

# ACQUIRING L2 TURKISH BY GERMAN ADULT LEARNERS: A CASE STUDY ON THE ACQUISITION OF ADJECTIVAL AND ADVERBIAL ELEMENTS

EDA BÜYÜKNISAN  
UNIVERSITY OF ÇUKUROVA (TURKEY)  
[ebuyuknisan@cukurova.edu.tr](mailto:ebuyuknisan@cukurova.edu.tr)

**Abstract:** *The present study aims to put light on the word order acquisition of adult German native speakers learning Turkish as a second language. It will be particularly concentrated on the word order of adjectives and adverbs due to the fact that the word order varies in German and Turkish, especially in complex sentences, and the usage of adjectives and adverbs in Turkish mainly differs from that in German.*

*The participants in this study are two adult German native speakers. One of them had been living in Adana, Turkey, for 2 months without any vocational, but with private reasons. Due to private reasons, he departed from Turkey after a staying of two months. Thus, data collected from this participant will only be evaluated partially. The other participant is currently living in Turkey and learning Turkish as his foreign language. Our aim in this research is to find out whether adult German native speakers transfer previous knowledge of German into Turkish.*

*The data obtained from the oral task is being transcribed; the data from the written tasks are being analyzed by entering them into the SPSS statistical program. Finally, One-way ANOVA will be applied to the data and the results will be compared with each other.*

**Keywords:** Turkish L2, German L1, Adult, Word Order Acquisition.

**Resumen:** El actual estudio apunta poner la luz en la adquisición del orden de las palabras de los nativos alemanes del adulto que aprenden Turco como segunda lengua. Será concentrado particularmente en el orden de las palabras de adjetivos y los adverbios debido al hecho que el orden de las palabras varía en alemán y turco, especialmente en oraciones complejas, y el uso de adjetivos y de adverbios en Turco diferencian principalmente de éste en alemán.

Los participantes en este estudio son dos nativos alemanes adultos. Una de ellos había estado viviendo en Adana, Turquía, por 2 meses sin vocacional, pero con razones privadas. debido a las razones privadas, él salió de Turquía después de permanecer de dos meses. Así, los datos recogidos de este participante serán evaluados solamente parcialmente. El otro participante está viviendo actualmente en Turquía y Turco que aprende como su idioma extranjero. Nuestra puntería en esta investigación es descubrir si los nativos alemanes del adulto transfieren el conocimiento anterior del alemán en Turco. Los datos obtenidos de la tarea oral se están transcribiendo; los datos de las tareas escritas están siendo analizados incorporándolas en el programa estadístico de SPSS. Finalmente, ANOVA unidireccional será aplicado a los datos y los resultados serán comparados con uno al otro.

**Palabras claves:** L2 Turco, L1 Alemán, Adulto, Adquisición del Orden de las palabras.

## 1. Introduction

Recent linguistic studies aim to put light on the issue of cognitive development, especially to language learning processes that directly involve theories of Universal Grammar (UG). UG, defined by Chomsky, is «the system of principles, conditions, and rules that are elements or properties of all human languages...the essence of human language» (in Cook:

1996: 1). It presents universality in deep structure, which may be quite distinct from the surface structures of sentences of different languages as they appear (Chomsky: 1998). UG, as a theory of first language (L1) acquisition, claims that «language is a set of general principles or constraints that underlie any grammar and also a set of a number of parameters to be set at one of the predetermined values through the exposure to the language being acquired» (Chomsky in Can: 2000: 1). Chomsky's hypothesis is that «human beings have a genetic endowment that enables them to learn languages. It is this innate capacity for language learning common to all human beings...» (Haegemann: 1994: 12). According to Haegemann (1994), it is not reasonable to think that

some individuals – those that will become native speakers of English – are born with a specific grammar of English and that others – those that will end up speaking Italian as their first language – are born with the grammar of Italian readily stored in their minds. Human beings with normal mental faculties are able to learn any human language. The innate linguistic endowment must be geared to any human language and not to just one (p.12).

As Cook (1995) suggests, sharing the same system in their first language (L1) acquisition, human beings apply the same UG system to their second language (L2) acquisition due to the shared principles. As for parameters, they are considered to vary from one language to another and hold the characteristics of that specific language (Cook & Newson: 1996). Acquiring an L2 means learning how these principles apply to a particular language and which value is appropriate for each parameter (Cook & Newson: 1996: 2). Although there have been a lot of linguists who accept this hypothesis, the debate on what ways of access people reach to this system has been going on.

In the present study the linguistic aspect of the language processing of adult German native speakers acquiring Turkish as a second language will be concentrated on. As the field of linguistic research is too broad to cover all aspects of language processing, this study will serve investigating on the word order acquisition of adult German native speakers of Turkish.

### **1.1. Statement of the Problem**

It is commonly known that theories on second language acquisition still show lacks in explanations of language systems in mind. Studies provide broad information on mental processes in the language system of human beings. Additionally, the availability of UG after the critical period still remains as an unanswered question for many scholars in the field of linguistics. Accordingly, investigating in these areas will brighten up issues concerning second language learning and teaching; and thus, directly affect methodological developments in language teaching.

### **1.2. Background of the Study**

Within language acquisition, the notion of limited processing capacity is a standard assumption in work on human cognition. For instance, short-term memory is thought to be limited in capacity and duration (Baddely :1990); the assumption that the processing capacity of L2 learners forms the basis of several approaches to SLA. The limited-capacity view on L2 processing constitutes a basic assumption in work on L2 input processing (Krashen: 1982; van Patten: 1996), in research on L2 skill acquisition (McLaughlin: 1987), in work on operating principles (Andersen: 1984), in the 'competition model' (Bates and MacWhinney: 1981), in Clahsen's (1984) L2 processing strategies as well as in Pienemann's studies on processability (2003).

To focus on input processing, one early approach to SLA that incorporates a processing perspective is Krashen's (1985) 'monitor model'. In his 'input hypothesis' Krashen claims that humans acquire language in only one way - by understanding messages, or by receiving 'comprehensible input'. ... We move from *i*, our current level, to *i+1*, the next level along the natural order, by understanding input containing *i+1*. (Krashen 1985: 2).

As this quotation illustrates, the 'input hypothesis' is aimed at explaining two things, namely the inferential mechanisms that drive the acquisition process and the assumed universal order of acquisition. In other words, Krashen's model evades the issue of specifying the architecture of the L2 processor and the inferential mechanisms involved.

Another example of later main-stream research on input processing is Van Patten's (1996) work. Van Patten follows the main idea of the 'input hypothesis' and stipulates two sets of input processing strategies in an attempt to spell out aspects of the architecture of the L2 processor. The first set consists of five cognitive strategies that are supposed to regulate which aspects of the linguistic input are attended to and processed first (van Patten: 1996). The second set consists of three Bever-style (Bever 1970) strategies for the assignment of grammatical and semantic roles to nouns (van Patten: 1996: 32). Van Patten follows Corder (1967) in distinguishing between 'input' and 'intake' and stipulates attention as the necessary condition for input to be transformed into intake. In his model the first set of strategies is intended to operationalise *attention* and the second, aspects of *sentence processing*. However, these processing strategies are limited to one narrow domain of language processing and are subject to the same conceptual limitations as Clahsen's (1984) strategies approach.

Also Carroll (1999; 2000) reviews the literature on L2 input processing and concludes that the standard assumption, based on Corder's (1967) input-intake distinction, according to which «... perception is regulated only by attention, which in turn is regulated by intention» (Carroll 1999) is not supported by any explicit theory of attention. Her view on the matter contrasts with the attention-filter assumption. Carroll seeks to demonstrate that signal detection is regulated by human knowledge systems independently of intention and concludes that «input is ... determined by our grammars» Carroll (1999: 343).

Andersen (1984; 1988) based his approach to SLA on a different set of assumptions. Andersen followed the basic design of Slobin's (1973; 1985) approach to L1 acquisition and proposed a set of 'operating principles' for SLA which concern two aspects of the acquisition process, namely the processing of language and the discovery of its formal and functional properties. In other words, his approach goes beyond language processing and incorporates learning mechanisms. An example is the 'one-to-one principle' which states that «an interlanguage system should be constructed in such a way that an intended underlying meaning is expressed with one clear invariant surface form...» Andersen (1984: 79).

A further approach to language acquisition is the 'competition model' (Bates and MacWhinney: 1981; 1982; 1987) that assumes limited processing resources in L2 learners. It is a functionalist approach that is based on the assumption that linguistic behavior is constrained, among other things, by general cognition and not by a language-specific cognitive module, and communicative needs. Following the functionalist tradition, Bates and MacWhinney assume that «the surface conventions of natural languages are created, governed, constrained, acquired, and used in the service of communicative functions» (Bates and MacWhinney: 1981: 192). According to this model, it is the task of the language learner to discover the specific relationship between linguistic forms of a given language and their communicative functions. The linguistic forms used to mark grammatical and semantic roles differ from language to language. For instance, agreement marking, word order, animacy etc. play a different role in the marking of subjecthood and agency in different languages. Pienemann (2003) proposes that linguistic forms are seen as cues for semantic interpretation in on-line comprehension and production, and different cues may compete as in the above case of the marking of subjecthood.

The competition model has formed the conceptual basis of experiments on bilingual sentence processing (Gass: 1987; Harrington: 1987; Kilborn and Ito: 1989; McDonald and Heilenman: 1991; Sasaki: 1991). In these studies, bilingual speakers of different languages need to identify the function of different 'cues' in L1 and L2. The input material is designed to reflect the coordination and competition of cues. For instance, Harrington (1987) studies the (competing) effect of word order, animacy and stress on the comprehension of Japanese and English sentences by native speakers and non-native speakers of the two languages who are all speakers of both languages. Obviously, the three cues have different weights in the two target

languages concerned. The results show that L2 learners transfer their L1 processing strategies (i.e. weighting of cues) when interpreting L2 sentences. This overall result is predicted by the competition model, since within this framework, processing cues are not initially separated by languages and their weighting can therefore be predicted to be transferred.

Clahsen (1984) assumed a set of speech processing strategies, which constrain the otherwise overly powerful grammar of the learner. These strategies are stated as Canonical Order Strategy (COS) in which each of the subconstituents contributes information to the internal structure of the constituent, Initialisation-Finalisation Strategy (IFS) where in underlying sequences permutations are blocked, and Subordinate Clause Strategy (SCS) in which permutations are avoided. This work was originally carried out in the late 1970's (Clahsen: 1979). Clahsen based these strategies on research into speech processing and language acquisition. COS was based on Bever's (1970) experiments on comprehension. IFS was based on findings from memory research. SCS is based on the finding that subordinate clauses are processed in a different mode than main clauses.

In conclusion, the processing-oriented approaches reviewed above (with the exception of Clahsen's) are not focused only on L2 processing and its effect on L2 development. Instead, L2 processing is studied as one of several interacting factors that contribute to L2 acquisition.

### 1.3. German Word Order Versus Turkish Word Order

Linguists are, in general, familiar with the notion that certain languages tend consistently to put modifying or limiting elements before those modified or limited, while others just as consistently do the opposite. Greenberg (2000) exemplifies Turkish as a language of the former type, putting adjectives before the nouns they modify, placing the object of the verb before the verb, the dependent genitive before the governing noun, adverbs before adjectives which they modify, etc.

Greenberg (2000) states that more detailed consideration of these and other phenomena of order reveal that some factors are closely related to each other while others are relatively independent. For reasons which will appear in the course of the exposition, it is convenient to set up a typology involving certain basic factors of word order. This typology will be referred to as the basic order typology. Three sets of criteria will be employed. The first of these is the existence of prepositions as against postpositions. The second will be the relative order of subject, verb, and object in declarative sentences with nominal subject and object. The vast majority of languages have several variant orders but a single dominant one. Logically, there are six possible orders: SVO, SOV, VSO, VOS, OSV, and OVS. Of these six, however, only three normally occur as dominant orders. The three which do not occur at all, or at least are excessively rare, are VOS, OSV, and OVS. These all have in common that the object precedes the subject. This gives the first universal claiming that in declarative sentences with nominal subject and object, the dominant order is almost always one in which the subject precedes the object. This leaves three common types: VSO, SVO, and SOV. The third basis of classification will be the position of qualifying adjectives (i.e., those designating qualities) in relation to the noun. As will be seen later, the position of demonstratives, articles, numerals, and, quantifiers frequently differs from that of qualifying adjectives. Here again there is sometimes variation, but the vast majority of languages have a dominant order. Pienemann (2003) defines the word order in German sentences as both being more variable and more flexible. In many cases, German word order is identical to English. This is the case for simple sentences like Pienemann exemplifies:

*Ich sehe dich. [I see you.]*

*Er arbeitet zu Hause. [He works at home.]*

*[Subject + Verb + Other Elements].*

This "normal" word order places the subject first, the verb second, and any other elements third. By saying verb, the conjugated or finite verb, that is, the verb that has an ending agreeing with the subject is meant: er geht, wir gehen, du gehst, etc.

With compound verbs, the second part of the verb phrase (past participle, separable prefix, infinitive) goes last, but the conjugated element (CE) is still second:

*Der alte Mann kommt heute an.*

[CE]

*Der alte Mann ist gestern angekommen.*

[CE]

*Der alte Mann will heute nach Hause kommen.*

[CE]

The only verb-second exception is for dependent or subordinate clauses. In subordinate clauses the verb always comes last, although today this rule is generally ignored by German native speakers. One other exception to this rule is that interjections, exclamations, names, and certain adverbial phrases usually set off by a comma, come first. The initial word or phrase set off by a comma comes first, but does not alter the verb-second rule.

Another area where German syntax may vary is the position of expressions of time (wann), manner (wie) and place (wo) presented by Pienemann (2003). The order in German is *time, manner, place* as presented in following example:

*Frank kommt heute mit dem Zug nach Hause.*

[time] [manner] [place]

The only exception would be if you want to start the sentence with one of these elements for emphasis:

*Heute kommt Erik mit der Bahn nach Hause. (Emphasis on time)*

But even in this case, the elements are still in the prescribed order: time (heute), manner (mit der Bahn), place (nach Hause). If we start with a different element, the elements that follow remain in their usual order:

*Mit der Bahn kommt Erik heute nach Hause.*

The emphasis is put on manner, that is not by car or plane. Pienemann states that these are the general rules in simple declarative sentences; though the word order rules change in the *dependent* or *subordinate* clauses in German.

A subordinate clause is that part of a sentence that cannot stand by itself and is *dependent* on another part of the sentence, the main clause. A subordinate clause is introduced by a subordinating conjunction (*daß, ob, weil, wenn, etc.*) or in the case of relative clauses, a relative pronoun (*den, der, die, welche, etc.*). The conjugated verb is placed at the end of a subordinate clause (post position). It is noteworthy that each German subordinate clause is set off by a comma. It is also of importance that a German subordinate clause may come first or last in a sentence:

*Es gibt eine Umleitung, weil die Straße repariert wird.*  
[There is a detour because the road repaired is being].

*Das ist die Dame, die wir gestern sahen.*  
[That is the lady (that/whom) we yesterday saw].

As seen in the examples above, a German subordinate clause always starts with a subordinating conjunction and ends with the conjugated verb. The other sentence elements, such as *time, manner, place*, follow in the normal order.

Compared to German, the Turkish word order shows main differences in basic semantic structures. According to Greenberg (2000) the pragmatically unmarked word order in Turkish is SOV, however, a basic sentence with three constituents can have six possible orderings. While the subject initial sentences are the most natural, the verb initial sentences are the least natural. Turkish is an agglutinative language with rich case morphology. The nominative case is null and the accusative case is overt but it can also be dropped in which case there are only two possible word orders, SOV and OVS. The word order is regular, but differs mainly in adjectival descriptions of subject and subject, time, adjectival descriptions of object and object, verb. The verb is always located finally in a sentence. Turkish punctuation normally puts a comma after the subject as with the following example sentence:

*Ellerinde oltası olan adam, yarın gece arkadaşının 50'ci doğum günü partisini*



The participants in this study have been two adult German native speakers aged 29 (Mr. K.) and 48 (Mr. B.). One of the participants, Mr. B. (48), has been living for vocational reasons in Adana, Turkey, for 16 months. This participant has been getting Turkish lessons for 14 months from a professional language teacher speaking German, English and Turkish. The other participant, Mr. K. (29) had been living in Adana, Turkey, for 2 months without any vocational, but with private reasons. Due to private reasons, he departed from Turkey after a staying of two months. Thus, data collected from Mr. K. will be involved and evaluated in further studies. This participant did not get any regular Turkish lessons. Moreover, he had been learning and improving Turkish by own means; that is, a book from Langenscheidt called “Turkish Guide” and a Turkish – Deutsch, Deutsch – Turkish Mini – Dictionary from Langenscheidt.

#### **2.4. Data Collection**

The main data, gained by writing, reading comprehension and speaking tasks including samples from the adjective and adverb word order has already been collected. Reading passages with comprehension questions have been given to the participant every 2 weeks. Furthermore, the participant was required to tell stories through pictures at least every four weeks. During the reading and story telling sessions, tape recording and note – taking procedures have been used. Other instruments that have been applied at least every four weeks are various free writing tasks. Besides the tasks and the related data presented in the table below, further data has been obtained from short messages (SMS) and letters (via air – mail) between the teacher and the participant.

#### **2.5. Instruments**

Tasks that have been applied (and their application date) during the data collection period of this study are presented in the table below:

GUIDED PRACTISE	25.04.2005
INTERVIEW	25.04.2005
SITUATION BASED PICTURE TELLING	21.06.2005
FREE PICTURE STORY	21.06.2005
TRANSLATION, GERMAN – TURKISH	27.06.2005
WORKSHEET, REVIEW COMPARATIVE - SUPERLATIVE	05.07.2005
COMPARING 3 ITEMS AT A TIME	05.07.2005
SPEAKING – CULTURAL FEATURES	05.07.2005
INTERVIEW – ROLEPLAY	13.09.2005
GUIDED SPEAKING - AUTHENTIC PICTURES	09.10.2005
PICTURE STORY TELLING	06.12.2005
DISCUSSION – MR. RAVIOLI (CHARACTER)	06.12.2005
REVISION – RETELLING A PREVIOUS STORY	06.12.2005
SPEAKING – FAVOURITE FOODS	06.12.2005
DESCRIBING SINGLE PICTURES	21.01.2006
GUIDED WRITING – BASED ON KEYWORDS	21.01.2006
NEW GRAMMATICAL PATTERN - GUIDED PRACTISE	21.01.2006
FREE WRITING	07.02.2006
GRAMMAR – INTRODUCTION + PRACTISE	07.02.2006

#### **2.6. Data Analysis**

In order to evaluate the obtained data, errors from the recorded and written data of the participant have been classified as partially presented in the table below. Furthermore, ANOVA for statistical analysis will be used whereby the SPSS program will support our data calculations.

### CLASSIFICATION OF DATA ACCORDING TO ERROR TYPES

EX.	CASE MARKERS	WORD ORDER	TENSE MARKERS
A	bir kadın çamaşır yaptı	belki çünkü çok kitaplar okumuş	Mühendisim olarak çalışıyorum. (çalıştım)
B	7 ayda Türkçe çalıştım	fiyat televizyona	Ve başka Avrupalı bayramlar kullanıyorum. (kullanacağım)
EX.	PHRASE STRUCTURE	VOCABULARY / WORD CHOICE	COPULA
A	belki çok söyledi	Şu zamandır Adana’da yaşıyorum	Bazen Alman şoför kötü, bencil
B	garson çalışıyor (olarak)	Ama yaz en güzel ay.	Devlet memuru zor.
EX.	INFLECTION	DETERMINER	VOICE
A	takım elbise ütmüş	Ben ilginç iş buluyorum	Bay Ravioli şişeyi patlıyor.
B	Hayatta iş gerekemek		
EX.	NUMBER	PHONOLOGY	OTHER
A	haftalar sonu	Umut...ın renki.	No
B	T. yemek çok lezzetli	Surat biraz kırışik.	Ulaşım kalabalık.
EX.	ADVERB-ADJECTIVE	DIRECT TRANSLATION	PERSON MARKER
A	Yavaş (yavaş yavaş)	Klaus arabasıyla işe sürüyor	Bazen yalnızlık seviyorum, ama yakınlık arıyor.
B	Aralık ayı Temmuz aydan daha soğuk	Hayal edebiliyorum.	

### 3. Discussion

According to the obtained and classified data from the participant, as it was expected, it might be currently interpreted that the majority of errors are made firstly in case markers, and secondly in word order of complex sentences. However, in order to focus on detailed and exact results, a complete analysis of the full data – which is in progress – is essential.

### References

- ANDERSEN, R. (1984). *The one-to-one principle of interlanguage construction*. Language Learning 34, 77-95.
- (1988). *Models, processes, principles, and strategies: Second language acquisition in and out of the classroom*. IDEAL 3, 77-95.
- BADDELEY, A. (1990). *Human memory: theory and practice*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- BATES, E. and MacWhinney, B. (1981). *Second-language acquisition from a functionalist perspective: pragmatic, semantic, and perceptual strategies*. In Winitz, H. (ed.), Native



- Language and Foreign Language Acquisition. New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 379, 190-214.
- BATES, E. and MacWhinney, B. (1982). *Functionalist approaches to grammar*. In Wanner, E. and Gleitman, L.R. (eds.) *Language Acquisition: The State of the Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 173-218.
- BATES, E. and MacWhinney, B. (1987). *Competition, variation and language learning*. In MacWhinney, B. (ed.), *Mechanisms of Language Acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 157-193.
- BEVER, T. G. (1970). *The cognitive basis for linguistic structures*. In Hayes (ed.), *Cognition and the development of language*. New York: Wiley.
- CARROLL, S.E. (1999). "Putting 'input' in its proper place". *Second Language Research* 15:4, 337-388.
- (2000). *Input and evidence: The raw material of second language acquisition*. J. Benjamins.
- CHOMSKY, N. (1998). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- CLAHSEN, H. (1979). *Syntax oder Produktionsstrategien. Zum natürlichen Zweitspracherwerb der Gastarbeiter*. In Kloepfer R. (ed.), *Bildung und Ausbildung in der Romania*. W. Fink: München, pp.343-354.
- (1984). *The acquisition of German word order: A test case for cognitive approaches to second language acquisition*. In R. Andersen (ed.), *Second languages*. Rowley, Mass.
- COOK, V. (1995). *Linguistics and second language acquisition* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London: Macmillan.
- COOK, V., & Newson, M. (Eds.). (1996). *Chomsky's universal grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- CORDER, S.P. 1967. *The Significance of Learner's Errors*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 5, 161-70.
- GASS, S.M. (1987). *The resolution of conflicts among competing systems: a bidirectional perspective*. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 8, 329-350.
- GREENBERG, J.H. (2000). *Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements*, In: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.). *Universals of Language*. London: MIT Press, pp. 76-80.
- HAEGEMANN, L. (1994). *Introduction to government and binding theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- HARRINGTON, M. (1987). *Processing transfer: Language-specific processing strategies as a source of interlanguage variation*. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 8, 351-377.
- KILBORN, K. and Ito, T. (1989). *Sentence processing in a second language: the timing of transfer*. *Language and Speech* 32:1, 1-23.
- KRASHEN, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- KRASEHN, S.(1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- MCDONALD, J.L. and HEILEMAN, L.K. (1991). *Determinants of cue strength in adult first and second language speakers of French*. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 12, 313-348.
- MCLAUGHLIN, B. (1978). *The Monitor model: some methodological considerations*. *Language Learning* 28: 309-32.
- PIENEMANN. (2003). *Language Processing Capacity*. In Doughty C., and Long M. H. (eds). *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 679-714.
- SLOBIN D. I. (1973). *Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar*. In C. A. Ferguson and D. I. Slobin (eds.), *Studies of child language development*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 175-208.
- WILSON. & SAYGIN A.P. (2001). *Adverbs and Functional Heads in Turkish: Linear Order and Scope*. *Proceedings of WECOL 2001*.

<http://www.turkishlanguage.co.uk/newmanisa.htm>

[http://www.absoluteastronomy.com/encyclopedia/G/Ge/German\\_grammar.htm](http://www.absoluteastronomy.com/encyclopedia/G/Ge/German_grammar.htm)