

# ELiS\_e

[e'li:zə]

<Essener Linguistische Skripte – elektronisch>

*Christoph Schroeder*

On the structure of spoken Turkish

[elise@uni-essen.de](mailto:elise@uni-essen.de)

<http://www.elise.uni-essen.de>

Christoph Schroeder  
On the structure of spoken Turkish

## 1. Introduction

**1.1** Turkish is a “left-branching language” with VP and NP modifiers in front of the head, participle-noun order, possessor-possessed order and postpositions. Subordination in Turkish is characterized by a rich variety of non-finite verbal constructions (participles, verbal nouns, converbs) which adhere to the left-branching structure. The unmarked word order in Turkish is *subject - indirect object/adverbial complement - direct object - verb*.

In this paper, I show that the structure of spoken Turkish is subject to certain pragmatic principles which seem to collide with the dominance of left-branching, non-finite subordination, as well as with the verb-final word order. However, the grammar of spoken Turkish has developed certain devices which may be analyzed as strategies to cope with these pragmatic principles **within** a basically left-branching and SOV-syntax.<sup>1</sup>

**1.2** One of these devices is the formation of finite clauses introduced by means of the conjunction *ki*. These clauses have attracted quite a considerable amount of attention in Turkish linguistics over the past few years.<sup>2</sup> There are different types of *ki*-clauses. I am

---

<sup>1</sup> This article further develops thoughts I was given the opportunity to present at the “VIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics” in Ankara, August 7-9, 1996. A preliminary version was published in the conference papers (Imer & Uzun 1997). The research which led to the present article was made possible by grants from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for a research project “Attributive Verbalkonstruktionen” which Winfried Boeder and myself were able to carry out at the University of Oldenburg in the framework of the “DFG-Forschungsschwerpunkt Typologie und Universalienforschung” from 1996 to 1999.

<sup>2</sup> We find these constructions discussed by Bainbridge (1987) and Erguvanlı (1980-1981), by Johanson in a number of publications (see especially Johanson 1975 [1991], 1996, 1999), as well as by Sezer (1978). As for the diachronic process in which *ki* came to be a Turkish conjunction see again Erguvanlı (1980-1981) and Johanson (1996). For *ki*-clauses in other Turkic languages cf. Johanson (1988: 250) on *ki* in Azeri Turkish, Kiral-Shahidi Asl (1991) on *ki* in North-Iranian Azeri Turkish, Schönig (1993) for an overview and Johanson (1992: 264f.) for a discussion. For the use of *ki* in Ottoman Turkish see Bulut (1997).

concerned with clauses like (1)a, i.e. with *ki*-clauses which have a certain resemblance to relative clauses of the Indo-European type:

(1)a [show 3]

bunlar santral-lar-da işlem bit-tikten sonra orta-ya çıktı-an  
 these power.station-PL-LOC processing finish-CONV after middle-DAT come-PRT  
 atık-lar... *ki* hem yaşam süre-ler-i çok uzun  
 residue-PL *ki* as.well life time-PL-POSS very long  
 hem de radyasyon açısından çok yükü-ler  
 as.well.as radiation concerning very loaden-PL

“these are residues coming about after the processing in the power station is over... (*ki*) they (~ which) have a long lifetime and also (they) are very loaded with regard to their radiation”

There are other *ki*-clauses that will not concern me, e.g. complement clauses as in (2), consecutive clauses as in (3) and temporal clauses as in (4). Nor am I interested in emphatic uses of *ki* as in (5) or in “frozen” uses of *ki* in modal adverbs like *tabii ki...* “certainly...”, *ne yazık ki...* “unfortunately...”.

(2) [news-1]

*ancak, üzülerek ifade ediyorum ki... bu hükümetin işçi kesimi ile diyalogu kopuktur*

“but I say with regret (*ki...*) (that) the dialogue between this government and the working class is disturbed”

(3) [ism-12]

*biz Nihat Yavuzla bu işi öyle bir ticarete döktük ki... eh üç dört tane işçimiz vardi İstanbulun altı ayrı yerinde aynı günde tezgahımız vardi*

“together with Nihat and Yavuz we turned this job into such a business (*ki...*) (that) we had three or four workers and had stands in Istanbul in six places at the same time”

(4) [pamuk]

*Ben içeri gittim fasulyemi bitiriyordum ki... “Çöz!” diye seslendi.*

“I went in and was about to finish the beans (*ki...*) (when) she said “undo me!”

(5) [ism-04]

*maçlardan sonra sık sık tartışırız... aslında tartışmak o kadar boş ki...*

“After the matches we often discuss (them).. actually to discuss is so stupid (*ki*)”

The *ki*-constructions exemplified in (2) through (5) share a number of properties which distinguish them from the “relatives”: relative *ki*-clauses as exemplified in (1)a have a pause **before** *ki* and *ki* may be stressed, whereas in the examples (2) through (5), *ki* is immediately adjoined to the preceding element, it is always unstressed and it is **followed** by a pause. Bainbridge calls the latter *ki* “enclitic” (1987: 49). It is, as Comrie (1981a: 85) describes it, “pronounced as part of the preceding clause, and not as part of the sub-

ordinate clause, as in Indo-European languages or Arabic". *ki* in constructions like (1)a on the other hand **is** in fact pronounced as part of the clause it introduces.

It was mentioned above that *ki*-clauses like (1)a have a certain resemblance with relative clauses of the Indo-European type. What kind of resemblance is this? It is certainly not a resemblance in terms of syntactic properties, since *ki*-clauses can never be attributive constituents of noun phrases. For example, the zero anaphora of the nucleus *attiklar* "residues" in the *ki*-clause of (1)a could just as well be replaced by a (possessive) pronoun or by a full (genitive) noun phrase:

(1)b    *ki*    hem    *onlarin*    *yaşam*    *süre-ler-i*    *çok*    *uzun*  
           *ki*    as.well    their    life    time-PL-POSS    very    long

(1)c    *ki*    hem    *attik-lar-in*    *yaşam*    *süre-ler-i*    *çok*    *uzun*  
           *ki*    as.well    residue-PL-GEN    life    time-PL-POSS    very    long

So relative *ki*-clauses in this respect behave like paratactic clauses. In fact, most of the time the "relative" *ki*-clause **does** have an overt "nucleus" itself:

(6)    [ism-3]

çık-tı-m	kapı-dan	sol-a	dön-dü-m
go.out-PST-1SG	door-ABL	left-DAT	turn-PST-1SG
insan-lar	birik-miş-ler	bir	koridor
people-PL	gather-PST-PL	a	hall
ara-da	parmaklık-lar	var...	<i>bir</i> <i>çığlık</i> <i>duy-du-m...</i>
between-LOC	bar-PL	EXIST	a    yell    hear-PST-1SG
<i>ki</i>	<i>bu</i>	<i>çığlığı</i> -i	<i>çok</i> <i>çok</i> <i>iyi</i> <i>bil-iyor-um...</i>
<i>ki</i>	this	yell-ACC	very    very    good    know-PRS-1SG
bizim	Server'-in	<i>çığlığı</i> -i	<i>bu</i>
our	S.-GEN	yell-POSS	this

"I stepped out, turned left outside the door, there were people gathering, there was a hall, inbetween there were bars, I heard a yell... (*ki*) I know *this yell* very very well.. it's our (friend) Server's yell"

Both the relative *ki*-clause and the clause preceding it are always grammatically well-formed finite clauses on their own. Thus the *ki*-clauses in (1)a and (6) are not **subordinate** relative clauses because there is no dependency between the *ki*-clause and the preceding clause in terms of syntactic embedding. Syntactically speaking, the relationship between the *ki*-clause and the preceding clause is a paratactic relationship and the non-enclitic *ki* belongs to the group of coordinating conjunctions in Turkish, most of which are loans (cf. Bainbridge 1987, Johanson 1975 [1991] and 1996). In this sense, non-enclitic *ki* is not a relative pronoun, as, for example, Kissling (1960: 145) suggests.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> However, Kissling has to be given credit as being one of the few Turcologists who have stressed the difference between the enclitic and non-enclitic *ki*. See also Erguvanlı (1980-1981) who suggests that the diachronic sources for the non-enclitic and the enclitic *ki* may be

Also, it is not a subordinator like the Persian *ke* or the Kurdish *ku*. Rather, Johanson's proposal "to consider such *ki*-propositions a kind of relative connection similar to the Latin *coniunctio relativa*" (1975: 106 [1991: 212]) points in the right direction because there are two crucial **pragmatic** features which allow us to say that there is a pragmatic dependency between these clauses and the clauses preceding them.

**1.3** As we will see in the following sections of this paper, this pragmatic dependency has certain parallels to the pragmatic dependency between attributive participles – which are the Turkish counterpart of relative clauses – and their matrix clauses.

These features are:

- i) Both relative *ki*-clauses and attributive participles always have a topic. In the case of relative *ki* clauses, this topic has an antecedent in the immediately preceding clause. In the case of attributive participles, this topic is identical with their head noun.
- ii) Relative *ki*-clauses never describe successive events in the narrative but provide non-sequential information on the topic. This is a feature that relative *ki*-clauses have in common with their non-finite participle counterpart, not necessarily though with Indo-European relative clauses. As Lars Johanson has shown, the latter may be sequential ("plot-advancing"), while attributive Turkish participles never are (see Johanson 1975: 116f. [1991: 222f.], 1999).

So we arrive at a "discourse-related description" of relative *ki*-clauses:

*ki*-clauses are finite, non-sequential clauses with a topic which has an antecedent in the immediately preceding clause.

In this paper, these constructions will be called "relative *ki*-clauses" in order to distinguish them from the constructions with the enclitic *ki*. But the reader should bear in mind that the term "relative" is not meant to imply syntactic embedding. I will come back to this point in the concluding section.

**1.4** As any native speaker of Turkish instinctively feels, clauses like (1)a and (6) are a feature of unplanned spoken discourse. They are rarely found in written discourse or, more generally, in planned discourse.

With the term "written" or "planned" discourse I refer both to texts which are actually written down as well as to talks which the speakers have prepared before they started to speak, or elaborate argumentations of professional speakers, i.e. politicians, lawyers, professional speakers on radio or television - except, of course, when spontaneity is deliberately created. Written discourse has an orientation towards a certain structure, which, as I will argue, differs considerably from unplanned spoken discourse, where relative *ki*-clauses nearly exclusively belong - in contrast with, for example, the

---

different; i.e. the Old Turkic *kim* "who" for the non-enclitic *ki* and the Persian subordinator *ke* for the enclitic *ki*.

complement construction formed with enclitic *ki*, which is frequently found in written discourse.

With “spoken” or “unplanned” discourse I refer to the type of unplanned discourse which evolves spontaneously, mostly in conversations – though it may of course contain narrative passages – and which is characterized by a high topical “fuzziness”, that is, by quick changes of topic, as well as by a high relatedness towards the extra-linguistic context and frequent turn-taking between the speakers.

Why is it that we find relative *ki*-clauses in spoken Turkish discourse whereas written discourse does not seem to need it? Assuming, as I do, that linguistic structure is shaped by function, we should be able to explain the occurrence of these constructions in spoken discourse in a particular syntactic slot.

Thus I will try to show

- i) that the occurrence of relative *ki*-clauses and a number of other units typical of spoken discourse is motivated by specific pragmatic “needs” a speaker must meet and which have a structural impact on the spoken language; and
- ii) that the use of relative *ki*-clauses may be a paratactic alternative to certain uses of attributive participles in Turkish, while it is **no** alternative to certain **other** uses of attributive participles.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 I will take a closer look at relative *ki*-clauses and classify them. In Section 3 this classification is related to the use of attributive participles in spoken and written discourse. Section 4 accounts for the fact that relative *ki*-clauses are a feature of spoken discourse, that is, their occurrence is related to the overall structure of spoken discourse as opposed to written discourse in Turkish. Section 5 concludes and briefly discusses the findings.

**1.5** A few words on the database are in order: as for unplanned spoken discourse, I use data from recordings of spoken Turkish produced by native speakers – students and middle-aged people from Istanbul and Ankara. The recordings are conversations with narrative passages between two people (“[ism]” and “[m]”). Furthermore, I have recorded passages from talk shows on Turkish television (“[show]”). For examples from planned discourse, I use a short story written by Tomris Uyar, “Bol buzlu bir aşk lütfen” (“A love with lots of ice, please”, “[uyar]”) from the collection of short stories “Yaza yolculuk” (“Journey into the summer”), Pınar Kür’s novel “Sonuncu sonbahar” (“Last autumn”, “[kür”]), Orhan Pamuk’s novel “Sessiz ev” (“The silent house”, “[pamuk]”) and recordings of television news (“[news]”).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> In the collection of my examples, the program “FLEXX”, developed by Gerjan van Schaik for corpus analyses of Turkish data, was an invaluable help.

## 2. Classification of relative *ki*-clauses

A text-related classification of relative *ki*-clauses may be made according to the antecedent of their topic in the preceding clause. This antecedent may be i) the entire preceding clause as in (7), or it may be ii) a noun phrase that is a part of the preceding clause, as in (1)a and (6).

(7) [ism-07]

tanıdık çevreden bir tip olması lazım... *ki* o da çok zor yani

“it should be somebody from the circle of friends... (*ki*) that (~ which) is very difficult, I reckon”

The type of relative *ki*-clause exemplified in (7) is the most frequent variety, and it is the only one which also occurs in written texts. In fact, a *ki* may even occur in sentence initial position in written texts:<sup>5</sup>

(8) [kür 133]

Tarık (yani Gökhan) o dönemde Aysel'in çevresinde dolanmamış, dolandıysa bile herhangi bir objektif tarafından zaptedilmemişti. *Ki*, bunu zaten biliyordum.

“Tarık (well, Gökhan) did not hang out in Aysel's circle at that time, even if he did hang out (there), this has not been registered by any lens. (*ki*) I knew this anyway.” (Whereby *bunu* “this” relates to the immediately preceding clause.)

*ki*-clauses that have a noun phrase of the preceding clause as the antecedent of their topic may be further classified according to the pragmatic status of this antecedent: the antecedent may be i) “not given” and “new”, i.e. it may be introduced in the preceding clause, as in (1)a, (6) and (9), and the antecedent may be ii) “given” and “new”, i.e. it may belong to the “pragmatic set” (cf. Hawkins 1991) of a concept which has already been established, or it may belong to the permanent registry or to the situation (cf. the definition in Bechert 1992: 8). For example in (10), the antecedent *ailesi* “her family” is “given” since it belongs to the “pragmatic set” of a referent which has already been established.

It is important to note, though, that the third possible pragmatic status of an antecedent which is “not new” and at the same time “given” on the basis of its being established by linguistic means, does not occur. The antecedent of the topic in relative *ki*-clauses is always “new”, i.e. it is always a concept which has not been mentioned before in the discourse in question.<sup>6</sup>

(9) [ism-13]

güzel, doğru cevaplar verdiler... *ki* cevapları ben söylemiştim onlara

“they gave nice and right answers... (*ki*) I had told them the answers.”

<sup>5</sup> This again confirms our analysis that the “relative” *ki* is non-enclitic.

<sup>6</sup> In the following, the terms “given”, “not given”, “new” and “not new” will appear in quotation marks when they refer explicitly to the pragmatic statuses defined above.

(10) [ism-01]

ailesine haber vermiyeceğimize karar verdik... *ki* ailesi çok tutucu insanlardı

“we decided that we would not tell her parents... (*ki*) her parents were very conservative people”

While the type of *ki*-construction with the whole preceding clause as the antecedent of its topic does not have an infinite “participle” alternative, the other two have, i.e. the information conveyed in the *ki* clauses in (1)a, (6), (9) and (10) could also be represented in the form of an attributive participle and it is only these *ki*-clauses that properly contrast with attributive participles. But in order to establish their comparability a text-related classification of attributive participles is required.

### 3. Classification of attributive participles

Looking at the use of attributive participles it appears that we can speak of three textual categories of participles:<sup>7</sup>

i) The **anaphoric** use of attributive participles:

Participles can “identify” a referent as part of an event previously mentioned in discourse. Referents identified by these participles are always “given” – either because they were previously introduced in relation to this event, as *mal* “goods” in (11), or the event necessarily presupposes their participation, as *sene* “year” in (12), which is “given” since an event which occurred at a certain time in the past implies some concept of time related to this event:<sup>8</sup>

(11) [m 11]

o	oraya	mal	sat-acak	sen gel-iyor-sun...
he	there(DAT)	goods	sell-FUT(3SG)	you come-PRS-2SG
onun	<i>sat-acağ-i</i>	<i>mal-i</i>	sen	sat-iyor-sun
his(GEN)	sell-PRT(FUT)-POSS	goods-ACC	you	sell-PRS-2SG

“he sells goods over there and you come... *the goods he was about to sell you sell (instead)*”

(12) [m 32]

orta	iki-de	buraya	gel-di-m...
middle	two-LOC	here(DAT)	come-PST-1SG
<i>gel-diğ-im</i>	<i>sene</i>	şive-m	değiş-ti
come-PRT-POSS.1SG	year	dialect-POSS.1SG	change-PST

“I came here during the second class of middle school... *in the year I came my dialect changed at once*”

<sup>7</sup> In this classification I am not concerned with headless participles, nor with adverbially used participle constructions, e.g. *Ali gel-diğ-i zaman* (A. come-PRT-POSS time) “when Ali came”.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the discussion of “exclusive indirect anaphora” in Erkù & Gundel (1987: 535) and Schroeder (1995: 210f.).

ii) The **establishing** use of attributive participles:

Participles can establish a new referent by specifying it as part of an event which itself has not been previously mentioned in discourse. Very often, the “establishing” procedure is carried out by non-subject participles, i.e. the type of attributive participle which takes a non-subject participant as its head noun and which has a possessive suffix agreeing with its genitive subject: a referent is introduced by means of an event in which it is a – mostly patient – participant, and where the agent is “given”. Consequently, among the 97 object participles found in Tomris Uyar's short story “Bol buzlu bir aşk lütfen” (“A love with lots of ice, please”, [uyar]), only one participle had an indefinite genitive subject and only 23 participles had an overt (genitive) subject; all others had zero anaphora of the subject, which is a good indicator of its givenness. Thus, object participles establish a new referent by way of linking it to a previously established, “given” referent.<sup>9</sup>

(13) [kür 23]

Aysel Aslan ile çevir-diğ-i iki film  
A. A. with shoot-PRT-POSS two film

“the two films which he shot with Aysel Aslan”

(14) [kür 42]

Daha önce çözümle-diğ-in cinayet-ler kolay-di.  
before solve-PRT-POSS.2SG murder-PL easy-PST

“The murders you solved before were easy.”

iii) The **non-restrictive** use of attributive participles:

As with “anaphoric participles”, the referent of the head noun of non-restrictive participles is always “given” – but its givenness does not depend on the event expressed by the participle. So this type of participle modifies its head without restricting its extension:<sup>10</sup>

(15) [kür 1]

Temmuz-da bile serin ol-an bu Boğaz semt-in-de, ..  
July-LOC even chilly be-PRT this Bosphorus district-POSS-LOC

“In this Bosphorus district, which is chilly even in July , ..”

(16) [news-1]

milletvekili-ler-den kes-il-ecek bu para-lar  
parliamentarian-PL-ABL cut-PASS-PRT(FUT) this money-PL

“this money, which will be cut from the parliamentarians”

<sup>9</sup> Equivalent English relative clauses are termed “anchored relative clauses” in Fox & Thompson (1990: 300).

<sup>10</sup> See Erkman-Akerson (1992) and Schroeder (1998) for a discussion of non-restrictive participles in Turkish.

If we now compare spoken and written discourse, one difference immediately becomes evident: “non-restrictive” participles are not used in spoken discourse, whereas they are fairly common in written texts. Similarly, “establishing participles” are also rarely used in spoken discourse, while this is the most common use of attributive participles in written texts. In particular “co-ordinate establishing participles”, i.e. participles modifying a new referent and coordinated with an additional attribute, as in (17), are never used in spoken discourse:

(17) [news-1]

Çetin Karaoğlan	cezaevin-den	firar et-tikten	sonra
Ç. K.	prison-ABL	escape-CONV	after
<i>Kuşadası'ndan</i>	<i>çal-dığ-ı</i>	<i>motor-lu</i>	<i>bir sandal-la</i>
K'ABL	steal-PRT-POSS	motor-ADJ	a boat-INSTR
önce-ki gün	Sisam ada-sın-a	gel-di.	
befor-ATTR day	S. island-POSS-DAT	come-PST	

“Following his escape from the prison, Çetin Karaoğlan came to the island of Samos the day before with a motorboat (lit.: with a boat with a motor), which he had stolen from Kuşadası.”

The most common use of attributive participles in spoken discourse is “anaphoric”. This brings us back to *ki*. One might like to suggest that relative *ki*-clauses in the spoken language as in (1)a, (6), (9) and (10) are used as an alternative to the non-restrictive, establishing and co-ordinate use of attributive participles.

However, while this may serve as a first step towards an understanding of relative *ki*-clauses, it is not an **explanation** for their use in spoken discourse. And it does not account for the fact that relative *ki*-clauses are no alternative choice to anaphoric participles. Thus we must take a closer look at the structure of spoken language in comparison with written language.

#### 4. The structure of spoken Turkish

In terms of “information packaging” there are two characteristics which are peculiar to spoken discourse in general as opposed to written discourse. These characteristics apply to Turkish as well as to any other language, although their consequences, of course, depend on the syntactic prerequisites of the language under investigation.

Firstly, unplanned/spoken discourse tends to organize information in smaller, syntactically autonomous units.

This fragmentation of the information makes it more easily accessible to the hearer, it gives the hearer more opportunities for “turn-taking”, and it allows the speaker to plan his/her talk “as s/he goes along”, i.e. to constantly adjust it to the linguistic and non-linguistic reactions of interlocutor and to the extra-linguistic context (cf. Givón 1979: 228f.).

A well known consequence of this is, syntactically speaking, the tendency of spoken Turkish towards a stronger paratactic organization of the text. This in turn has the consequence that semantic relationships between clauses like the relationship between “se-

quentiality” and “non-sequentiality” or pragmatic relationships of topic identity can no longer be coped with by left-branching syntactic structure, in particular by infinite subordinate clauses which are constituents of their matrix clause. Instead, a heavier functional load lies on the tools for paratactic text organization because under these conditions they are the locus where the pragmatic and semantic relation between clauses is coded. Consequently, in addition to using intonation and pauses, spoken language heavily relies on “discourse markers” in order to structure a text, i.e. conjunctions, focus markers, interjections and other function words (cf. Schiffrin 1987). *ki* after pause, then, is a discourse marker which announces a non-sequential predication about a topic which has an antecedent in the immediately preceding clause. This clause may be uttered by the same speaker or by the interlocutor; notice the frequent use of relative *ki*-clauses in turn-takings:

(18) [m 32] (continuation of (12))

C: geldiğim sene benim şivem değişti hemen

“in the year I came my dialect changed at once”

D: *ki* Karadenizlilerin kolay değişmiyor

“(ki) the one the people from the Black Sea have doesn't change easily”

Secondly, unplanned discourse is characterized by a salient differentiation of information according to the informational status of its units.

So, information is not organized into arbitrary chunks. Its distribution has a pragmatic basis, i.e. it is “new” or “not new” information, it is topic or comment, it is elaborating information or contains the “focus”, i.e. the core part of the comment<sup>11</sup>, is gives the deictic framework within which the predication holds or it is the predication itself - but one unit does not contain both “new” **and** “not new” information or topic **and** comment and so forth.

On the sentence level, a well known consequence of this is the frequent use of the post-predicate position in spoken Turkish. Previous work (cf. Erguvanlı 1984: 43ff., Mundy 1955, Schroeder 1995) shows that the differentiation of the information as exhibited in sentences with post-predicate units follows a certain linear pattern. This pattern may be described as follows: first comes the focus in preverbal (focus) position, then the predicate may be followed by elaborating information, i.e. Mundy's “sentence plus” (1955: 399f.), which further qualifies the focus occurring on the left of the predicate; so this may be new information, although the focus must be referential without it. Also the topic and the deictic frame may follow the predicate. Thus, in general terms, the information which links the new information on the left of the predicate to preceding

<sup>11</sup> In the definition of “focus” I follow Comrie (1981b: 57), who defines it as “the essential piece of the new information that is carried by a sentence”.

discourse and to the extra-linguistic context may follow the predicate. I will call this “linking information”.<sup>12</sup>

The most consistent use of the post-predicate position is found in questions and referent introduction. In questions, we note a tendency for everything apart from the question word or the questioned constituent to appear in the post-predicate position. For example in (19), the post-predicate nominalization in the last line anaphorically comprises information the speaker “B” has given before. The example shows that the topical constituent in the post-predicate position may be a complex textual referent:

(19) [ism-02]

B: bu işi otuz senedir yapıyorum

“I have been doing this work for thirty years.”

D: otuz senedir... ondan önce?

“Thirty years... and before that?”

B: ondan önce... bayan terzisiydi-m

“Before that... I was a ladies tailor.”

D: gene dikişle alakalı

“Again connected to clothing.”

B: tabii terzi... dikişle alakalı

“Sure, tailor... connected to clothing.”

D: yani nasıl ol-du dikiş-i bırak-ıp buna geç-iş-in

well how be-PST(3SG) tailoring-ACC leave-CONV this(DAT) go-NOM-POSS.2SG

“Well, how did it happen that you left tailoring and came to do this?”

Very often in questions the post-predicate position also contains a second-person pronoun which “seems to have the effect of emphasizing the speaker's concern with his interlocutor” (Zimmer 1986: 199):

(20) [ism-05]

nasıl gir-di-n sen bu iş-e ?

how get into-PST-2SG you this work-DAT

“how did you get this job?”

Something similar applies to referent introduction in sentences with an (indefinite) new referent as their subject and a predicate low in transitivity, i.e. existential sentences with the existential predicate *var* or with predicates like *gelmek* “come” or *bulunmak* “be found”. In spoken discourse, these presentative constructions are used far more fre-

<sup>12</sup> Note that the sequence of elaborating and linking information does not imply linear order. Note also that next to elaborating and linking information, “afterthought” information may also follow the predicate. But it seems that afterthought has to be classified as extra-clausal, since, unlike other post-predicate information, it is separated from the preceding predicate by a pause. I will not deal with afterthought in the following.

quently to introduce new referents than in written discourse. In written discourse new referents are more often introduced as non-subjects (see Klomp 1996).<sup>13</sup> Again, the post-predicate position is heavily used in presentatives, leading to a structure where only the essential part of the new information – the focus – appears on the left of the predicate, while all elaborating or linking information is shifted to the right. For example in (21), the elaborating adverbial constituent further qualifies the predication. And in (22), the adverbial constituent provides linking information, since the workplace of the person in question has also provided the deictic frame for the discourse preceding the utterance:

(21) [ism-08]

kanser	korku-su	var	aşırı	derece-de
cancer	fear-POSS	EXIST	extreme	grade-LOC
“she is afraid of cancer to an extreme degree”				

(22) [ism-07]

başka	bir	adam	var	iş	yer-in-de
another	a	man	EXIST	work	place-POSS-LOC
“there is another guy at her workplace”					

A very telling example for how spoken language may split up the information is the use of an additional discourse marker, i.e. the “passe-partout-word” *şey* “thing”. In the presentation of new, often fairly complex textual referents, and in yes-no questions, the use of *şey* as a “dummy” for the new referent or the questioned constituent allows the new information itself to be shifted to the right.<sup>14</sup> Thus there arises a further differentiation between the announcement of the type of speech act itself (question or referent introduction) – by simply presenting the predicate frame with *şey* in focus position – and the new information in the post-predicate position:

(23) [ism-08]

şimdi	<i>şey-i</i>	anlat-ayım	biraz
now	thing-ACC	talk-OPT.1SG	a little
daha evvel	çalış-tıg-im	şirket-te	çek-tıg-im
before	work-PRT-POSS.1SG	company-LOC	endure-PRT-POSS.1SG

sıkıntı-lar-dan

<sup>13</sup> Note that the use of presentative constructions in itself can be conceived of as a strategy to differentiate clearly between referent introduction and other pragmatic operations like the establishment or the continuation of a topic (cf. Schroeder 1999: 45-54) – a differentiation which again follows the “second characteristic” of unplanned discourse noted above.

<sup>14</sup> Note that *şey* also serves as a pause filler. As a pause filler, it is often combined with other pause fillers and usually followed by a pause: [ism-02] *adam eh.. şey.. çok düzlen* “the guy is em.. what do you call it.. very proper”. This use of *şey* is probably the source of its use as a discourse marker. Erguvanlı (1984) also notes the substitutional use of *şey*, though in her approach *şey* serves as a dummy for (afterthought) material “remembered after a sentence has been uttered” (1984: 51). The use of *şey* as a discourse marker as described here is also noted by Auer (1990: 277).

neden bu iş-e başla-dıg-ımı falan  
 why this work-DAT start-PRT-POSS.1SG-ACC so on

“now I will talk a little about *thing*, about the strains I had to endure at the company I worked in before, and why I started this job and so on”

In demonstrating the differentiation of the information units in the spoken language I have so far restricted myself to **sentences**. But it can be shown that the same principle applies to **sentence combining**. For example, instead of using *sey* with the new information being shifted to the post-predicate position, as in (23), the predicate frame can be repeated, as in (24)a and (25)a. This leads to a structure with two clauses which are pragmatically closely related to each other: the first clause “announces”, so to speak, a presentation, which the second clause carries out:

(24)a [ism-01]

sey mi yok ithal izn-i mi yok ham deri-nin?  
 thing QUE NEG.EXIST import permission-POSS QUE NEG.EXIST raw leather-GEN  
 “is there no *thing*, is there no import permit, for the raw leather?”

(25)a [ism-08]

Tom diye bir sey var şirket var İngiliz  
 T. QUO a thing EXIST company EXIST English  
 “there is a *thing* called Tom, there is a company, (an) English (one)”

In the examples I have so far found, this structure goes together with the use of the post-predicate position for linking or elaborating information in the second clause. Obviously, speakers tend to avoid the combination of both new **and** linking or elaborating information in post-predicate position – a combination which would evolve if the ([non-existential) predicate were not repeated. Thus (24)b and (25)b are not acceptable as alternatives to (24) and (25). This again underlines the strictness with which spoken language keeps units with different informational statuses apart from each other:

(24)b [ism-01]

?sey mi yok ithal izn-i mi ham deri-nin  
 thing QUE NEG.EXIST import permission-POSS QUE raw leather-GEN

(25)b [ism-08]

? Tom diye bir sey var şirket İngiliz  
 T. QUO a thing EXIST company English

On the basis of this general characterization of spoken discourse we are now able to understand the occurrence of the relative *ki*-clauses with a noun phrase antecedent in the preceding clause: *ki* combines a clause containing a “new” referent with a clause containing elaborating or linking information about this referent. Thus with *ki*, the linear order principle “new information followed by elaborating or linking information” is maintained even above sentence level, i.e. in a paratactic text organization. In (6) and (9) for example, the information conveyed in the *ki*-clause provides linking information about

the new referent of the preceding clause by relating it to “given” participants, in these examples to the speaker himself. Apart from this, there already are restrictive attributes in (1)a and (9) which specify the new referent; the information conveyed in the *ki*-clauses, then, gives further non-restrictive information. The same applies to the type of *ki*-clause in which the topic is a “given” referent, as in (10): no information is needed to identify the referent, thus any predication about it consists of elaborating or linking information and may thus be shifted to the right.

The working of the principle “new information followed by elaborating or linking information” is again limited by the requirements of the units; and this accounts for the fact that anaphoric participles cannot be substituted by relative *ki*-clauses. Anaphoric participles are not linking or elaborating information, but constitute the very semantics of a referring expression. If they did not identify the referent in the very “informational unit” where it turns up, this would break with the fundamental principle of discourse which says: “always start from the maximum amount of shared information in the given speech situation”.

## 5. Conclusion and outlook

**5.1** I have tried to show that the non-enclitic coordinating conjunction *ki* is a discourse marker designated to code a non-sequential predication about a topic which has an antecedent in the immediately preceding clause. This antecedent is always “new” and it may be the whole preceding proposition, or a noun phrase.

The fact that non-enclitic *ki* almost exclusively belongs to spoken or unplanned Turkish discourse must be seen in the light of the specific characteristics of spoken discourse as opposed to written discourse: the stronger paratactic structure of unplanned or spoken Turkish shifts a higher functional load onto “discourse markers” in order to organize the text. Furthermore, spoken Turkish has a tendency towards a linear order of “new information followed by elaborating or linking information”. The use of the post-predicate position is an outcome of this tendency on the sentence level. The use of *ki* in instances where the topic of the clause it introduces is a noun phrase constituent of the preceding clause is an outcome of this tendency on the text level.

Thus, relative *ki*-clauses contain elaborating or linking information. In this respect, we can speak of a parallel to the informational status of those *ki*-clauses where the topic has a noun phrase antecedent in the preceding clause and certain types of attributive participles, namely establishing, co-ordinate and non-restrictive participles. These types of relative *ki*-clauses may thus be seen as possible alternatives provided by the spoken language to these types of participles.

**5.2** Here are some residual problems that could not be pursued here in the necessary detail and that require further discussion:

**5.2.1** In the introductory section I stressed the fact that relative *ki*-clauses are not subordinate clauses. Syntactically speaking, it is clear that they exhibit all the charac-

teristics of finite main clauses. On the other hand, pragmatically speaking they **do** exhibit a strong dependency on the preceding clause.

In the recent typological discussion on clause-combining it has been suggested by various scholars that relationships between clauses should be understood in terms of a scalar approach rather than as absolute oppositions defined on a purely syntactic basis (“embedded vs. non-embedded”).<sup>15</sup> In the scalar approach, semantic and pragmatic parameters are also called for. This means that questions concerning the scope of the illocutionary force operator of one clause over the other are also taken into consideration as well as temporal relations (sequential vs. non-sequential) and thematic relations (topic continuation vs. topic switch). In this light, the status of relative *ki*-clauses still needs to be investigated in relation to other strategies of clause combining in Turkish.

**5.2.2** Last, but not least it needs to be asked whether the order of “new information followed by elaborating/linking information” does in any way collide with the left-branching and SOV syntax of Turkish. As has been pointed out by Auer (1990), in a noteworthy article on the structure of spoken Turkish, this is not the case. The linear order principle has to be understood as a principle concerning the distribution of information in texts. It is not, however, a syntactic principle. The postverbal position is an option with certain pragmatic prescriptions which make it attractive given the specific characteristics of unplanned/spoken Turkish discussed in Section 4 above. The use of *sey* actually is a response to this: the “dummy” is required in the syntacticized pre-verbal focus position in order to **allow** for a dislocation of constituents. And also the fact that *ki* and *kim* have rather **lost** their subordinating functions in a diachronic process and developed into a coordinating conjunction (cf. Erguvanlı 1980-1981, footnote 3) shows that Turkish integrated these forms into its own syntactic prerequisites (cf. Johanson 1996).

It needs to be stressed, however, that discourse markers like *ki* and *sey*, which allow this linear order principle to be adhered to **within** a basically left-branching and SOV syntax, are an essential part of Turkish grammar, of which the chapters on the **spoken** language are yet to be written.

---

<sup>15</sup> See Foley & Van Valin (1984: 256f.), Lehmann (1988), Matthiessen & Thompson (1988), Raible (1992).

## Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	NEG	negative
ACC	accusative	NOM	nominalizer
ADJ	adjective derivation	OPT	optative
ATTR	attribute marker	PL	plural
COM	comitative	PRT	participle
CONV	converb	PASS	passive
DAT	dative	POSS	possessive
EXIST	existential predicate	PRS	present tense
FACT	factitive	PST	past tense
FUT	future	QUE	question enclitic
GEN	genitive	QUO	quotation particle
INSTR	instrumental	SG	singular
LOC	locative		

## References

Auer, Peter. 1990. Einige umgangssprachliche Phänomene des Türkischen und ihre Erklärung aus „natürlichen“ Prinzipien. In: Norbert Boretzky et al. (eds.). *Spielarten der Natürlichkeit – Spielarten der Ökonomie. Beiträge zum 5. Essener Kolloquium über „Grammatikalisierung: Natürlichkeit und Systemökonomie“ vom 6.10. - 8.10. 1988 an der Universität Essen*. 2. Band, 2. Halbband. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 271-297.

Bainbridge, Margret. 1987. Loan conjunctions in Turkish versus native syntax. In: Hendrik E. Boeschoten & Ludo Th. Verhoeven (eds). *Studies on modern Turkish. Proceedings of the Third Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Tilburg: University Press, 42-56.

Bechert, Johannes. 1992. Standard German: some first impressions. In: Giuliano Bernini & Davide Ricca (eds). *Topics*. EUROTYP Working Papers, I/2, May 1992, 5-20.

Bulut, Christiane. 1997. Strategies of relativization in an Ottoman Turkish text. In: İmer & Uzun, 77-87.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981a. *The languages of the Soviet Union*. (Cambridge Language Surveys) Cambridge: University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1981b. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: UP.

Erguvanlı, Eser. 1980-1981. A case of syntactic change: *ki* constructions in Turkish. *Bogaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi, Humanities* 8-9, 111-139.

Erguvanlı, Eser Emine. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Erkman-Akerson, Fatma. 1992. Determination bei restriktiven und appositiven Nominalsyntagmen und Relativkonstruktionen im Türkischen. *Diyalog* 1, 45-68.

Erkü, Feride, Jeanette Gundel. 1987. The pragmatics of indirect anaphors. In: Jef Vereschueren & Marcella Bertuccelli-Papi. (eds.). *The pragmatic perspective. Selected papers from the 1985 International Pragmatics Conference*. (Pragmatics & Beyond, Companion Series 5) Amsterdam/Phil.: Benjamins, 533-546.

Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: University Press.

Fox, Barbara A. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1990. A discourse explanation of the grammar of relative clauses in English conversation. *Language* 66, 2, 297-316.

Givón, Talmi. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

Haiman, John & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.). 1988. *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam/Phil.: Benjamins.

Hawkins, John. 1991. On (in)definite articles: implicatures and (un)grammaticality prediction. *Journal of Linguistics* 27, 405-442.

İmer, Kâmile & N. Engin Uzun (eds.). 1997. *Proceedings of the VIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Ankara, August 7-9, 1996*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

Johanson, Lars. 1975. Some remarks on Turkic "hypotaxis". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 47, 104-118. (Reprint in: Johanson, Lars. 1991. *Linguistische Beiträge zur Gesamtturkologie*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 210-224.)

Johanson, Lars. 1988. Iranian elements in Azeri Turkish. In: Ehsan Yarshater (ed.). *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. III. Costa Mesa/CA: Mazda, 248-250.

Johanson, Lars. 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakte*. Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann-Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main. Band XXIX, Nr. 5, 167-299.

Johanson, Lars. 1996. Kopierte Satzjunkturen im Türkischen. *Zeitschrift für Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49, 1, 39-49.

Johanson, Lars. 1999. Zur Wiedergabe weiterführender Relativsätze im Türkischen. In: Lars Johanson & Joachim Rehbein (eds.). *Türkisch und Deutsch im Vergleich*. (Turcologica 39) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 129-137.

Kiral-Shahidi Asl, Filiz. 1991. *Persische Lehnsyntax im aserbaidschanischen Städialekt von Tübrisz*. Magisterarbeit, Universität Mainz.

Kissling, Hans Joachim. 1960. *Osmanisch-türkische Grammatik*. (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie III) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Klomp, Harry. 1996. The structure of discourse and preferred argument structure. Paper presented at the VIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, Ankara, August 7-9, 1996.

Lehmann, Christian. 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: Haiman & Thompson, 181-225.

Matthiessen, Christian, Sandra A. Thompson. 1988. The structure of discourse and 'subordination'. In: Haiman & Thompson, 275-329.

Mundy, C.S. 1955. Turkish syntax as a system of qualification. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 17, 279-305.

Raible, Wolfgang. 1992. *Junktion. Eine Dimension der Sprache und ihre Realisierungsformen zwischen Aggregation und Integration*. (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1992, Bericht 2) Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Carl Winter.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. (Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 5) Cambridge: University Press.

Schönig, Claus. 1993. Finitprädizierte Relativsätze in Sprachen des altaischen Typs. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 3, 181-191.

Sezer, Engin. 1978. Farsça'dan gelen yabancı ya da Türkçe'de ki'li ad tümceçikleri. [The stranger from Persia, or: ki-clauses in Turkish] *Genel Dilbilim Dergisi* 1, 2, 18-30.

Schroeder, Christoph. 1995. Post-predicate arguments in Turkish. *Zeitschrift für Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 48, 1/2, 204-218.

Schroeder, Christoph. 1998. Vom Partizip zum Adjektiv im Türkischen. In: Winfried Boeder et al. (eds). *Beiträge zur empirischen Sprachwissenschaft. In memoriam Johannes Bechert*. Tübingen: Narr, 303-318.

Schroeder, Christoph. 1999. *The Turkish nominal phrase in spoken discourse*. (Turcologica 40) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zimmer, Karl. 1986. On the function of the post-predicate subject pronouns in Turkish. In: Aksu-Koç, Ayhan & Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan (eds.). *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference. August 9-10, 1984*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications, 195-206.