zaman Trabzon-a gel-ecek-sin?*”
Ali say-PROG **that** when Trabzon-DAT come-FUT-2SG
Ali says that “When will you come to Trabzon?”
- (3) Ali, “*Ne zaman Trabzon’a gel-ecek-sin?*” de-di.
Ali when Trabzon-DAT come-FUT-2SG say-PST
Ali said, “When will you come to Trabzon?”

In examples (1) and (2), the reported clauses are syntactically marked by subordinating particles of *diye* and *ki*. Whereas (3) involves a reported clause neither syntactically nor morphologically marked.

Furthermore, in some syntactic accounts reporting clauses in Turkish have been discussed as a phenomenon of direct speech and indirect speech dichotomy (Arslantaş 2002; Kornfilt 1997; Özmen 2004, 2008, 2016; Sözer 2004). According to Coşar (1997, 2006), a reporting clause is a type of a mixed construction. She analyzes reporting clauses in terms of their syntactic constituency. Lastly, Türkmen (2018) examines reporting clauses regarding terminology, definition, and classification. He analyzes reporting clauses by compiling them from the historical Turkish texts according to their syntactic features.

However, in recent years, the subject of reported speech has emerged from different methodological approaches such as literary theory, semantics, pragmatics, linguistic philosophy, linguistic theory, and discourse studies (Clift & Holt 2006, p. 2; Holt 2009, p. 190).

I think that the label of reporting clause is more functional than the label of a nested compound sentence which is commonly used in Turkish grammar. The term of nested compound sentence marks at least two sentences that are interwoven. On the other hand, the term of reporting clause is related to the mixed construction of interwoven sentences. It, therefore, focuses on the parts of this construction and how these constituents relate to the main verb. The quotation, which is accepted as the internal sentence, is nested in a compound sentence, and it may not

always be a feature of the full member sentence.¹ Thus, different from the studies which give examples of reporting clauses under the title of a nested compound sentence or direct and indirect speech, I accepted the term of reporting clause. Since a reporting clause can be constructed with different types of sentences and a conveyed clause can be a constituent of a reporting clause, so that remains a powerful motivation for me to prefer the term of reporting clause in this paper.

For Coulmas (1986, p. 14), some languages have several different ways of indicating whether a given report is direct or indirect: tense, mood, complementizer, and word order. In Turkish, there are also differences between direct and indirect quotes in terms of complementizer as follows:

- (1) Ali, “*Hastayım*” dedi.
Ali ill: 1SGP say: PST
Ali said, “I am ill.”

- (2) Ali *hasta olduğunu* söyledi.
Ali be ill: NOM-3SGPOSS-ACC say:PST
Ali said (that) he was ill.

The above examples include direct and indirect reporting clauses respectively. The inner sentence in the first example uses the first person singular suffix for the predicate, whereas the predicate in the second example is differentiated by a nominalization suffix and a third person singular possessive suffix. Despite differences in form, both clauses convey the same message (as also observed in Li 1986, p. 29).

Furthermore, the topic of word order has been widely discussed in literature. Erguvanlı-Taylan (2018) categorizes the research on this subject into three approaches: theoretical, functional, and prosodic. According to her definitions (2018, p. 3), the progressive structure of the sentence and the syntactic rules governing these structures determine word order in the theoretical approach. In the functional approach, word order is determined by functional and pragmatic factors, and the order reflects information structure. Additionally, the prosodic structure is an essential factor in word order, and word order cannot be fully analyzed without taking into account prosodic features in the prosodic approach. The study aims to demonstrate similar reporting clause sequences in various historical texts from a diachronic perspective, so the functional approach will be adopted rather than others.

1 I can exemplify this feature in the following sentence which is taken from Dede Korkut Stories:

<i>Ayağ-ı-nun</i>	<i>sin-duğ-ı-nı</i>	kimse-ye	di-me-di. (DK D242/8)
leg:3SGPOSS-GEN	break:NOM-3SGPOSS-ACC	no one:DAT	tell:NEG-PST

‘He told no one that his leg was broken.’ (Lewis 1974, p. 155)

For Li (1986, p. 29), a direct quote is often placed between the subject and the verb of saying in verb-final languages. In addition, Turkish generally adheres to a canonical subject-object-verb word order. In contrast, SOV order can vary in the construction of reporting clauses. Especially in some of examples reporting clause, the direct object can be post-verbal position. Former studies mostly defined this as “scrambling”. According to Akan (2009, p. 1-2), scrambling is defined as free word order by Ross (1967)², and is seen as a result of totally optional movement operations by some linguists and a result of certain obligatory movement operations by some others. The present analysis will examine such sentences in terms of their information structural status as focus and backgrounding.

3. Analyzing The Word Order In Reporting Clauses In Turkish Historical Texts

3.1. The Methodology

I focused on the examples of reporting clauses in the historical texts (in two different word order patterns which are Object-Verb (OV) and Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) where it is observed that the conveyed clause joins the main sentence as a constituent of the main verb. Document analysis, as one of the qualitative methods, was used to investigate the reporting clauses in this paper. The historical texts which are a kind of translation or related to translation were excluded from the sample. In the beginning, reporting clause instances were checked to see whether they were found in Orkhon Inscriptions. After that, four examples of reporting clauses were chosen from the historical texts KB, DK, and THG, and were also analyzed to show the characteristics of some reporting clause examples. The examples are cited in the paper with their original spelling as found in their corresponding texts. In addition to using boldface for the verbs, which are the main verb of reporting clause, the conveyed clauses are italicized for ease of reference.

3.2. The Analysis

Reporting clauses in Turkish historical texts were handled in former studies. Özmen (2004) analyzes direct speech which is formed with the verb *ay-* in *Kutadgu Bilig* and *Divanü Lügati 'l-Türk*. He mentions that the main sentence, which is formed with the verb *ay-* in direct speech, comes before the reported clause which is an object of the verb *ay-* unlike canonical word order. In his paper “Türkçede Dolaysız Anlatım” [Direct speech in Turkish], Özmen (2008) states that direct speech is used in every period and field (Old Turkic, Karakhanid Turkish, Old Anatolian Turkish, Ottoman Turkish, and Turkish). In this sense, examples of the reporting clause in Turkish are possible to trace, but this study is restricted to word order phenomena in reporting clauses.

The first examples of the reporting clause in Turkish were in the oldest written records in Turkish (Tekin 1997, p. 7), i. e. the Orkhon inscriptions.³ Reporting clauses in the Orkhon

2 Özsoy (2019, p. 1) mentioned that Ross held the scrambling to be an optional stylistic movement rule.

3 The reason why I investigate reporting clause in Orkhon inscriptions is that I think it will be convenient to

inscriptions and Tonyukuk inscription⁴ were constructed employing the verb of *ti-* (see 4 a-b-c). However, in the Tonyukuk inscription, there is a reporting clause in which the verbs *ay-*⁵ and *ti-*⁶ are used together (see 4d).

- (4) a. *bunça işig küçüg birtükgerü sakinmatı türük bodun ölüreyin urugsıratayın tir ermiş* (KT E10)

“(The Chinese), without taking into consideration the fact that (the Turkish people) have given their services so much (to the Chinese), said: ‘We shall kill and exterminate the Turkish people’.” (Tekin 1997, p. 265)

b. *türük kara kamağ bodun ança timiş illig bodun ertim ilim amtı kanı kemke ilig kazganur men tir ermiş kaganlıg bodun ertim kaganım kanı ne kaganka işig küçüg birür men tir ermiş ança tip tabgaç kaganka yağı bolmuş* (BK E8-9)

“Then, the Turkish common people apparently said as follows: ‘We used to be a people who had an (independent) state. Where is our own state now? For whose benefit are we conquering these lands?’ they said. ‘We used to be a people who had its own kagan. Where is our own kagan now? To which kagan are we giving our services?’ they said. By talking in this way (among themselves), they again became hostile to the Chinese emperor.” (Tekin 1997, p. 264)

c. *ol üç kagan ögleşip altun yış üze kawışalım temiş* (T E3)

“These three kagans apparently consulted together and said: ‘Let us come together at the Alai mountains.’” (Tekin 1997, p. 285)

d. *bilge toñukuka, baña aydı bo süg èlet tedi kıyınıg köñlünçe ay ben saña ne ayayın tedi kelir erser körü kelür kelmez erser tılg sawıg alı olor tedi* (T N7-8)

“He ordered me, Bilge Tonyukuk, (as follows): ‘Lead this army!’ he said, ‘Give the judgments according to your own conscience. What (else) shall I say to you?’ he said, ‘If the enemy comes, a trick can be planned, If they do not come, then stay there (quietly) getting messages and information about the enemy.’” (Tekin 1997, p. 287)

Reported clauses in (4d) are surrounded by the verbs *ay-* and *tê-*. As also observed in Özmen (2004, p. 75), this kind of construction in reporting clauses in Turkish is widely used in Old

investigate these clauses from a diachronic point of view.

- 4 It is a memorial to Tonyukuk, the great Turkish statesman and commander, found in the same territory, about 300 kilometers to east of the two Orkhon inscriptions (Tekin 1997, p. 10).
- 5 Clauson (1972, p. 266) defines the verb of *ay-* as following: (i) Intrans. ‘to speak’; (ii) ‘to say, declare, prescribe (something *Acc.*); (ii) ‘to say’ with the words said in *oratio recta*. There is little difference of meaning between *ay-*, *te-* and *sözle-*, but any rate in the earliest period *ay-* seems to be to some extent honorific, while the others are not.
- 6 Clauson (1972, p. 433) defines the verb of *ti-* as following: specifically, ‘to say’, not ‘to speak’, which is *ay-* or *sözle-*; in the early period necessarily accompanied by words in *oratio recta*.

Anatolian Turkish (e.g. in DK). THG, which is dated XVII century in Ottoman Turkish, also has same clauses (Respectively, the verb *eyit-*, reporting clause, and the verb *de-*). For example:

- (5) *Begil aydur: Görklüm atdan düşdüm, ayağum sindi dedi.* (DK D242/12-13)
 Begil speak:PRS beautiful:1SGPOSS horse:ABL fall:1SGPST leg:1SGPOSS
 break:PST say:PST
 “Begil replied, ‘My beautiful one, I fell from my horse and broke my leg’” (Lewis 1974, p. 155)
- (6) *Ol eyitdi emir sultanumuñdur dedi* (THG 7ba/8)
 He speak:PST command sultan:1SGPOSS-GEN-COP say:PST
 “‘The command is of my Sultan’, he said.”

The above quotes in (5-6) (*Görklüm atdan düşdüm, ayağum sindi* ‘My beautiful one, I fell from my horse and broke my leg’ and *emir sultanumuñdur* ‘The command is of my Sultan’.) are in between the verbs of *ay-/eyit-*, and the verb of *di-*. Such examples are not found in contemporary standard Turkish. Respectively the verb *ay-*, the reported clause which follows on the verb *ay-* and the verb *ti-* is explained with different approaches in former studies. According to Özmen (2004, p. 75), *ay-* and *ti-* are used together for emphasis. In time, this usage also leads to drop the verb *eyit-*. On the other hand, Daşdemir (2000, p. 736) considers it is grammatically incorrect. He mentions that this type of usage emerges because of the concern of emphasizing that the reported words do not belong to the narrator and reminding the owner of the reported words. Despite different views, both points seem reasonable. However, I think in cases where there is more than one reported clause, using a second reported verb may be a reason to eliminate the ambiguity of who is speaking in these texts.

Besides the first examples of reporting clauses, similar constructions will attract significant attention when focusing on the reporting clause. It will therefore be seen that there are the same order patterns of OV and SVO that can be realized in different historical texts of Turkish.

- (7) a. *Şökli Melikden adam geldi, Kazan Bigüñ hatını kankiñuzdur dedi* (DK D51/10-11)
 Şökli King:ABL man come:PST Kazan Prince:GEN wife:3SGPOSS which:2PL-COP
 ask:PST
 “King Şökli’s man came and asked, ‘Which of you is the wife of Prince Kazan?’” (Lewis 1974, p. 50)
- b. *emir sultanumuñdur dediler* (THG 27a/1)
 command sultan:1SGPOSS-GEN-COP say:PST-3PL
 “‘The command is of my Sultan.’ (they) said.”

Both reported and reporting clauses have two significant elements in (7a). The conveyed clause (*Kazan Bigün hatunı kankıñuzdur* ‘Which of you is the wife of Prince Kazan’) in (7a) is an object of the verb *di-* which originates from the verb *ti-* (Tietze 2002, p. 571). Noteworthy, the main verb *di-* in (7a) is also associated with the meaning of the verb *sor-* (to ask). Also, it is a sentence that has a subject and verb. Similar to conveyed clause, a reporting clause has two elements, but it differs from conveyed clause with regards to the arguments of the sentence.

(7b) is a reporting clause that consists of the object and the verb. There is also a conveyed clause (*emir sultanumuñdur* ‘The command is of my Sultan’) which is the object of the verb *de-*. The conveyed clause is also a two-element clause, which are the subject and the predicate.

There are striking similarities between (7a) and (7b) in terms of the word order. It can be said that both are two-argument reporting clauses containing a two-argument quote. Both of the reported clauses in (7a) and (7b) precede the main clause verb. Being in the immediately preverbal positions, their information structural status is the focus.⁷

(8) a. *özüm aydı sözle sözün barı tök* (KB 195)

self:1SGPOSS say:PST tell:IMP word:GEN all:3SGPOSS pour:IMP

‘I said to myself, ‘Let your words pour forth!’’ (Dankoff 1983, p. 46)

b. *Herkes derlerdi acaba şenligün aslı nedür niye olur* (THG 27a/2)

everyone say-PL-PST why celebration:GEN reason:3SGPOSS what:COP why happen:PRS

Everyone said, ‘‘What is the underlying reason of this celebration and why does it happen now’’

It is seen that SVO occurs in (8a) and (8b), unlike the canonical word order in Turkish. (as also observed in Özmen 2004). (8a) which is a three-element reporting clause in which the quote serves as the object of the main verb *ay-*. (8b) is an object of the reporting verb *de-*.

The word order in (8a) and (8b) is SVO. The reported clauses both in (8a) and (8b) follow the main clause. Based on their linear position, it can be concluded that these post-verbal clauses are backgrounds in terms of their information structural status.⁸ Furthermore, there is a construction in the semantic roles of agent – transmitter (subject), the act of say (verb), and source (object).

7 Erguvanlı (1984, p. 72) acknowledged three major syntactic positions, each of which corresponding to a certain information structural status. Three major syntactic positions are as followings:

i) Sentence-initial (Topic)

ii) Immediately preverbal (Focus)

iii) Post-predicate (Backgrounding)

8 De Vries (2006) has examined that the properties of and structure of reported direct speech in Dutch. According to his own proposal, the quote-final construction is fundamentally different from sentence-initial and discontinuous.

4. Conclusion

From the analysis that was carried out throughout this paper, the finding clearly shows that the same order of constituents from different periods of historical texts in Turkish can be observed through the reporting clause. I can conclude that the first instances of reporting clauses are found in Orkhon Turkic. It means that reporting clauses are not alien origin constructions in Turkish.

Besides, reporting clauses constructed with the verb *ay-* and *ti-* together (such as in TN7-8, DK D242/12-13, and THG 7ba/8) are not sustainable in current Turkish. Finally, such clauses could be found in the XVII century in Turkish (such as in THG).

From the findings obtained from examining two-word order patterns in Turkish, reporting clauses support the claim that these are the same constructions in terms of syntax. For example, the word order of SVO in reporting clauses can powerfully be found both in Kutadgu Bilig and The Campaign Narrative of Tiryaki Hasan Pasha.

Also, the internal syntax of reporting clauses exhibits various interesting properties. It was found that reporting clauses, which essentially consist of three-element SVO may be varied in terms of constituents of the quote. In these kinds of mixed constructions, the reported clause that joins to the main sentence as an object can vary with both the number of the sentence and the part of a sentence.

Unlike the canonical word order of Turkish, I can conclude that SVO is used in reporting clauses. This kind of inversion construction should not be interpreted as being due to stylistic use. It can be explained by the priority given to the act of reporting rather than to the content of the message being conveyed. One may argue that such an inversion takes place because of pragmatic conditions. Thus, we should consider the pragmatic function concerning syntactic position.

To recapitulate, the finding of this paper regarding the word order of the reporting clause shows that the order of constituents in Turkish syntax can be immensely diversified, and its variety can also be preserved to remain sustainable.

Acknowledgements: I am deeply grateful to Mark de Vries for his generous help and critical comments on an earlier draft. I am also grateful to Güliz Güneş for her contribution in reviewing the paper.

Abbreviations

BK - Bilge Kagan (Tekin 1997)

DK - Dede Korkut Stories (Ergin 2014; Lewis 1974)

KB - Kutadgu Bilig (Arat 2006; Dankoff 1983)

KK - Kara Kitap (Pamuk 1999)

KT - Kül Tigin (Tekin 1997)

T - Tonyukuk (Tekin 1997)

THG - The Campaign Narrative of Tiryaki Hasan Pasha (Şenlik 2017)

Acknowledgements: I am deeply grateful to Mark de Vries for his generous help and critical comments on an earlier draft. I am also grateful to Güliz Güneş for her contribution in reviewing the paper.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

REFERENCES

- Akan, T. (2009). *On scrambling in Turkish*. (Unpublished MA thesis). Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Arat, R. R. (2006). *Kutadgu Bilig*. İstanbul: Kabaalçı Yayınevi.
- Arslantaş, H. (2002). Türkçede dolaylı anlatım. *Ana Dili (Dil ve Eğitim Dergisi)* (27), 46-55.
- Clauson, S. G. (1972). *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Clift, R. & Holt, E. (2006). Introduction. In E. Holt & R. Clift (Eds.), *Reporting talk: Reported speech in interaction* (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 24) (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coşar, A. M. (1997). *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın Beş Şehir adlı eserindeki cümlelerde unsur dizilişi ve kuruluş ilişkisi*. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Coşar, A. M. (2006). *Üç çay risalesi inceleme-metin-tıpkıbasım*. Trabzon: Serander Yayınları.
- Coulmas, F. (1986). Reported speech: Some general issues. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 1-28). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Daşdemir, M. (2000). *Dedem Korkut Kitabı'nın söz dizimi*. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum.
- de Vries, M. (2006). Reported direct speech in Dutch. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 23(1), 212-223.
- Ergin, M. (2013). *Türk dil bilgisi*. İstanbul: Bayrak.
- Ergin, M. (2014). *Dede Korkut kitabı-1* (9th edn). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Erguvanlı, E. E. (1984). *The function of word order in Turkish grammar* (Linguistics 106). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Erguvanlı-Taylan, E. (2018). Türkçede sözcük dizimine yeniden bir bakış. In Ü. D. Turan & H. Kopkallı Yavuz & A. Balcı (Eds.), *Dilbilimde güncel tartışmalar* (pp. 3-22). Ankara: Dilbilim Derneği Yayınları.
- Holt, E. (2009). Reported speech. In S. D'hondt & J. O. Östman, & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *The pragmatics of interaction* (Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights 4) (pp. 190-205). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish* (Descriptive Grammars). London: Routledge.
- Lewis, G. (1974). *The book of Dede Korkut*. Great Britain: Penguin Books.
- Li, Charles N. (1986). Direct speech and indirect speech: A functional study. In F. Coulmas (Ed.) *Direct and indirect speech* (pp. 29-45). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Özkan, M. & Sevinçli, V. (2013). *Türkiye Türkçesi söz dizimi* (6th edn). İstanbul: Akademik Kitaplar.
- Özmen, M. (2004). Divanü Lügati't-Türk'te ve Kutadgu Bilig'de 'aymak' fiiliyle kurulan dolaysız anlatım cümleleri üzerine. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, (14), 67-77.
- Özmen, M. (2008). Türkçede dolaysız anlatım. In Y. Çotuksöken & N. Yalçın (Eds.) *20. Ulusal Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri (12-13 Mayıs 2006)* (pp. 265-275). İstanbul: Maltepe Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Özmen, M. (2016). *Türkçenin sözdizimi* (2nd edn). Adana: Karahan Kitabevi.

- Özsoy, A. Sumru (2019), Introduction. In A. Sumru Özsoy (Ed.) *Word order in Turkish* (pp. 1-38). Cham: Springer
- Pamuk, O. (1999). *Kara Kitap* (27th edn). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Sözer, Z. (2004). *Türkçe'de dolaylı anlatım ve kimi yan cümleler*. İstanbul: Dilmer Yayınları.
- Şenlik, A. Ş. (2017). *Tiryâkî Hasan Paşa gazavât-nâmesi ve bazı filolojik notlar*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi.
- Tekin, T. (1997). *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic* (Uralic and Altaic 69). Routledge.
- Tietze, A. (2002). *Tarihi ve etimolojik Türkiye Türkçesi lügati*. İstanbul & Wien: Simurg Yayınları.
- Türkmen, E. (2018). Türkçede aktarma cümleleri üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Uluslararası Beşeri Bilimler ve Eğitim Dergisi* (4), 274-285.

