

UDC 811

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/96-1-36>**Konul Umud EYVAZOVA,***orcid.org/0009-0009-5797-2699*

Doctoral Student at the Department of Turkology

Baku State University

(Baku, Azerbaijan), *kenul.khalil93@mail.ru*

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL STUDIES IN TURKISH AND AZERBAIJANI LINGUISTICS

The article presents a descriptive and comparative analysis of scholarly studies devoted to the investigation of dialectal phraseology within Turkish and Azerbaijani linguistics. It is emphasized that, in contemporary Turkological scholarship, the study of dialect phraseology constitutes one of the most salient and methodologically relevant research domains. Although modern studies allocate considerable attention to the examination of dialectal lexis – indeed, this trajectory has frequently assumed a dominant position – the comparative and systematic study of dialect phraseology has not received adequate scholarly treatment. Furthermore, the critical evaluation of the existing academic literature in this field has largely remained beyond the central scope of analytical inquiry. This circumstance necessitates a reassessment of the issue in alignment with contemporary scientific and methodological standards.

From this perspective, the scientific novelty of the present study lies in its analytical synthesis of scholarly works dedicated to phraseological units functioning in the dialects and vernacular varieties of Turkish and Azerbaijani. The research systematizes the principal investigative directions in dialect phraseology in both languages, delineates their convergent and divergent characteristics, and provides a theoretically substantiated interpretation of their contribution to the advancement of Turkological linguistic theory.

In the main body of the article, the problem is examined along two principal vectors. First, the development of phraseology as an autonomous subdiscipline within Azerbaijani linguistics is considered, including scholarly works devoted specifically to the phraseology of dialects and vernaculars, as well as their thematic orientations and methodological paradigms. The second section addresses the principal research trajectories in Turkish dialectology and studies concerned with the phraseological systems of regional varieties, which are subjected to systematic scholarly evaluation. Within this framework, detailed consideration is given to the works of eminent Turkological scholars.

The study concludes that dialect phraseology has not been neglected within either Turkish or Azerbaijani linguistics; rather, this research domain has received a certain degree of scholarly engagement in both intellectual traditions. In Turkish linguistics, investigations have predominantly followed a trajectory of empirical documentation and practical compilation. In contrast, within Azerbaijani linguistics, this field has been developed largely within a theoretical-conceptual framework, with linguistic data interpreted from historical and comparative perspectives. The parallel examination of fixed expressions attested in the dialects of both languages may therefore be regarded as one of the priority directions of contemporary Turkological scholarship.

Key words: Turkish and Azerbaijani linguistics; dialect phraseology; areal characteristics of phraseological units; research methodologies and paradigms; scholarly discourse.

Конул Умуд ЕЙВАЗОВА,*orcid.org/0009-0009-5797-2699*

докторант кафедри тюркології

Бакінського державного університету

(Баку, Азербайджан) *kenul.khalil93@mail.ru*

ВІДМІННІ РИСИ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ У ТУРЕЦЬКОМУ ТА АЗЕРБАЙДЖАНСЬКОМУ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ

У статті представлено описовий та порівняльний аналіз наукових досліджень, присвячених дослідженню діалектної фразеології в рамках турецького та азербайджанського мовознавства. Підкреслюється, що в сучасній тюркологічній науці вивчення діалектної фразеології є однією з найважливіших та методологічно релевантних галузей дослідження. Хоча сучасні дослідження приділяють значну увагу вивченню діалектної лексики – справді, ця траєкторія часто займала домінуюче становище – порівняльне та систематичне вивчення діалектної фразеології не отримало належного наукового охоплення. Крім того, критична оцінка існуючої академічної літератури в цій галузі значною мірою залишалася поза межами центральної сфери аналітичного дослідження. Ця обставина вимагає переоцінки питання відповідно до сучасних наукових та методологічних стандартів.

З цієї точки зору, наукова новизна цього дослідження полягає в аналітичному синтезі наукових праць, присвячених фразеологічним одиницям, що функціонують у діалектах та різновидах турецької та азербайджанської

мов. У дослідженні систематизовано основні напрямки дослідження діалектної фразеології обох мов, окреслено їхні конвергентні та дивергентні характеристики, а також надано теоретично обґрунтоване тлумачення їхнього внеску в розвиток тюркологічної лінгвістичної теорії.

В основній частині статті проблема розглядається за двома основними векторами. По-перше, розглядається розвиток фразеології як автономної піддисципліни в азербайджанській лінгвістиці, включаючи наукові праці, присвячені саме фразеології діалектів та різноманіття, а також їхні тематичні орієнтації та методологічні парадигми. У другому розділі розглядаються основні траєкторії досліджень у турецькій діалектології та дослідження, пов'язані з фразеологічними системами регіональних різновидів, які підлягають систематичній науковій оцінці. У цих рамках детально розглянуто праці видатних вчених-тюркологів.

У дослідженні робиться висновок, що діалектна фразеологія не була ігнорована ні в турецькій, ні в азербайджанській лінгвістиці; радше, ця галузь досліджень отримала певний ступінь наукового залучення в обох інтелектуальних традиціях. У турецькій лінгвістиці дослідження переважно йшли шляхом емпіричної документації та практичного узагальнення. Натомість, в азербайджанській лінгвістиці ця галузь розвивалася значною мірою в теоретико-концептуальних рамках, а лінгвістичні дані інтерпретувалися з історичної та порівняльної точок зору. Паралельне вивчення фіксованих виразів, засвідчених у діалектах обох мов, тому можна вважати одним із пріоритетних напрямків сучасної тюркологічної науки.

Ключові слова: турецька та азербайджанська лінгвістика; діалектна фразеологія; ареальні характеристики фразеологічних одиниць; методології та парадигми дослідження; науковий дискурс.

Introduction. Phraseological units occupy a structurally and semantically significant position within the lexical inventory of any language and constitute one of the fundamental components of its lexical-semantic system. Contemporary theoretical and methodological approaches demonstrate that phraseological units, including fixed collocations, formulaic constructions, idiomatic expressions, and set phrases, are intrinsically linked to a community's worldview, ethnocultural value system, and traditional patterns of social existence.

These linguistic units, as products of the collective consciousness of the people, have undergone processes of stabilization and lexical fossilization over time, thereby becoming integrated into the lexical inventory of the national language. Phraseological units occupy a prominent position not only in colloquial speech and the literary language but also within dialects and vernacular varieties, where they contribute to the refinement and intensification of communicative efficacy. The articulation of thought through expressive forms generated by the speech community engenders stylistic enrichment, expands the expressive potential of the language, and renders communication more vivid and authentic. A substantial portion of these linguistic formations, emanating from the national cognitive framework, transcends the boundaries of local usage and, through increasing frequency and diffusion, gradually becomes institutionalized within the lexical structure of the literary language, ultimately assuming the status of a central communicative component.

From this perspective, in examining the lexical corpus of Turkish and Azerbaijani dialects, the formulation of a systematic scholarly approach to the functional-semantic nature of phraseological units employed in these vernaculars has been identified as one of the principal objectives of the present study.

In contemporary Turkological linguistics, the investigation of dialect phraseology is regarded as one of the most salient and methodologically pertinent research trajectories. Phraseological units formed within dialectal systems constitute significant linguistic data reflecting the historical evolution of the language, the quotidian life of the people, their worldview, and their national-cultural modes of cognition. Consequently, the study of dialect phraseology extends beyond the confines of lexical-semantic analysis and simultaneously contributes to the resolution of ethnolinguistic and linguocultural problems. Furthermore, given that phraseological units specific to dialects often function within restricted communicative domains, the processes of globalization pose a tangible risk of their marginalization or eventual obsolescence, thereby heightening the urgency and relevance of scholarly inquiry in this field.

The genetic affinity of Turkish and Azerbaijani, together with their shared historical and cultural foundations, conditions the existence of extensive parallels within their respective dialect phraseologies. The phraseological units attested in the dialects and vernacular varieties of both languages exhibit structural and semantic correspondences, while simultaneously manifesting regionally determined divergences.

Although contemporary scholarship has devoted considerable attention to the study of dialectal lexis – and, indeed, this orientation has frequently assumed a dominant position – the comparative and systematic investigation of dialect phraseology has not been accorded adequate scholarly emphasis. Moreover, the critical evaluation of the academic literature pertaining to this domain has largely remained peripheral to mainstream research agendas. This research gap necessitates the re-examination of the problem in accordance with contemporary scientific and methodological standards.

The scholarly novelty of the present research is defined by its analytical assessment of academic works dedicated to the study of phraseological units functioning within the dialects and vernacular varieties of Turkish and Azerbaijani. The study systematizes the principal research directions in dialect phraseology across both languages, delineates their convergent and divergent characteristics, and provides a theoretically substantiated interpretation of their contribution to the advancement of Turkological linguistic theory.

The methodological foundation of the study is constituted by descriptive and comparative methods, together with the analytical procedures intrinsic to these approaches. The empirical material has been compiled based on Turkish and Azerbaijani dialectological dictionaries, as well as data obtained through field research. The selected methodological framework enables an objective assessment of the distinctive characteristics and scholarly potential of works devoted to dialect phraseology.

1. The Study of Dialect Phraseology in Azerbaijani Linguistics

One of the principal indicators of a language's development is determined by the cognitive and intellectual level of its speakers; in this respect, phraseological units should be regarded as a significant parameter of that developmental process. Emerging as one of the earliest artistic manifestations of human thought, phraseological units constitute a rich reservoir that reflects the national mindset and collective mentality of a people, both structurally and semantically, as a fundamental component of literary expression. Manifesting at times in the form of word combinations and at other times as entire sentences, phraseological units, despite their figurative character, play a crucial role in ensuring clarity and euphemistic articulation of meaning.

The formation of phraseological units occurs through protracted historical stages of development. Initially possessing an occasional and context-bound character, these linguistic formations gradually acquire functional stability and become conventionalized expressions within the contemporary linguistic environment. During this process, the syntactic cohesion between the constituent components of phraseological combinations weakens, and the units evolve into indivisible semantic-syntactic wholes capable of functioning as a single syntactic constituent within the sentence. As noted in the theoretical literature: "When considered within the framework of linguistic theory, the fragmentation of the ancient Turkic language and the emergence of independent Turkic languages were accompanied by processes of differentiation and divergence within the phraseolog-

ical domain. This development, correlated with the evolution of newly formed languages, led to a partial attenuation of shared phraseological elements" (Bayramov, 1978, p. 65).

In the formation of phraseology as an autonomous branch of linguistics, the scholarly contributions of Academician Viktor Vladimirovich Vinogradov must be accorded particular recognition. The system of phraseological classification he proposed on the basis of Russian-language material continues to serve as a significant point of reference within contemporary scholarly discourse. His works *"The Fundamental Concepts of Russian Phraseology"* (1946) and *"On the Main Types of Phraseological Units in the Russian Language"* (1947) laid the theoretical foundations of the discipline. Following these two seminal studies, scholarly interest in phraseological research intensified considerably throughout the former USSR, giving rise to sustained and systematic academic inquiry in the field (Seyidov, 1992, p. 72).

In Azerbaijani linguistics, the earliest conceptual manifestations of phraseology, including the use of the term "idiomatism," may be found in the textbook *"Turkic Grammar"* (1928), co-authored by Bekir Chobanzadeh and F. Aghayev. However, systematic investigation of the phraseological system of the literary language commenced only after the 1950s.

Within Azerbaijani linguistics, the position of phraseological units in the language system, as well as the mechanisms underlying their formation and development, have been extensively examined from various perspectives by a number of distinguished scholars. Among those who have made significant contributions to this domain are Mammad Huseynzadeh, Azad Demirchizadeh, Suleyman Jafarov, Hasan Bayramov, M. Islamov, M. T. Taghiyev, F. Huseynov, N. Valiyeva, G. Yusifov, A. Hajiyeva, H. H. Bakhshiyev, N. Rahimzade, A. Gurbanov, K. Aliyev, R. Hasanov, T. Afandiyeva, A. A. Orujov, S. M. Murtuzayev, S. Mehdiyeva, R. Maharramova, B. Khalilov, and other prominent linguists whose scholarly contributions have substantially advanced the field.

One of the earliest scholarly investigations conducted in this direction found its expression in Mammad Huseynzadeh's fundamental work *"Modern Azerbaijani Language"* (1954). In this study, the author provided the initial scientific characterization of the distinctive features of phraseological units in the Azerbaijani language, thereby establishing a theoretical foundation for the subsequent development of this field (Bayramov, 2019, p. 3).

Azad Demirchizadeh, through his examination of the stylistic properties of fixed word combinations, emerged as one of the first scholars to facilitate the

functional analysis of phraseological units within Azerbaijani linguistics. His work “Stylistics of the Azerbaijani Language” is particularly noteworthy for its analytical treatment of these issues. The systematic investigation of the phraseological system of the literary language was further advanced in the works of Suleyman Jafarov, Hasan Bayramov, M. Adilov, Yagub Seyidov, Afad Gurbanov, and other distinguished linguists. These studies made substantial contributions to the scientific consolidation and theoretical elaboration of phraseology as an established subdiscipline within Azerbaijani linguistics.

Hasan Bayramov’s instructional manual “Fundamentals of Azerbaijani Phraseology” constitutes one of the most significant sources presenting a systematic account of the history of Azerbaijani phraseological studies. In this work, the author not only delineates the object of phraseological research but also provides comprehensive scholarly explanations concerning the defining characteristics of phraseological units, their semantic features, their interrelations with lexical and syntactic units, their modes of formation, and their convergent and divergent features in comparison with other linguistic units.

In the co-authored monograph “Fixed Word Combinations” by M. Adilov and G. Yusifov, the specific properties of this group of linguistic units are extensively analyzed. The authors examine their distinctions from free combinations, the typology of various figurative constructions, stable comparative combinations, and the stylistic features of phraseological units.

The subject of proverbs and sayings, considered part of the phraseological and paremiological corpus of the Azerbaijani language, has been the principal focus of the extensive and comprehensive research conducted by Z. Alizadeh. According to Yagub Seyidov, I. Hamidov, applying the methodological approaches of Russian and European linguists, undertook an in-depth philosophical and logical analysis of proverbs and sayings, culminating in the compilation of the significant work “Azerbaijani–Russian and Russian–Azerbaijani Dictionary of Proverbs and Sayings” (Seyidov, 1992, p. 278).

Although theoretical problems of phraseology in Azerbaijani linguistics, including extensive research devoted to phraseological units functioning in the literary language, have been widely addressed, the investigation of phraseology within regional dialects requires more detailed and systematic inquiry. Azerbaijani dialect phraseology has primarily been examined within the broader context of lexical studies of individual vernaculars, and a number of scholarly articles and certain dissertation studies have been devoted to this subject. In his 1957 article “Phrase-

ological Combinations,” M. Islamov analyzed the phraseological features of the Sheki (Nukha) dialect. Through this research, he distinguished himself as one of the first scholars to direct systematic academic attention to the phraseology of this dialect (Islamov, 1957, p. 127).

In his work devoted to “The Lexicon of the Borchaly Dialects,” M. Chobanov classified the phraseological units recorded in this dialect into five categories: (1) idioms; (2) set expressions; (3) proverbs; (4) sayings; and (5) expressions in narrative form (Chobanov, 1997, p. 127).

S. Behbudov’s “Dictionary of Phraseology of Azerbaijani Dialects,” published in 2011, should be regarded as one of the most significant milestones in the study of Azerbaijani dialectology. This first dictionary specifically devoted to dialect phraseology was compiled on the basis of materials drawn from various monographic studies, dissertation research, and scholarly articles, thereby representing a substantial contribution to the documentation and systematization of dialectal phraseological data.

Research in the field of Azerbaijani dialect phraseology has expanded considerably in recent years. Among the notable contributions in this domain is the candidate dissertation by M. A. Bashirova entitled “The Structure and Semantics of Dialect Phraseological Units of the Azerbaijani Language,” composed on the basis of material from the Derbent dialect. Similarly significant are J. Ismayilova’s study “The Investigation of Phraseological Units from a Linguocultural Perspective,” Sh. Mammadov’s works “Traces of Ancient Historical Periods in the Dialect Phraseology of the Azerbaijani Language” and “Somatic Phraseological Combinations in the Dialects and Vernaculars of the Azerbaijani Language and Their Structural-Semantic Characteristics,” as well as H. Mammadov’s “The Lexicon of the Karabakh Vernaculars,” Sh. Mammadova’s “*Phraseological Units in the Dialects and Vernaculars of Nakhchivan*,” G. Gambarova’s “The Vernaculars of the Neftchala District of the Azerbaijani Language,” R. Gurbanov’s “The Vernaculars of the Masalli District of the Azerbaijani Language,” and N. Hasanov’s “The Lexicon of the Yevlakh Vernaculars.” In each of these investigations, particular attention is devoted to the analysis of dialect phraseology.

A number of more recent publications have likewise addressed specific issues in this field. These include F. Yusifova’s “Cognitive Characteristics of Phraseological Units in the Eastern Group Dialects of the Azerbaijani Language,” X. Mammadova’s “Phraseological Combinations in the Dialects and Vernaculars of the Azerbaijani Language,” A. Bayramov’s

instructional manual “The Aghbaba Vernacular of the Azerbaijani Language” (2020), and K. Guliyeva’s “Dictionary of the Northeastern Absheron Vernaculars of the Azerbaijani Language” (2025), all of which incorporate discussions of selected aspects of dialect phraseology.

It should be emphasized that the dialects of Nakhchivan have, for many years, constituted one of the principal research trajectories within Azerbaijani dialectology and have been subjected to systematic scholarly examination. As a result of sustained academic inquiry, comprehensive studies have emerged that document the phraseological features of the dialects and vernacular varieties of the region. These investigations are represented in the scholarly legacy of A. A. Guliyev, A. M. Guliyev, G. A. Hajiyeva, N. Y. Aliyeva, Z. Ismayil, R. Zulfugarov, and other researchers.

2. The Study of Dialect Phraseology in Turkish Linguistics

The history of research devoted to the dialects and vernacular varieties of the Turkish language is, in fact, not particularly ancient. As A. Akar observes, “*In the vernaculars of the Turkish language, there exist numerous fixed expressions that have fallen out of use in the standard written language. These units, which continue to survive in spoken usage, not only facilitate the recovery of the forgotten archaic lexical stratum of the language through dialectological investigation, but also contribute to determining the logic underlying the formation of fixed expressions, their creative potential, and their interaction with social life*” (Akar, 2025, p. 52).

With the institutionalization of Turkology as an autonomous academic discipline, research in this direction gained momentum, and the earliest scientifically grounded examples may be traced to the 1860s. Initially confined to the collection of linguistic material, these scholarly activities gradually evolved into systematic research endeavors. The distinguished Turkish scholar Zeynep Korkmaz classifies research in this field into two principal periods on the basis of content and methodology: “*The first period comprises studies conducted prior to 1940, while the second period encompasses those extending from 1940 to the present day. According to the author, the first stage may be characterized as the ‘period of foreign researchers,’ and the second stage as the ‘period of national researchers’*” (Korkmaz, 1995, p. 232).

First and foremost, it should be emphasized that, in the Turkish linguistic tradition, a variety of terms have been employed to denote the concept expressed by the word *deyim* (idiomatic expression). As noted in the relevant scholarship, “among these, one observes

Arabic-derived terms such as *darbimesel*, *tabir*, and *ıstılah*” (Sinan, 2015, p. 17). Within Turkish linguistics, the notion of *deyim* has likewise been characterized through diverse definitional frameworks. In the *General Turkish Dictionary (Genel Türkçe Sözlük)*, the term *deyim* is typically defined as a fixed word combination that has, to a greater or lesser extent, diverged from its primary (literal) meaning, possesses a distinctive mode of expression, and is employed in the sense of an idiomatic expression.

According to Zeynep Korkmaz, a *deyim* is a word or word combination that conveys a meaning distinct from its literal sense and is characterized by figurative expressiveness and semantic vividness (Korkmaz, 2019, p. 111).

Vahit Hatiboğlu, for his part, defines idiomatic expressions as fixed expression patterns formed for the purpose of intensifying expressive force, consisting of lexical elements that, from a logical standpoint, partially transcend literal reality. In such constructions, certain components remain invariant, whereas others may undergo inflectional modification through the addition of grammatical suffixes (Hatiboğlu, 1984, p. 194).

Doğan Aksan interprets the idiom as a lexical unit formed through the combination of several words – occasionally, though rarely, through the secondary semantic use of a single word – for the purpose of expressing a specific concept, emotion, or situation (Aksan, 2020, p. 35).

Berke Vardar, in his Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms (*İzahlı Dilçilik Terimleri Sözlüğü*), conceptualizes the idiom as a semantic grouping that generates a new lexical unit, typically characterized as a stabilized expression whose meaning has diverged, to varying degrees, from its primary denotation (Vardar, 1988, p. 74).

F. Bozkurt similarly explains the term *deyim* as a combination of words that, in order to enhance expressive force, depart to some extent from literal reality in a logical sense (Bozkurt, 1995, p. 170).

In light of these definitional perspectives, it may be concluded that, although the concept of *deyim* has been explicated in various formal configurations within Turkish linguistics, it essentially encompasses linguistic units belonging to the phraseological system. In Turkish, this category of fixed combinations is conventionally subsumed under the general designation *deyim*.

Professor A. Akar has divided dialectological research in Turkey into two principal phases. 1) The first phase encompasses the period prior to the **establishment of the Republic**. According to Akar, dialectological investigations commenced during the Otto-

man era within the broader framework of research conducted by European linguists and folklorists. The earliest work in this direction was the study by the Russian linguist V. A. Maksimov devoted to the Karaman and Hüdavendigâr dialects of Turkish. Subsequently, this line of research was continued by European scholars such as C. Turi, M. Hartmann, K. Foy, Ignác Kúnos, F. Giese, and others. For example, Karl Foy, through his articles on the Aydin dialects, and the Hungarian Turkologist Ignác Kúnos, through his studies of the Rumelian vernaculars, may be regarded as pioneering figures in Turkish dialectology in the early twentieth century (Akar, 2025, p. 25).

Among the scholars active in this field, the Polish Turkologist Tadeusz Kowalski merits particular mention. In 1923 and 1927, Kowalski undertook two extensive scientific expeditions with the aim of conducting dialectological research in the regions of Anatolia and Rumelia. On the basis of texts he personally collected in situ, he published the results of his investigations in 1931 in the Encyclopaedia of Islam under the title “Osmanisch-Türkische Dialekte” (“Ottoman-Turkish Dialects”). The fact that his research was grounded directly in the scientific analysis of materials obtained from authentic spoken language environments has provided justification for regarding Tadeusz Kowalski as a foundational figure in Turkish dialectology (Stachowski, 2024, pp. 167–177).

It should also be noted that, during that same period, among local scholars Nejip Asim conducted certain investigations devoted to the Kilis and Erzurum vernaculars (Akar, 2025, p. 26).

b) With regard to the Republican period, A. Akar systematizes dialectological research into several principal directions: (a) lexicographic studies; (b) investigations devoted to the analysis of dialect texts; (c) monographic research; and (d) the preparation of a dialectological atlas. The establishment of the Turkish Language Association (*Türk Dil Kurumu*) in 1932 provided substantial impetus to the development of Turkish linguistics, including dialectology. Among the institution’s principal initiatives during those years was the systematic collection of materials pertaining to Turkish dialects, as well as the compilation and publication of dialect dictionaries. At this stage, studies devoted to the analysis of dialect texts displayed particular interest in the investigation of Anatolian vernaculars. The Finnish Turkologist Martti Räsänen, whose work in this direction attracted considerable scholarly attention, made significant contributions to the collection and analysis of dialect material. His four-volume work “Türkische Sprachproben aus Mittelanatolien” (“Turkish Samples from Central Anatolia”) (1933; 1935; 1936; 1942) encompasses

important texts collected from the provinces of Sivas, Konya, Yozgat, Ankara, Kayseri, Kirsehir, Chankiri, and Afyon, and is regarded as a fundamental source for sustained dialectological research.

Although foreign researchers produced numerous scholarly works prior to the 1930s, the number of local specialists was relatively limited and research initiatives were comparatively less extensive; consequently, there existed a pronounced need to strengthen national scholarly engagement in this field. The expansion of dialectological activity among national experts was realized largely through the initiative of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Pursuant to a governmental decree adopted under Atatürk’s leadership between 1932 and 1934, official institutions were instructed to undertake the systematic collection of dialectological materials. It is noteworthy that, during this same period, concrete steps were also initiated in Azerbaijan toward the collection and publication of dialectological materials. Thus, “in the mid-1920s, Nikolay Ashmarin prepared a program and methodological guidelines for the collection of materials for a dictionary of Azerbaijani dialects and vernaculars. Based on these guiding documents, approximately 60,000 words and expressions had been collected by 1930. Using the gathered lexical material, the *Dictionary of Azerbaijani-Turkic Folk Vernaculars*’ was compiled and published” (Guliyev, 2024, p. 1). In this respect, the corresponding period in Turkish linguistics may likewise be evaluated as a phase during which dialectological research received substantial scholarly contributions.

In the 1940s, a linguist of Azerbaijani origin, Ahmad Jafaroglu, played a pivotal role in the development of Turkish dialectology. He organized expeditions to numerous provinces of Anatolia, where he collected samples from folk vernaculars. The materials obtained during these expeditions were published in nine volumes, and these works, such as “*Collections from Anatolian Dialects*” (1943), “*Collections from the Dialects of Our Eastern Provinces*” (1941), and “*Compilations from the Dialects of Anatolian Provinces*” (1951), among others, are recognized as among the first major sources enabling a comprehensive examination of the dialects of Turkey Turkish (Akar, 2006, p. 42).

During the same period, the Turkish linguist Omer Asim Aksoy devoted considerable scholarly effort to the study of dialects. His work “Proverbs in the Gaziantep Dialect” (1941), together with the four-volume study “The Gaziantep Dialect” (1945–1946), represents a sustained and systematic engagement with vernacular speech (Ozerdim & Berge, 1995, pp. 63–70). The monographic character of Aksoy’s

research, focused on a specific region and particularly attentive to formulaic expressions – that is, phraseological units – constitutes one of the principal factors distinguishing his scholarly contribution from those of his contemporaries.

The linguist-dialectologist Kamal Edip Kurkchuoğlu's work *"The Urfa Dialect"* (1945), which brings together texts, grammatical description, and a lexicon pertaining to the Urfa vernacular, is of particular significance in that it provided foundational and essential data on dialects during a period when dialectological research was comparatively underdeveloped.

The 1950s may be regarded as a turning point in the history of research on Turkish dialects, as during this period academically rigorous investigations in Turkey expanded both in scope and in number. In this context, the scholarly activity of Professor Zeynep Korkmaz merits special recognition. Her work *"Southwestern Anatolian Dialects: Phonetics"* (1956; reprinted 1994) is widely considered the first doctoral dissertation in this field. Korkmaz's research established new methodological standards in dialectology through its balanced selection of informants, consistency in transliteration symbols, and the comparative approach applied in phonetic analysis.

Having introduced new directions to the discipline with her doctoral dissertation, Zeynep Korkmaz further stimulated the development of dialectological research with another major study, *"The Dialects of Nevşehir and Its Region"* (1963; 1977). Unlike her earlier work, this study possesses a more distinctly monographic character and occupies a significant position in the progressive advancement of dialectological scholarship. Following Ahmad Jafaroglu, Zeynep Korkmaz emerged as the leading figure in dialect research. The precision she demonstrated in matters of transcription and the scientific rigor she applied in grammatical analysis subsequently became foundational models for later investigations. For instance, Ahmet Bican Erçilasun's 1971 doctoral dissertation *"The Dialects of Kars Province"* was structured explicitly in accordance with the methodological framework established by Korkmaz, a model that ultimately evolved into an established tradition within Turkish linguistics.

Although, following Korkmaz's seminal work in the early 1960s, a number of publications concerning the collection of dialect materials were produced by local scholars (Erimer, 1970, pp. 211–236), apart from several significant exceptions, few methodologically robust and comprehensive dialectological studies were conducted prior to the 1970s.

The period of relative stagnation that persisted until the 1970s came to an end with the establishment

of new universities in Anatolia, which catalyzed a renewed expansion of dialectological research. In this regard, Ataturk University in Erzurum occupies a particularly prominent position. The dedicated engagement of highly qualified linguists and Turkologists such as *Kaya Bilgegil*, *Selahattin Oljay*, and Mehmet Kaplan with dialect studies fostered the production of substantial scholarly works within the university (Akar, 2006, p. 43). Notably, between 1970 and 1980 alone, approximately one hundred graduate theses devoted to dialectology were successfully defended (Koktekin, 2018, pp. 284–290).

In the 1980s, one of the leading scholars in the study of Turkish dialects was Tunjer Gulensoy, whose work entitled *Kutahya ve Yoresi Agizlari* ("The Dialects of Kutahya and Its Region") occupies a significant place among major dialectological studies. The monograph was prepared based on the precise and systematic analysis of forty-five hours of audio recordings collected from informants and includes both carefully edited dialect texts and an extensive scholarly commentary section (Gulensoy, 1988). The transcription system employed in the study, together with the methodological rigor demonstrated in the phonetic and morphological analyses, distinguishes this work from many analogous dialectological investigations.

Beginning in the 1990s, dialect research was conducted intensively both through master's and doctoral dissertations and within the framework of scholars who devoted particular attention to dialect studies. As a result of these sustained efforts and the publication of numerous works, significant progress was achieved in the investigation of Turkish dialects. Given the scope of the present research, it is not possible to subject all studies produced after that date to detailed analysis here; these materials constitute the subject of a separate comprehensive inquiry. Nevertheless, a considerable portion of these works may be traced in the volume "Bibliography of Turkey Turkish Dialects" (Gulensoy & Alkaya, 2003), as well as in the articles "The Importance of Dialectological Studies for Turkish Language Teaching" (Alyilmaz & Alyilmaz, 2018: 7–38), "Provinces and Districts on Which No Studies Have Been Conducted Concerning Turkey Turkish Dialects" (Bulut, 2013: 1129–1149), and "An Evaluation of Graduate Studies Conducted on Provincial and District Dialects in Turkey" (Guler, 2012: 1835–1861).

Despite these limitations, prominent scholars such as E. B. Erçilasun, L. Karahan, N. Demir, A. Buran, A. Akar, and S. K. Yalchin, among others, have played a substantial role in examining various aspects of contemporary Turkish dialects. Within the context

of this extensive body of research, the phraseology of Turkish dialects has consistently remained within scholarly focus, and the scope of such investigations has gradually expanded. Representative works in this domain include: H. T. Dalioglu, “Proverbs Spoken in Isparta” (1934); S. Ayral, “Proverbs Spoken in Kayseri” (1944); Ozyedekçi Kazim, “Idioms of the Kayseri Dialect” (1946); B. Mustafa, “Proverbs and Idioms in Sivas”; S. Bulut, “Formulaic Expressions in Anatolian Dialects and Their Usage Characteristics” (1973); J. Haluk, “Selected Aphoristic Expressions Used in the Sivas Region” (1978); M. G. Demiray, “Proverbs and Idioms from Zile” (1979); K. Dogan, “Proverbs and Idioms from Sivas” (1980); B. Basoglu, “Proverbs, Idioms, Admonitions, and Beliefs in the Boyabat Region” (1982); and Y. Duzkoynu, “Blessings, Curses, and Oaths in the Samsun/Carshamba Region” (1983).

In recent decades, new works have been produced in the field of the study of phraseology in Turkish dialects, and particular attention has been devoted to phraseological units in research focusing on the lexical composition of dialects. Alongside the dictionary “Proverbs and Idioms in Regional Dialects”, published for the fourth time in 2009 by the Turk Dil Kurumu (Turkish Language Association), the following studies constitute significant scholarly sources for the investigation of dialect phraseology: G. Hurriyet, “Formulaic Expressions in Turkish” (2011); A. Josar, “On Idioms Compiled from the Gumushane Dialects” (2016); S. Bulak, “Idioms in the Van Kuresin Dialect” (2016); C. Sari, “Formulaic Language Units in Turkey Turkish Dialects” (2019); O. Suataman, “The Lexical Stock of the Kars Province Dialects” (2022); Hami Akman, “Idioms of the Van Dialect” (2024); A. Kanmaz and A. M. Josar, “Mapping Health-Related Idioms in the Compilation Dictionary” (2024); and Seyfettin Ozdemirel, “On Certain Idioms Observed

in Turkey Turkish Dialects [Karabuk and Nigde Dialects]”) (2025).

Conclusion. A comparative examination of the study of dialect phraseology in Turkish and Azerbaijani linguistics yields the following scholarly conclusions:

– Within both Turkish and Azerbaijani linguistics, dialect phraseology has not remained beyond the scope of scholarly investigation; rather, in each linguistic tradition, varying degrees of systematic attention have been directed toward the study of dialectal varieties.

– In comparison with Azerbaijani linguistics, research into dialect phraseology within Turkish linguistics demonstrates a longer chronological trajectory, as well as a broader geographical distribution and institutional scale.

– The predominantly practical orientation characterizing studies of dialect phraseology in Turkish linguistics may be evaluated as a significant scientific and methodological resource for the further advancement of research on Azerbaijani dialects.

– In scholarly works devoted to dialect phraseology within Turkish linguistics, lexicographic description occupies a central and structurally defining position.

– In Turkish linguistics, the empirical-practical dimension and its analytical treatment assume a leading role in the investigation of dialect phraseology, whereas in Azerbaijani linguistics the field is distinguished by the predominance of theoretical conceptualization, with linguistic data interpreted primarily within a historical-comparative paradigm.

– In Azerbaijani linguistics, there remains a pronounced need for comprehensive lexicographic research on dialect phraseology, particularly with respect to the systematic collection, critical analysis, and scholarly publication of linguistic materials.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bayramov A. *Azərbaycan dilinin Ağbaba şivəsi*. Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 2020. 628 s.
2. Bayramov H. *Azərbaycan dili frazeologiyasının əsasları*. Bakı: Maarif. 1978. 176 s.
3. Bayramov İ.M. *Azərbaycan dialektologiyası*. Bakı: İKSAD. 2022. 456 s.
4. Behbudov S.M. *Azərbaycan dili şivələrinin frazeologiya lüğəti*. Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 2011. 292 s.
5. Cəfərov S.Ə. *Müasir Azərbaycan dili. Leksika*. Bakı: Şərq-Qərb. 2007. 192 s.
6. Çobanov M.N. *Borçalı şivələrinin leksikası*. Bakı: Borçalı. 1997. 210 s.
7. Dəmirçizadə Ə.M. *Azərbaycan dilinin üslubiyatı*. Bakı: Azərtədrisnəşr. 1962. 271 s.
8. Əlizadə Z. *Azərbaycan atalar sözü və zərbi-məsəllərin leksik – semantik xüsusiyyətləri*. Bakı: ADU mətbəsi. 1980. 108 s.
9. İslamov M.İ. Frazeoloji birləşmələr (Nuxa dialekti materialı üzrə). *Azərbaycan SSR EA-nın Xəbərləri* (ict.elm.ser.), Bakı, 1957. №11, s.127-140.
10. İsmayılova J. Frazeoloji vahidlərin linqvokulturoloji aspektədən tədqiqi. *Əli bəy Hüseynzadənin 150 və akademik Məmmədəğa Şirəliyevin 105 illik yubileyləri şərəfinə keçirilən “Sələflər və xələflər” I Beynəlxalq simpoziumun materialları*, Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 2014. 660 s.
11. Quliyev V. Elimizin və dilimizin dostu. Vilayət Quliyevin türkoloq N.İ. Aşmarin haqqında qeydləri, “*Ədəbiyyat*” qəzeti, 28.02.2024, URL: <https://edebiyatqazeti.az/news/science/11423> (15.02.2026).
12. Qurbanov A.M. *Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin frazeologiyası*. Bakı: APİ. 1963. 40 s.

13. Məhərrəmli Q., İsmayılov R. *Azərbaycan dilinin frazeologiya lüğəti*. Bakı: Altun kitab. 2015. 288 s.
14. Məmmədov Ş.X. *Azərbaycan dilinin dialekt frazeologiyasında qədim tarixi dövrlərin izləri*. “Əli bəy Hüseynzadənin 150 və akademik Məmmədəğa Şirəliyevin 105 illik yubileyləri şərəfinə keçirilən “Sələflər və xələflər” I Beynəlxalq simpoziumun materialları”, Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 2014. 660 s.
15. Məmmədova Ş. *Naxçıvan dialekt və şivələrində frazeoloji vahidlər*. Fəlsəfə doktorluğu dissertasiyası. Naxçıvan. 2021. 136 s.
16. Məmmədov H. *Qarabağ şivələrinin leksikası*. Fəlsəfə doktorluğu dissertasiyası. Sumqayıt. 2025. 155 s.
17. Seyidov Y.M. *Azərbaycan dilində söz birləşmələri*. Bakı: Bakı Universiteti. 1992. 408 s.
18. Seyidəliyev N. Əhmədov B. *Azərbaycan dilin böyük frazeoloji lüğəti (A-İ)*. Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 2024. 1140 s.
19. Akar A. *Ağız araşdırmalarına giriş*. İstanbul: Ötügen, 2025. 120 s.
20. Akar A. Ağız araşdırmalarında yöntem sorunları. *Turkish Studies*, 2006. 1(2), s. 41-53.
21. Aksan D. *Her Yönüyle Dil-Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim-III*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 2020. 244 s.
22. Aksoy Ö. A. Derleme sözlüğü. *Türk Dili Dergisi*, 1958. VII (79), s. 315-316.
23. Alyılmaz C. & Alyılmaz S. (2018). “Ağız Bilimi çalışmalarının türkçe öğretimi açısından önemi. *Türk Dünyası Dergisi*, № 45, s. 7-38.
24. Bozkurt F. *Türkiye Türkçesi*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınları. 1995. 448 s.
25. Bulut S. Türkiye Türkçesi ağızları üzerine çalışma yapılmayan il ve ilçeler. *Turkish Studies*, № 8 (1), 2013. s. 1129-1149.
26. Ercilasun A. B. *Kars ili ağızları: Ses bilgisi*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 2020. 388 s.
27. Erimer K. Anadolu ve Rumeli ağızları üzerinde bir bibliyografya denemesi. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten*, 1970. № 18, s. 211-236.
28. Genel Türkçe Sözlük: URL: <https://sozluk.gov.tr/> (15.02.2025)
29. Gülensoy T. *Kütahya ve yöresi ağızları: İnceleme-metinler-sözlük*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 1988. 257 s.
30. Gülensoy T. & Alkaya, E. *Türkiye Türkçesi ağızları bibliyografyası*. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları. 2003. 350 s.
31. Güler M. “Türkiye’deki il ve ilçe ağızları üzerine yapılan lisansüstü çalışmalarla ilgili bir değerlendirme”, *Turkish Studies*, № 7(4), 2012. s. 1835-1861.
32. Hatiboğlu Vecihe *Türkçenin Sözdizimi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları. 1984. 207 s.
33. Korkmaz Z. *Güney-Batı Anadolu ağızları: Ses bilgisi (phonetique)*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 1994a. 130 s.
34. Korkmaz Z. *Neşehir ve yöresi ağızları*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 1994b. 229 s.
35. Korkmaz Z. *Anadolu ağız araştırmalarına toplu bir bakış. Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 1995. s. 232–248.
36. Korkmaz Z. *Dil Bilgisi Terimleri Sözlüğü*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 2019. 260 s.
37. Köktekin K. Atatürk Üniversitesi’nin ağız araştırmalarındaki yeri. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2018. № 60, s. 281-291.
38. Kürkcüoğlu K. E. *Urfa ağızı*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 1991. 149 s.
39. Özerdim S. N. & Berge M. Asım Aksoy. *Kebikeç Dergisi*. 1995. № 1, s. 63-70.
40. Sinan A.T. *Türkçenin Deyim Varlığı*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları. 2015. 536 s.
41. Stachowski M. Türkiye Türkçesi diyalektolojisinin başlatıcısı olarak Tadeusz Kowalski (1889-1948). Çev.: H. O. Altun, *BABUR Research*, № 3(2), 2024. s. 167-177.
42. Vardar B. *Açıklamalı Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: ABC kitabevi. 1988. 295 s.

REFERENCES

1. Bayramov A. (2020). Azərbaycan dilinin Ağbaba şivəsi [Aghbaba dialect of the Azerbaijani language]. Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 628 s. [in Azerbaijani]
2. Bayramov H. (1978). Azərbaycan dili frazeologiyasının əsasları [Fundamentals of Azerbaijani language phraseology]. Bakı: Maarif. 176 s. [in Azerbaijani]
3. Bayramov İ.M. (2022). Azərbaycan dialektologiyası [Azerbaijani dialectology]. Bakı: İKSAD. 456 s. [in Azerbaijani]
4. Behbudov S.M. (2011). Azərbaycan dili şivələrinin frazeologiya lüğəti [Phraseological dictionary of Azerbaijani language dialects]. Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 292 s. [in Azerbaijani]
5. Cəfərov S.Ə. (2007). Müasir Azərbaycan dili [Modern Azerbaijani language]. Leksika. Bakı: Şərq-Qərb. 192 s. [in Azerbaijani]
6. Çobanov M.N. (1997). Borçalı şivələrinin leksikası [Lexicon of Borchaly dialects]. Bakı: Borçalı. 210 s. [in Azerbaijani]
7. Dəmirçizadə Ə.M. (1962). Azərbaycan dilinin üslubiyatı [Stylistics of the Azerbaijani language]. Bakı: Azərtədrisnəşr. 271 s. [in Azerbaijani]
8. Əlizadə Z. (1980). Azərbaycan atalar sözü və zərbi-məsəllərin leksik – semantik xüsusiyyətləri [Lexical and semantic features of Azerbaijani proverbs]. Bakı: ADU mətbəsi. 108 s. [in Azerbaijani]
9. İslamov M.İ. (1957). Frazeoloji birləşmələr (Nuxa dialekti materialı üzrə) [Phraseological units (on the material of the Nuxha dialect)]. Azərbaycan SSR EA-nın Xəbərləri (ict.elm.ser.), Bakı, №11, s.127-140. [in Azerbaijani]
10. İsmayılova J. (2014). Frazeoloji vahidlərin linqvokulturoloji aspektdən tədqiqi [Study of phraseological units from a linguocultural aspect]. Əli bəy Hüseynzadənin 150 və akademik Məmmədəğa Şirəliyevin 105 illik yubileyləri şərəfinə keçirilən “Sələflər və xələflər” I Beynəlxalq simpoziumun materialları, Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 660 s. [in Azerbaijani]
11. Quliyev V. (2024). Elimizin və dilimizin dostu [Phraseology of the modern Azerbaijani language]. Vilayət Quliyevin türkoloq N.İ. Aşmarin haqqında qeydləri, “Ədəbiyyat” qəzeti, 28.02.2024, <https://edebiyyatqazeti.az/news/science/11423> (15.02.2026) [in Azerbaijani]

12. Qurbanov A.M. (1963). Müasir Azərbaycan dilinin frazeologiyası. Bakı: APİ. 40 s. [in Azerbaijani]
13. Məhərrəmli Q., İsmayılov R. (2015). Azərbaycan dilinin frazeologiya lüğəti [Dictionary of phraseology of the Azerbaijani language]. Bakı: Altun kitab. 288 s. [in Azerbaijani]
14. Məmmədov Ş.X. (2014). Azərbaycan dilinin dialekt frazeologiyasında qədim tarixi dövrlərin izləri [Traces of ancient historical periods in the dialect phraseology of the Azerbaijani language]. “Əli bəy Hüseynzadənin 150 və akademik Məmmədəğa Şirəliyevin 105 illik yubileyləri şərəfinə keçirilən “Sələflər və xələflər” I Beynəlxalq simpoziumun materialları”, Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 660 s. [in Azerbaijani]
15. Məmmədova Ş. (2021). Naxçıvan dialekt və şivələrində frazeoloji vahidlər [Phraseological units in Nakhchivan dialects and dialects]. Fəlsəfə doktorluğu dissertasiyası. Naxçıvan. 136 s. [in Azerbaijani]
16. Məmmədov H. (2025). Qarabağ şivələrinin leksikası [Lexicon of Karabakh dialects]. Fəlsəfə doktorluğu dissertasiyası. Sumqayıt. 155 s. [in Azerbaijani]
17. Seyidov Y.M. (1992). Azərbaycan dilində söz birləşmələri [Word combinations in the Azerbaijani language]. Bakı: Bakı Universiteti. 408 s. [in Azerbaijani]
18. Seyidəliyev N., Əhmədov B. (2024). Azərbaycan dilin böyük frazeoloji lüğəti (A-İ) [Large phraseological dictionary of the Azerbaijani language (A-I)]. Bakı: Elm və təhsil. 1140 s. [in Azerbaijani]
19. Akar A. (2025). Ağız araştırmalarına giriş [Introduction to Language research]. İstanbul: Ötüken. 120 s. [in Turkish].
20. Akar A. (2006). Ağız araştırmalarında yöntem sorunları [Methodological problems in Language research]. Turkish Studies, 1(2), s. 41-53. [in Turkish].
21. Aksan D. (2020). Her Yönüyle Dil-Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim-III [Linguistics with all aspects of language-mother lines-III]. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 244 s. [in Turkish].
22. Aksoy Ö. A. (1958). Derleme sözlüğü [Turkish Language]. Türk Dili Dergisi, VII (79), s. 315-316. [in Turkish].
23. Alyılmaz C. & Alyılmaz S. (2018). Ağız Bilimi çalışmalarının türkçe öğretimi açısından önemi [The importance of oral science studies in terms of teaching Turkish]. Türk Dünyası Dergisi, № 45, s. 7-38. [in Turkish].
24. Bozkurt F. (1995). Türkiye Türkçesi [Turkey Turkish]. İstanbul: Cem Yayınları. 448 s. [in Turkish].
25. Bulut S. (2013). Türkiye Türkçesi ağızları üzerine çalışma yapılmayan il ve ilçeler [Countries and districts where studies on Turkish dialects of Turkey are not carried out]. Turkish Studies, № 8 (1), s. 1129-1149. [in Turkish].
26. Ercilasun A. B. (2020). Kars ili ağızları: Ses bilgisi [The dialects of the Kars year: Sound information]. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 388 s. [in Turkish].
27. Erimer K. (1970). Anadolu ve Rumeli ağızları üzerinde bir bibliyografya denemesi [A bibliographic essay on Anatolian and Rum dialects]. Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten, № 18, s. 211-236. [in Turkish].
28. Genel Türkçe Sözlük [General Turkish Dictionary]: URL: <https://sozluk.gov.tr/> (15.02.2025) [in Turkish].
29. Gülensoy T. (1988). Kutahya ve yöresi ağızları: İnceleme-metinler-sözlük [Kutahya and local dialects: Review-texts-dictionary]. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 257 s. [in Turkish].
30. Gülensoy T. & Alkaya, E. (2003). Türkiye Türkçesi ağızları bibliyografyası [Bibliography of Türkiye Turkish dialects]. Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları. 350 s. [in Turkish].
31. Güler M. (2012). Türkiye’deki il ve ilçe ağızları üzerine yapılan lisansüstü çalışmalarla ilgili bir değerlendirme [An evaluation of graduate studies on provincial and district dialects in Turkey]. Turkish Studies, № 7(4), s. 1835-1861. [in Turkish].
32. Hatiboğlu Vecihe (1984). Türkçenin Sözdizimi [Syntax of Turkish]. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları. 207 s. [in Turkish].
33. Korkmaz Z. (1994a). Güney-Batı Anadolu ağızları: Ses bilgisi (phonetique) [Dialects of South-Western Anatolia: Phonetics]. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 130 s. [in Turkish].
34. Korkmaz Z. (1994b). Nevşehir ve yöresi ağızları [Nevşehir and local dialects]. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 229 s. [in Turkish].
35. Korkmaz Z. (1995). Anadolu ağız araştırmalarına toplu bir bakış [An overview of Anatolian language research]. Türk Dili Üzerine Araştırmalar. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. s. 232-248. [in Turkish].
36. Korkmaz Z. (2019). Dil Bilgisi Terimleri Sözlüğü [Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 260 s. [in Turkish].
37. Köktekin K. (2018). Atatürk Üniversitesi’nin ağız araştırmalarındaki yeri [the place of Atatürk University in language research]. Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, № 60, s. 281-291. [in Turkish].
38. Kürküoğlu K. E. (1991). Urfa language [Urfa mouth]. Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 149 s. [in Turkish].
39. Özerdim, S. N. & Berge M. (1995). Ömer Asım Aksoy [Omer Asim Aksoy]. Kebikeç Dergisi, № 1, s. 63-70. [in Turkish].
40. Sinan T. (2015). Türkçenin Deyim Varlığı [Idioms in Turkish]. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları. 536 s. [in Turkish].
41. Stachowski M. (2024). Türkiye Türkçesi diyalektolojisinin başlatıcısı olarak Tadeusz Kowalski (1889-1948) [Tadeusz Kowalski (1889-1948) as the initiator of Turkish Turkish dialectology]. Çev.: H. O. Altun, BABUR Research, № 3(2), s. 167-177. [in Turkish].
42. Vardar B. (1988). Açıklamalı Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü [Annotated Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]. İstanbul: ABC kitabevi. 295 s. [in Turkish].

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 27.02.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 30.03.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 22.04.2026

Стаття поширюється на умовах
ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)

