

DIRECT REPORTED SPEECH: POSITIONING AND

RELATIONAL IDENTITY WORK

DİDEM İKİZOĞLU

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2010

DIRECT REPORTED SPEECH: POSITIONING AND  
RELATIONAL IDENTITY WORK

Thesis submitted to the  
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts  
in  
Linguistics

by  
Didem İ̇kizođlu

Bođaziçi University  
2010

## Thesis Abstract

Didem İkizoğlu “Direct Reported Speech: Positioning and Relational Identity Work”

This thesis aims to describe how direct reported speech (DRS) is constructed in Turkish and investigate how narrators make use of different reporting strategies in order to position themselves, their audience and the speakers they report in order to construct relational identities.

Our analysis is based on 6 hours of video and audio recordings composed of both life story interviews and naturally occurring conversations. The most frequent DRS strategies in our data are DRS with the quotative *de-*, DRS with zero quotative and DRS with the converbial *diye*. DRS with the quotative *de-* is categorized into DRS with single quotative and DRS with multiple quotatives. In the latter category, the irregular behavior of *de-* in terms of sentential distribution, argument structure and prosodic features challenges its status as a verb. As for the narrative functions of DRS, we argue that there are three main categories: event description, theatrical representation and character assertion. Event description is carried out by DRS with single quotative, embedded in the narrative as part of complicating action or evaluation. Theatrical representation function is fulfilled by DRS with zero quotative, which enables the reporter to play the part of the reported speaker. Character assertion function is achieved when the narrative itself is the reported conversation and the multiple quotatives work towards reinforcing the reported speaker’s position in the narrative. We further show that narrators are well aware of the representation and positioning effects of different strategies and make conscious choices regarding the DRS strategy to be used, as the organization of experiences via narratives requires the organization of characters.

## Tez Özeti

Didem İkizođlu “Dolaysız Anlatım: Konumlandırma ve İlişkisel Kimlik Kurulumu”

Bu tez Türkçe’de dolaysız anlatım yapılarının tarif edilmesini ve anlatıcıların farklı dolaysız anlatım stratejileri kullanarak kendilerini, dinleyicilerini ve alıntıladıkları konuşmacıları ilişkisel kimlik kurulumunu sağlamak amacıyla nasıl konumlandıklarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Analiz 6 saatlik ses ve görüntü kayırlarına dayanarak yapılmıştır ve bu kayıtlar hem hayat hikayesi mülakatlarından hem de doğal konuşmalardan oluşmaktadır. Verilerde en sık karşılaşılan dolaysız anlatım stratejileri de- alıntılایıcısı, sıfır alıntılایıcı ve diye ile kurulanlardır. de- alıntılایıcısıyla kurulan dolaysız anlatım yapıları ikiye ayrılır: tek alıntılایıcı yapılar ve çoklu alıntılایıcı yapılar. İkinci kategoride de-’nin tümcedeki dağılımı, öge yapısı ve ezgisel özellik konularındaki sıradışı davranışı fiil olarak sınıflandırılmasını zorlaştırmaktadır. Dolaysız anlatımın anlatı işlevleri ise üç kategoride incelenmektedir: olay tarifi, teatral temsil ve kişilik dayatması. Olay tarifi tek alıntılایıcı ile gerçekleştirilir ve anlatıların düğüm ya da yorum bölümlerinde yer alır. Teatral temsil sıfır alıntılایıcı ile sağlanır ve alıntılایıcının alıntının sahibini oynamasına olanak tanır. Kişilik dayatması işlevi anlatımın kendisi alıntıdan oluştuđu ve alıntılایıcılar konuşmacının anlatıdaki konumunun altını çizme işlevini gördüđu zaman sağlanır. Ayrıca, anlatıcılar farklı stratejilerin temsil ve konumlandırma etkilerinin farkında olarak, anlatı üzerinden deneyimlerin düzenlenmesi anlatılardaki karakterlerin düzenlenmesini gerektirdiğinden, kullanacakları dolaysız anlatım için bilinçli tercihler yaparlar.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe my deepest gratitude to my advisor Didar Akar, who has been there for me through the best of times and the worst of times. Starting from my first linguistics course at Boğaziçi University as an undergraduate, she guided and encouraged me in my studies while leaving me room to work in my own way. I am indebted to her more than she knows.

I am deeply grateful to Meltem Kelepir for her detailed and constructive comments and for her invaluable insights that contributed to the basis of this thesis. I would also like to present my sincere thanks to Leyla Martı for her comments.

My gratitude for Deniz Tarba Ceylan is beyond words. She gave me her healing hand when I was at the very bottom and has not let me slip away ever since. She is the teacher I someday hope to be. I am grateful to Beste Can for everything she does and is to me. Bilgen is a true friend and I cannot thank her enough for her support and the many hours of enlightening conversations we had. Güliz has been a true comrade in all walks of life for the past three years. Özge contributed to my data, but above that she contributed to my life greatly as one of the oldest and most cherished friends. Süleyman, Susan, Evra, Derya, Alys, Samed, Saka, Deniz, Ümit, Mehmet, Nicola, Engin, Elif, Cem, Ayşen, Ayşegül among many others are greatly appreciated for their contributions in my thesis and for making my life much more than just bearable.

Finally, special thanks go to my parents Zeynep and Mustafa, without whom none of this would ever happen.

## CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Research Questions .....	2
1.2 Overview of the Thesis .....	3
1.3 Concepts and Definitions Used in This Study .....	6
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	7
2.1 Research on Narrative .....	7
2.2 Research on Reported Speech .....	13
2.1.1. Form of Reported Speech .....	5
2.1.2. Authenticity of Reported Speech .....	6
2.1.3. Functions of Reported Speech .....	6
CHAPTER 3: DATA .....	28
3.1 Recordings.....	28
3.2 Participants .....	28
3.3 Implications of Using Interviews and Naturally Occurring Conversations ...	28
CHAPTER 4: DIRECT REPORTING STRATEGIES IN TURKISH .....	32
4.1 Parsing Criteria.....	32
4.2 The Number of Quotative <i>de-</i> According to Sentential Parsing of Data.....	35
4.3 Sentential Position of the Quotative <i>de-</i> .....	39
4.3.1 Sentences with One Quotative <i>de-</i> .....	39
4.3.2 Sentences with Multiple Quotative <i>de-</i> .....	41
4.3.2.1 Sentences with Two Quotative <i>de-</i> .....	44
4.3.2.2 Sentences with Three Quotative <i>de-</i> .....	44
4.3.2.3 Sentences with Four Quotative <i>de-</i> .....	45
4.3.2.4 Sentences with Five Quotative <i>de-</i> .....	46
4.4 Zero Quotatives .....	47
4.5 DRS with the Converbial <i>diye</i> .....	53
4.6 DRS with the Discourse Marker <i>falan</i> ‘and so on’ .....	58
4.7 Implications of Our Description of DRS .....	64
4.7.1 Questions Regarding Marker <i>falan</i> ‘and so on’ <i>de-</i> ’s Position in the Sentence .....	66
4.7.2 Questions Regarding the Prosodic Features of DRS with <i>de-</i> .....	73
4.7.3 Questions Regarding Argument Structure.....	73
4.8 Conclusion .....	73
CHAPTER 5: FUNCTIONS OF DIRECT REPORTED SPEECH IN NARRATIVE.....	77
5.1 Research on Narrative.....	78

5.1.1 Even Description with <i>de-</i> as a Single Quotative.....	79
5.2 Theatrical Representation with Zero Quotative .....	88
5.3 Character Assertion with DRS .....	96
5.3.1 Character Assertion with Multiple <i>de-</i> .....	96
5.3.2 Multiple Quotative and Zero Quotative Co-occurrence.....	112
5.4 Conclusion .....	116
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	116
REFERENCES.....	123

## TABLES

1. Tietze's categorization of DRS in Turkish.....	17
2. Sternberg's categorization of mimetic and diegetic discourse.....	23
3. Overall frequency of DRS with <i>de-</i> and no quotative in our data.....	37
4. The number of <i>de-</i> as a single quotative in different positions.....	40
5. Two <i>de-</i> combinations in our data.....	43
6. Three <i>de-</i> combinations in our data.....	45
7. Distribution of <i>diye</i> in data.....	55
8. The frequency of DRS constructions with <i>falan</i> .....	61

## NOTE ON TRANSCRIPTION

- (1) Numbers in parentheses indicate intervals within or between utterances. They are timed in seconds.
- ,
- A comma indicates continuing intonation.
- .
- A period indicates falling intonation.
- ?
- A question mark indicates rising intonation.
- :
- A colon indicates vowel lengthening.
- 
- A single dash indicates discontinued word or utterance.
- =
- Equal signs indicate latching, where one speaker's utterance is immediately followed by the other's.
- (( ))
- Double parentheses provide information about the transcriber's description of events in the conversation such as laughter, etc. We have also used them to indicate the reported speakers in the absence of quotative markers.
- XX
- Represents unintelligible words.
- XXX
- Represents unintelligible utterances.
- ...
- Represents omitted speech
- “ “
- Quotation marks are used to mark direct reported speech

....

Underlined phrases indicate quotative markers.

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

As Vološinov puts it “Reported speech is speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also *speech about speech, utterance about utterance*” (1986, p.115). As individuals engage in narratives, through which they make sense out of their experiences, they do not adopt a single voice. They also include other individuals’ utterances within theirs as well as their own past utterances. Thus they achieve a polyphonic discourse where different voices come into contact and dialogize one another.<sup>1</sup>

This study focuses on how reported speech is adopted in conversational narratives to do identity work. When we take identity as a process that people engage themselves in, rather than an unchanging core essence that they possess, we focus on the social and discourse practices, as well as practices related to the stylization of the body (Butler, 1990) that frame this process in which individuals present themselves to others in certain ways and negotiate their roles with one another (Fairclough, 1989). Via their usage of reported speech in their narratives speakers negotiate their own identities as well as the identities of the other reported speakers. Through the use of various narrative devices, such as external and internal evaluations, they mark their attitude towards the narrative and the characters within that narrative. As

---

<sup>1</sup> Bakhtin argues that no utterance we speak can be isolated but they are always dialogic in nature, in response to other’s thoughts and feelings. The reason is that “our thought itself . . . is born and shaped in the process of interaction and struggle with other’s thought, and this cannot but be reflected in the forms that verbally express our thoughts as well” (1986, p. 92).

narrators, the speakers have the privilege of representing all the elements in their stories according to their own point of view. Especially in the case of direct reported speech, they reenact the past utterances of other speakers as they find suitable according to their frame. Thus, the narrators not only position themselves in relation to their listeners, but they also position themselves in relation to the characters in their narratives as well as positioning the reported characters in relation to one another. This network of positioning different characters vis-à-vis one another enables the narrators to construct identities both for themselves and the ones they report. Hence reported speech appears as a worthwhile research topic, especially from the perspective of identity construction.

### 1.1. Research Questions

The primary aim of this study is to investigate how speakers make use of different reporting strategies in order to position themselves, their listeners and the speakers they report in order to construct relational identities in Turkish conversational narratives. Surprisingly, although the studies commenting on reported speech in narratives are abundant, there are very few in-depth studies focusing on both. Moreover, there is no study in Turkish singularly focusing on the use of reported speech for identity construction in conversational narratives.

In an effort to fill this gap, we use both life-story interviews and multi-party conversational data, as these two different sources of data provide different types of narratives. While interviews provide longer, more prototypical narratives with

minimal listener participation, naturally occurring multi-party conversations are abundant with small stories marked by co-narrations.

This aim requires us to address the following questions:

- (i) How are the different types of direct reported speech constructed by narrators in our data of Turkish conversational narratives and what is their distribution?
- (ii) What functions do different types of direct reported speech (i.e. single and multiple *de-* and zero quotative) have within the larger narratives?
- (iii) How do narrators make use of these different types of direct reported speech in order to do relational identity work?

## 1.2. Overview of the Thesis

The organization of this thesis is as the following:

The remainder of Chapter one introduces the topics with the research questions that guide the analysis chapters and provides the definitions of the basic concepts such as narrative, reported speech.

Chapter two reviews the previous research dealing with narrative and reported speech, mostly in other languages.

Chapter three discusses the data used in this study as well as the recordings and participants. Additionally, the implications of using both interviews and everyday conversations for an analysis of reported speech will be addressed.

Chapter four lays out different strategies of direct reporting in Turkish and describe their frequency and distribution across the data. We will show that the most common strategy of reporting in Turkish is the one with the quotative *de-* ‘say’. Direct reported speech constructed with the converbial *diye* and direct reported speech constructed without any quotative markers will also be described in this chapter. We will also discuss the frequent use of direct reported speech with the discourse marker *falan*, emphasizing how the discourse marker tunes the epistemic status of the quotation. Our description of the irregular behavior of *de-* raises interesting questions regarding its status as a verb. Finally, we discuss the positioning of *de-* in the sentence, the implications of having multiple quotatives in terms of argument structure and the prosodic features of direct reported speech with the quotative *de-*.

Chapter five focuses on the positioning functions of direct reported speech with *de-* and zero quotative. The positioning function of reported speech will be addressed through the complex network of speaker, listener, reporter and audience. Within this network, the positioning of the speaker vis-à-vis the listener and that of the reporter/narrator vis-à-vis the audience will be addressed. There is also the question of the speaker’s and listener’s positioning vis-à-vis the audience, which at the same time serves to position the reporter/narrator. The focus will be on how the narrator/reporter exploits these possibilities in order to present the characters in his/her narrative according to his purpose in narrating.

Chapter six presents the discussion of results and conclusion.

### 1.3. Concepts and Definitions Used in This Study

In this section we will provide the definitions of the key concepts used in this study. Given that our aim is to investigate how narrators make use of reported speech in order to position themselves vis-à-vis other participants and negotiate their relational identities within the frame of personal narratives; we need to put forth what we understand from the terms personal narrative, reported speech and concepts relevant for the discussion of these.

We take personal narratives to be chronologically structured tellings of personal experience, which have tellibility and an interactional purpose (Labov and Waletzky, 1967; Labov, 1972; Ochs and Capps, 1996; 2001; Linde, 1993; Georgakopoulou, 2006; among many others). As reflected in our data, we take experience as not necessarily limited to the events the narrator experiences, but also including the telling of thoughts, dreams, previously read books, even visual stimuli. Life story, on the other hand, is a special subgroup of personal narratives, which mainly focuses on the events and relations in a certain person's life, comprised of many sub-narratives which do not have to be temporally adjacent to one another.

In our discussion of reported speech (RS) we will adhere to the differentiation of Direct Reported Speech (DRS) and Indirect Reported Speech (IRS), based on whether the quotation is given from the reported speaker's point of view or the reporter's point of view. Although the reproduction of the utterance from the reporter's point of view is accepted to be an indication of reporter's interference (Güldemann, 2008), we accept that reproducing an exact copy of an utterance from

the reported speaker's point of view is not possible and all types of reported speech exhibit reporter's interference in varying degrees.

In this thesis, although a discussion of the differentiation of direct reported speech and indirect reported speech is included in the next chapter, the focus of our analysis is on direct reported speech. The reason is that the frequency of direct reported speech vastly outnumbers that of indirect reported speech.

A reported utterance has five elements: the reported message (quote), the reported speaker or original speaker (speaker), the reporter speaker (reporter), the listener of the reported speaker (listener) and the listener of the reporter speaker (audience). It is not obligatory for the reporter to express all elements, only the ones which are relevant for the current discourse. For example, in DRS while the message is obligatorily expressed and the speaker is also usually expressed, the listener of the reported speaker may be optional, depending on what the reporter wishes to convey. Thus, speakers choose between different forms according to the function required by the discourse.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1. Research on Narrative

As a genre, narratives have attracted interest from various disciplines such as psychology, literary theory, anthropology, sociology and linguistics. The reason why narrative analysis is so important for those who aim to understand the human is that narrative activity provides tellers a fundamental means of making sense of experience, as pointed out by Ochs and Capps (1996):

Personal narrative simultaneously is born out of experience and gives shape to experience. In this sense narrative and self are inseparable . . . We come to know ourselves as we use narrative to apprehend experiences and navigate relationships with others (p. 20-21).

Narrative does not only give shape to experience, it also gives shape to self. Bucholtz et al. (1999) points out that identity is not an unchanging core essence that people possess. Speakers do not enter and leave conversations with fully developed identities, but negotiate, construct and conceptualize identities both for themselves and the others via the usage of various discursive and social practices to position themselves and others within an intricate configuration of roles (Fairclough, 1989). Narratives allow the speakers to choose from a wide range of possible communicative strategies and thus are amongst the most fertile grounds for doing identity work.

Narrative studies in linguistics began in 1960s, in an undeliberate way: working on vernaculars Labov and Waletzky realized that asking the participants to narrate personal stories reduced the effect of the observation. According to Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972), a narrative is a way of re-telling past events, in which the order of real events parallels the order of narrative clauses (of which a narrative has to have at least two). Narrative clauses give information about what happened. They have a fixed order and one cannot change that order without changing the interpretation of the narrative. This recapitulating of past experience constitutes the referential function of the narrative. A narrative must also have an evaluative function, that is, it has to have a point worth telling.

According to the narrative structure proposed by Labov (1972), a fully developed narrative has six components: an abstract (where the outline of the narrative is given), an orientation (where the participants and the setting are introduced), complicating action (composed of the narrative clauses telling what happened), resolution (where the series of events given in the complicating action are terminated), evaluation (the narrative's *raison d'être*) and a coda (where the end of the narrative is signalled).

Evaluation is the most complex component of the narrative, and it is where most of the identity work takes place. Evaluation may take many forms and occur in different positions within the narrative. Labov (1972) differentiates between external evaluation where the narrator steps away from the narrative and directly addresses the audience in regard to the point of the narrative and internal evaluation where the narrator works the evaluation into the narrative. Internal evaluations allow the listeners to be engaged with the narrative to make their own interpretations and

inferences and thus are considered to be a more effective means of conveying the point of the narrative. All the components we have discussed so far have the tendency to correlate with specific grammatical structures and are linked with certain functions in discourse. For example, while in orientation stative predicates are commonly used, in evaluation subordinate clauses and adverbial clauses are common.

The narrative structure proposed by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) has been criticized by many authors for different reasons. Ricoeur (1980) argues against the strictly linear temporal structure, claiming that “every narrative combines two dimensions, one chronological and the other non-chronological . . . the second is the configurational dimension, according to which the plot construes significant wholes out of scattered events” (p. 178). Thus, according to Ricoeur, the ending of the story is significant in terms of constructing the plot. This notion is at odds with Labov’s concept of temporally adjacent narrative clauses which follow the order of the event.

The data used by Labov and Waletzky (1967) and Labov (1972) were drawn mainly from interviews where the participant roles and the structure of the discourse is rather fixed. The interviewer asks questions and the interviewee replies/tells narratives. This sterile, one teller type narratives differ from the ones in natural conversations, where the participants work together to construct the narrative. One example is the “diffuse story” analyzed by Polanyi (1978, cited in Toolan 2001), where a conversational narrative is followed by multiparty evaluative work. She notes that in this type of narrative fictionality is allowed to a greater extent because the focus is on telling a story.

Georgakopoulou (2006) notes that narratives are “not autonomous and self contained units, but they are talk-in-interaction” (p. 84), where different participants contribute in differing degrees and ways. The larger identities of the participants play a determining role in how they contribute to the story (initiation, plot contribution or evaluation) and to what extent their contributions are accepted.

Similarly, Ochs and Capps (2001) argue that Labovian structure is not sufficient in explaining everyday conversational narratives, which exhibit a continuum of different types with “default narrative of personal experience”, where we see “once active teller, highly tellable account, relatively detached from surrounding talk and activity, linear temporal and causal organization, and certain, constant moral stance.” (p.20) at one end and other types of narratives which are more common in everyday conversations with “multiple, active co-tellers moderately tellable account, relatively embedded in surrounding discourse and activity, nonlinear temporal and causal organization, and uncertain, fluid moral stance” (p.23) at the other. Thus, instead of a set of features which characterize all narratives, they propose the “dimensions” above which are relevant to narrative but not necessarily exhibited to equal extent.

Moreover, personal narratives, as a mode of cognitive functioning (Bruner 1990), enable the tellers to not only narrate past events in a fixed structure to convey a point to their listeners, but also use narrative as a tool for re-evaluating and reconstructing experience in such a way to “illuminate an experience [and] pieced together over time, narrative plots attempt to illuminate a life” (Ochs and Capps, 1996 p.26). Through narratives, narrators construct their identities by telling what kind of a person they are (De Fina, 2003; Linde, 1993; Kerby, 1991), which in turn

places them to a position in their social and cultural context (Bruner 1990, 2001; Chafe 1994).

The re-evaluative and reconstructive function of narrative is significant especially in the case of life stories, which are an ultimate means of expressing and negotiating a person's sense of self. Linde (1993) proposes the following definition for a life story:

A life story consists of all the stories and associated discourse units, such as explanations and chronicles, and the connections between them, told by an individual during the course of his/her lifetime that satisfy the following two criteria:

1. The stories and associated discourse units contained in the life story have as their primary evaluation a point about the speaker, not a general point about the way the world is.
2. The stories and associated discourse units have extended reportability; that is, they are tellable and are told and retold over the course of a long period of time (p.21).

According to Linde (1993), the main aim of every person is to achieve a coherent self, as "both a social demand and an internal, psychological demand" (p. 220), whose past, present and future are connected to one another with the principles of continuity and causality. Life stories function to create this sense of coherence in people's experiences. Continuity refers to self as being one and the same through time. Parallel to the temporal sequence of narratives, which connect the narrative clauses to one another, the narrative itself connects the past to the present. Causality enables the narrator to "create a self whose past is relevant to its present, since events in the character's past can be interpreted as causing present states and events" (p. 111).

Life stories are also the sphere where the narrator negotiates its identity with others. The positioning taking place during narrative is quite complex, extending

“not only to relations between the participants in the speech situation, but also to relations reported in the narrative and to relations between the participants in the speech situation and the characters in the narrative” (Linde, 1993, p. 113). Linde argues that through narrative structure and various linguistic strategies, the narrator both distinguishes himself from others, as a unique being in relation with the others and relates to itself from outside as the object of narrative. These strategies enable a wide range of evaluation of persons and actions.

In this negotiation of self, besides his/her relation to the experience, the narrator’s relation to the listeners is also very significant, as narrators “use these stories to claim or negotiate group membership and to demonstrate that [they] are in fact worthy members of these groups, understanding and properly following their moral standards” (Linde, 1993). After all, every narrator has the agenda of eliciting agreement from his/her listeners.

Wortham (2001) underlines another crucial point by noting that

autobiographical narratives may give meaning and direction to narrators’ lives and place them in characteristic relations with other people, not only as narrators represent themselves in characteristic ways but also as they enact characteristic positions while they tell their stories (p. 9).

Reported speech is one of the elements that provide the narrative with its performance quality (Hymes, 1996; Bauman 1986). Moreover, reported speech also functions to create polyphony by giving voice to characters. As we will discuss in the following section, this voicing of characters renders a powerful tool of internal evaluation where the narrator can emphasize certain features of the characters’ personality (Carranza, 1998) and position himself/herself as positive/moral

characters (Ronkin, 2001). It is also argued that reported speech and agency in narrative relate to each other, where diminished agency parallels reported speech being confined to certain limited speech acts (De Fina, 2003). The following section is an overview of literature dealing with reported speech.

## 2.2. Research on Reported Speech

Linguistic studies on reported speech focus on three main aspects: the analysis of different structures which are used to construct different types of reported speech (i.e. form), the authenticity of reported speech (i.e. the representation), and the uses of reported speech in interaction (i.e. function).

### 2.2.1. Form of Reported Speech

The analyses of reported speech that deal with its form generally aim to achieve a categorization of different types. Traditional accounts categorize reported speech under two groups: direct reported speech (henceforth DRS) and indirect reported speech (henceforth IRS), which are exemplified respectively in (1a) and (1b) below.

(1) a. John said “I will feed the cat tomorrow.”

b. John said that he would feed the cat today.

The DRS in (1a) is composed of a quotation [I will feed the cat tomorrow] introduced by a quotative phrase [John said]. The quotative phrase, referred to as the

“quotative index” by Güldemann (2008), “is commonly equated with the matrix clause in a complex sentence of complementation whose purported complement is the quoted simple sentence” (p. 1) . The deictic expressions in the quotation, namely the first person singular pronoun and the time adverb, as well as the verb tense are situated in the original context. (2b) on the other hand, is an example of IRS and is composed of a subordinate clause, introduced by the complementizer [that]. The deictic expressions and tense is situated in the reporting context.

Following Coulmas (1985) and Li (1986), Oshima (2006) explains the structural difference between DRS and IRS with reference to transparency/opacity. In IRS the quote “is transparent: it is syntactically/semantically integrated to the embedded clause, in the sense that there is no heterogeneity between the embedding and embedded clauses in terms of their syntactic and semantic statuses” (p. 10). In DRS, the quote is an opaque, independent clause which is “mentioned rather than used”. This fundamental difference in opacity/transparency leads to the difference in the point of view which is adopted for the reporting of an utterance. While in IRS the utterance is presented from the reporter’s point of view, in DRS the reported speaker’s point of view is retained. The consequence of this asymmetry in the points of view is that, in DRS “all deictic and expressive elements are referentially shifted [to the reported speaker’s point of view]” (Roncador 1988, p.108), as opposed to IRS, where the deictic and expressive elements will be presented from the reporter’s point of view.

The lack of agreement amongst the authors towards the less prototypical types has shown that reported speech does not yield itself to a clear-cut binary categorization. One issue regarding DRS is that although it has been assumed that

DRS is composed of a quote introduced by a quotative, various studies show that DRS without a quotative is a common phenomenon that works against a unified account of DRS (Leech and Short, 1981; Tannen, 1986; Wiesemann, 1990; Clark and Gerrig, 1990; Mathis and Yule, 1994). Research by Couper-Kuhlen (1998), Kelwitz and Couper-Kuhlen (1999), Günther (1997,1998, 2000), and Oliviera, Jr. and Cunha (2004) has shown that prosodic elements such as voicing and intonation serve to mark and separate quotations from the matrix clause and from other quotations (if there are any) within DRS.

There are also in-between categories of reported speech, namely

- (a) free direct speech
- (b) free indirect speech
- (c) incorporated quotation.

Leech and Short (1981) differentiate free direct speech from DRS by the lack of narrator (in our case reporter), depriving the quotation of a reporting frame. Free indirect speech, which can be placed between DRS and IRS, carries features such as “a backshift in tense and the use of third person pronouns (features of IRS) and the realization of illocution, including imperative” (Keizer 2009). Incorporated quotation cannot be grouped under either DRS or IRS either (Clark and Gerrig 1990). This type of quotations, while having “its own syntactic structure, retains grammatical relation in the utterance as a whole. Thus this report is . . . both independent and subordinated, simultaneously bearing formal similarity to both direct and indirect reported speech” (Hickerson, 2006, p.12).

In light of these concerns and the understanding that a clear-cut formal categorization of reported speech is not possible, scalar analyses were proposed (McHale, 1978; Leech and Short, 1981). These analyses place different types of reported speech on a continuous scale that ranges between purely diegetic and purely mimetic (McHale 1978) according to the degree of deictic shift they undergo. In such a scale, the purely diegetic prototypical IRS with the greatest degree of reporter interference/deictic shift will be at one end and the purely mimetic prototypical DRS will be at the other end. The in-between categories we discussed above, namely free direct speech, free indirect speech and incorporated quotation will be placed in the intermediary positions between the two poles, the more deictic shift a structure displays the closer to IRS it will be positioned. However, a binary approach is still entertained by others such as Oshima (2006), who proposes a semantic analysis of reported speech and argues that “a report in the direct mode is a relation between an agent and a linguistic object (linguistic representation), and a report in the indirect mode is a relation between an agent and a semantic object (proposition)”(p. 9) and proposes that the above mentioned in-between categories are in fact subtypes of IRS.

Tietze (1959) defines 18 types of Direct Reported Speech for Turkish. The following chart is developed from his discussion. He defines Type one, in which the DRS is constructed with the sentence final quotative verb *de-* ‘say’ as the unmarked structure and the others as types which are derived from this unmarked type.

Table 1: Tietze's categorization of DRS in Turkish

Type	Structure
1	S(subject) + Q(otation) + de-
2	S + Q <sub>1</sub> + de- + Q <sub>2</sub> + de- etc.
3	S + Q <sub>1</sub> + de- + Q <sub>2</sub>
4	Q + de- + S
5	Q <sub>1</sub> + de- + S + Q <sub>2</sub>
6	S + Q (or Q)
7	S + other verb + Q + de-
8	S + de- + Q + de-
9	S + de- + ki + Q + de-
10	S + de- + ki + Q
11	S + de- + Q
12	S + other verb + Q
13	S + Q + de- + other verb
14	S + Q + de- + söyle
15	Q + de- + S + de-
16	S + Q <sub>1</sub> + de- + other verb + Q <sub>2</sub>
17	Q + de- + S + other verb
18	Q + de- + other verb + S

As seen from table (1) above, Tietze differentiates types of DRS according to the number and the position of the quotative verb as well as the position of the subject, which encodes the reported speaker. We will refer back to Tietze (1959) in our discussions of DRS in Turkish in the following chapters.

The studies of reported speech that focus on form mainly aim to achieve a categorization of different types of reported speech. In doing so, while some researchers are in favor of a binary distinction between IRS and DRS, others argue that the structure does not lend itself to such a clear cut binary categorization and the in between categories can only be accounted for if one adopts a scalar approach.

### 2.2.2. Authenticity of Reported Speech

What is meant by the question of authenticity or representation is whether reported speech provides an accurate reproduction of the original speech that it is claiming to report. Since it is unquestionably accepted that in IRS the utterance is expressed in the reporter's own words, the question of authenticity is mainly related to DRS.

Regarding the difference between DRS and IRS, Coulmas (1985) points out that,

In direct speech the reporter lends his voice to the original speaker and says (or writes) what he said, thus adopting his point of view, as it were. Direct speech, in a manner of speaking, is not the reporter's speech, but remains the reported speaker's speech whose role is played by the reporter . . . In indirect speech, on the other hand, the reporter comes to the fore. He relates a speech event as he would relate any other event: from his own point of view (p. 2).

Coulmas is one of the supporters of the verbatim approach, which argues that DRS provides an authentic reproduction of an utterance. The verbatim approach claims that DRS has the capacity of "reproducing and mimicking the speech of the reported speaker" (Li, 1986, p. 42). As we see, criteria for judging authenticity differs according to different authors. Since DRS claims to reproduce the exact copy of an utterance, the content of this copy is also a matter of debate. The question what

aspects of the utterance are relevant for reproduction receives different answers from different researchers. Some argue that DRS reproduces an exact verbal copy of the uttered words/sentences, in which case a word to word copy is adequate, others find features such as prosody, voicing, false starts, etc. relevant. Still others argue that gestures and facial expressions are also to be included in DRS, reproducing both form and content (Li, 1986), which ultimately requires acting out on the part of the reporter. In IRS, these are conveyed with additional comments by the reporter. Overall, all these arguments imply that reported speech has the capacity to capture and represent an utterance authentically.

On the other hand, numerous studies point to the theoretical and empirical impossibility of reproducing a completely authentic quotation. Vološinov (1986) is the first to point out that no matter how faithful a reproduction the reporter provides (that is, even if there is such a possibility for the reporter to remember and reproduce an exact copy of an utterance), it can never have the same meaning with the original utterance. The reason is that when we are interpreting an utterance we do so according to its context. “If text encompasses the words spoken during an exchange, then context involves the remaining aspects of the social interaction” (Buttny, 1998, p.46) , because the meaning of the utterances are interpreted and altered according to the context. In reported speech, the change in context causes irrecoverable meaning change, as Bakhtin (1981) puts it,

The speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is – no matter how accurately transmitted – always subject to certain semantic changes. The context embracing another’s word is responsible for its dialogizing background, whose influence can be very great. Given the appropriate methods for framing, one may bring about fundamental changes even in another’s utterance accurately quoted (p. 340).

However, research has shown that an accurate reproduction of speech is not possible anyways. What reporters tend to remember is actually the meaning of the utterance, not the verbatim form (Lehrer, 1989). In Mayes's (1990) data, out of 320 naturally occurring examples, the authenticity of at least 50% is doubtful, ranging between plausible quotes that the reporter is unlikely to remember "given the memory limitations", improbable quotes such as sentences that have very complex syntactic structures or that were uttered several years ago, highly improbable quotes such as Greek chorus like quotes where all speakers utter the same quotation or quotes spoken habitually and 'impossible quotes' where the person utters a sentence which never existed. Her study thus shows that the significance of DRS in discourse is not a consequence of its capacity to faithfully reenact past utterances, but the functions it fulfills within discourse.

Tannen (1989) takes the leap regarding the question of authenticity and argues that it is impossible to reproduce speech in current context which is uttered elsewhere, in any context. For her, the process of representing another's words is a creative process very similar to that of creating a script in a literary work. She argues against analyses which equate the reporter with Goffman's (1981) animator<sup>2</sup>, who only reenacts someone else's utterance and claims that even the name 'reported speech' is misleading, since, as pointed out by Tannen (1989):

---

<sup>2</sup> Goffman (1981) splits the speaker's role into three distinct roles: animator, author and principal. Animator is the person responsible for the physical articulation of the utterance, i.e. "the sounding box". The author is the one who produces the utterance, i.e. "the agent who scripts the lines"; and the principal is the one who is affected by the utterance, i.e. "the party to whose position the words attest" (p. 226). These roles can appear all at once, or separately. In the case of reported speech, it is argued that the reporter is only the animator; he neither authors nor is responsible for the utterance he articulates. He only 'animates' the original speaker.

when a speaker represents the words of another, what results is by no means describable as 'reported speech'. Rather it is constructed dialogue. And the construction of the dialogue represents an active, creative, transforming move which expresses the relationship not between the quoted party and the topic of talk but rather the quoting party and the audience to whom the quotation is delivered (p. 109).

Tannen's point is significant in many ways, one relevant aspect for our discussion being that it puts aside the question of authenticity and underlines the speakers' intentions. Scholars who argued in favor of the verbatim approach stated that the intention of reporters is to present a faithful reenactment of a previous utterance. However, a number of studies including Mayes (1990) has shown that that is rarely the case. Speakers make use of reported speech, to the extent that they construct logically impossible dialogues<sup>3</sup>, in order to fulfill certain functions within the discourse. Once the question of authenticity (taken as arguing for or against the verbatim approach) is out of the way, we can focus on the discourse functions the speakers are aiming at achieving and their means of doing so.

There are also alternative accounts of DRS in terms of representation.

According to the demonstration theory account of Clark & Gerrig (1990), quotations

---

<sup>3</sup> Tannen (1989) makes use of this kind of impossible dialogues in favor of her argument that reported speech is constructed dialogue. She analyzes instances such as "dialogue representing what wasn't said" (p. 111) where the reporter explicitly states that the original utterance does not exist, "dialogue as instantiation" (p. 111) where the reporter exemplifies a frequently happening utterance, "summarizing dialogue" (p. 113) where the reporter gives the gist of the utterance, "choral dialogue" (p. 113) where the reporters are represented as speaking all together as in a Greek chorus, which hardly ever happens in real life, "the inner speech of others" (p. 114) which the reporter has no access to, "vague referents" (p. 118) where the reported utterance is obviously different than the original utterance, "nonhuman speaker" (p. 118) where the reported speaker obviously could not have uttered the quotation. Mayes (1990) also classifies quoting utterances which never took place and quotations belonging to nonhuman beings as impossible quotes.

are a type of demonstration, where demonstrations are non-serious actions<sup>4</sup> which have selective depictions. Clark & Gerrig argue that in DRS, the reporter plays the role of the original speaker when quoting an utterance, rather than producing an authentic utterance of his own. Thus, he is engaging himself in a type of non-serious action. Moreover, as in other types of demonstrations, reporters do not copy all the features of the object (of demonstration), but they select relevant features. These features may (but do not have to) include voicing, pitch, rhythm, prosody, false starts, language, dialect etc.

Studies that focus on the question of authenticity basically lead to two directions. Since IRS is by definition filtered by the reporter's point of view, the studies which focus on the question of authenticity deal with DRS. One direction that the question leads to is the verbatim approach, which argues that DRS provides an authentic reproduction of an utterance. While this claim seems to make sense if we take the structural properties of DRS into account, there are many studies which lead to the other direction: DRS does not have the capacity to capture and reenact past utterances. Supported by cognitive and psychological findings on memory, as well as literary and philosophical arguments on the functions of context with regard to interpretation, the verbatim approach is severely challenged.

---

<sup>4</sup> According to Goffman (1974) there are two types of actions: serious and non-serious. In a nutshell, we can say that while serious actions really and literally occur, non-serious actions are make-believe.

### 2.2.3. Functions of Reported Speech

Similar to the question of representation, the question of function is also analyzed based on the separation of DRS and IRS. Applying Plato's notions of mimesis (imitation, representation, mimicry) and diegesis (telling, recounting, narrating) to reported speech, scholars formulate a categorization parallel to that of DRS and IRS, where DRS corresponds to mimetic discourse and IRS to diegetic discourse. Based on this categorization, Sternberg (1982, p. 111) formulates the representational oppositions given in table 2 below:

Table 2: Sternberg's categorization of mimetic and diegetic discourse

Mimetic discourse	Diegetic discourse
Empathetic (or sympathy-promoting)	Nonempathetic (e.g. distanced quotation)
Specific (detailed)	Nonspecific (generalized, lacking detail)
Realistic	Nonrealistic (unlifelike)
Distinctive	Nondistinctive (homogeneous, stylized)
Reproductive	Nonreproductive (paraphrased, reformulated)

It is possible to draw different functions of DRS and IRS from this chart. We can also say that certain features are a result of other features. For example, the empathy feature of DRS is claimed to be rooted in its being realistic. The feeling of being directly exposed to the words of the other, without the interference of the reporter, causes the audience to relate to the original content. We have shown how different scholars argued against the verbatim approach with convincing evidence from natural conversation and psycholinguistic data and showed that in DRS it is not the case that the reporter reproduces an exact copy of an utterance. Nevertheless, when it comes to actual communication, DRS is still held to be more factual and reliable than

IRS. This realistic aspect of DRS has been of interest as well. Wierzbicka (1974) argues that the 'theatrical' element in DRS arises because the "person who reports another's words by quoting them temporarily assumes the role of the other person" (p. 272). Mayes (1990) suggests that DRS is theatrical because in DRS the quotation has the same deictic center with the original event, which enables the speaker to tell an event as if it "were presently occurring" and "dramatize the event and make it seem more vivid".

Another function of DRS is that of dissociation of responsibility. When speakers are the authors of their own words, they are responsible for the outcome; but if the utterance does not belong to them and they are only reporting it, they are distanced from the utterance which enables them to talk from a safe zone regarding the effect of the utterance. Thus they can convey the message without being responsible for its content. Tannen (1989) observes that in reported criticisms, the criticized party directs his feelings of hurt and anger towards the source of the criticism rather than the reporter.<sup>5</sup> Goffman (1981) also finds that speakers are more comfortable uttering curses and taboo words when they are reporting them as someone else's speech, than when they are speaking "in their own voice". Both of these examples show how reported speech works to build a distance between the reporter and the message.

In narratives, the empathy producing theatrical aspect makes DRS an important component functioning as narrative clauses or evaluations. Based on Labov's definition (Labov and Waletzky, 1967; Labov, 1972; 1982) narrative clauses correspond to temporally ordered events that take the narrative's plot further.

---

<sup>5</sup> Tannen (1989) notes that this may well be a culture specific phenomenon relevant for Americans. She quotes an Arab proverb pointing out that the person reporting an insult is the actual offender, which makes a contrasting point with her observation.

However, what attracted the attention of most scholars is the evaluation function of reported speech, especially that of DRS in narratives. Evaluation is where the narrator expresses his/her point in telling the narrative, the reason behind the narrative's existence. Labov (1972) defines two types of evaluation: external evaluation and internal evaluation. While in external evaluation the narrator cuts his story and makes his point as the narrator, internal evaluation is embedded in the narrative and does not require a jump from the narrative world to the real world.

Labov points out that internal evaluations are more effective than external evaluations. He also categorizes DRS as an instance of internal evaluation. This point is not relevant only for English language, as Mayes (1990) notes, the narratives in many languages make use of DRS at "peak" (p. 346) points, that is the climax of the story (Larson, 1978; Glock, 1986; Macaulay, 1987). DRS can also have a support function and serve to make certain narrative clauses more concrete, similar to what exemplification, justification and paraphrase do in rhetoric (Vincent and Perrin, 1999).

Another function that is derived from the perception (or illusion?) that DRS is a more authentic and thus factual and reliable rendition of an utterance is its being used frequently as evidence in narratives. Wooffitt (1992) found that DRS is very common in narratives of paranormal experiences. He argues that the use of DRS made the subject of the narration more objective and thus less open to charges.

Philips (1986) points out that in legal context DRS and IRS are used to serve different functions. In her analysis of the usage of reported speech during a cocaine possession trial, she argues that "by putting reported speech in Quotes, the lawyers signal to the jury that it should be given more attention than other reported speech,

that its truthfulness and reliability matter. The lawyers make use of the American cultural notion that speech which a person is willing to quote is remembered better and is more exact than other reported speech, and hence is more reliable” (p. 169).

The usage of DRS in evidence function is also quite common in conversational narratives. Speakers often quote others in order to increase or decrease the force of a statement. When the reporter uses DRS in order to provide evidence for a claim, the identity of the reported speaker also becomes significant. One special type of the evidence function is the “authority function” (Vincent and Perrin, 1999) where the reporter appeals to authority for the sake of argumentation.

The majority of the literature deals with the functions of DRS, but IRS with its differing syntactic and semantic structure, also has functions in discourse. In Philips’ (1986) data, IRS was found to occur in utterances giving background information. Mayes (1990) points out that besides giving background or supporting information, IRS is used in clarifications and corrections of errors, that is in giving factual information. She argues that speakers use IRS for corrections, because “indirect quotes convey propositional content, and that is all that is necessary to clarify the facts, [which] contrasts with the use of direct quotation to present affirmative elements rather than factual information” (p. 358).

Based on the mimesis vs diegesis distinction, DRS and IRS exhibit differing discourse properties, which render them suitable for different discourse functions. Since DRS is perceived as more realistic and factual, it functions to build empathy. It is widely used as internal evaluation in narratives. Reporters also make use of DRS when they want to use another’s words as evidence. Moreover, DRS is also used

when there is a need for distance between the reporter and the message. *IRS*, on the other hand, is used when the reporter wants to emphasize the propositional content.

## CHAPTER THREE

### DATA

#### 3.1 Recordings

The data of this study is composed of the transcriptions of 6 hours of audio and video recordings. 4,5 hours of the recordings are interviews about the participants' life stories, and 1,5 hours of the recordings are of everyday conversations amongst peers. The interviews and the conversations were transcribed in their entirety in a slightly modified orthography reflecting the nature of conversational language.

The first three recordings are interviews done in an institutional setting with three residents of a women's shelter in İstanbul<sup>6</sup>. The names of the participants are Hatice, Selma and Nezahat (pseudonyms for reasons of confidentiality).

#### 3.2. Participants

Hatice has the longest history of shelter experience in the group. She is in her 40s, has been married three times and has three children who were at an institution at the time of the recording. She has suffered domestic violence from her parents and

---

<sup>6</sup> Data had been collected by Didar Akar for a research project supported by Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırmalar Koordinatörlüğü (no: 07HB401)

possibly from her husbands. She has been to several different women's shelters, she has finally settled at the shelter where the interview takes place.

Selma is 25 years old and has moved in with her boyfriend when she was 14, after living as a homeless person for two years. She has two children and has been disowned by her family. She has no contact with any of her relatives except her mother.

Nezahat is in her late 20s and was married once without children. Unlike the other two participants, she somewhat receives support from her family. She is a high school graduate, thus compared with the other women at the shelter, she has received higher education. She has physical disability and lives on the special state pension when she doesn't work.

The fourth recording is also an interview, but this one takes place in a familial setting. Interviewer (Ece) interviews her grandmother (Elif). Ece is a 26 year old university graduate, currently working at a PR company. Elif is an 80 year old woman, divorced long ago and was retired after having worked in many different jobs. Their close relationship and shared past is reflected in the narrative of the grandmother's life story.

The fifth recording is a naturally occurring conversation taking place between three university students: Aslı, Ali and İdil. Their ages are around 24-27; and they study political science, medicine and English literature respectively. The recording is made at Aslı's apartment, where the three met for some coffee and chat. They engage in informal/friendly conversation and narrate stories about their daily lives at school as well as the films they see and the books they read.

### 3.3. Implications of Using Interviews and Naturally Occurring Conversations

As seen above, our data is comprised of two different types: interviews and everyday conversations. As discussed in the literature, narrative studies initiated by Labov and Waletzky (1967) were based on interviews. These differ from natural everyday conversations in a number of ways. Interviews have a more rigid structure with pre-determined conversational roles, where the interviewer asks questions in order to elicit narratives from the interviewee and the interviewee in return acts as required by the setting. Thus, especially in the case of life stories, the number of narratives vastly outnumbers those in conversations, since the whole point of a life story is to elicit narratives of past experience. This configuration of roles enables the interviewee to have longer turns with minimum interference from the other participants. The result is what Shegloff calls an “academically hybridized form” (1997, p. 104). Narratives within everyday conversational settings on the other hand, exhibit the features of natural conversation. In this type, participants work together to build the narrative, that is they co-narrate. The roles are negotiated as the conversation is carried along, and the fluidity calls for various strategies through which the participants position themselves in relation to one another.

Thus, the two different types of data enable us to look at the question from two different viewpoints. The interviews serve as the laboratory in which we can observe the different types of reported speech with their differing functions and how these forms and functions converge in narrative context. The conversation data, on

the other hand, show us how these forms and functions are employed by narrators in real-life contexts in order to serve further interactional purposes.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DIRECT REPORTING STRATEGIES IN TURKISH

In this chapter we will discuss the different strategies of DRS in our data. These strategies include the use of the quotative verb *de-*, its converbial form *diye*, and quotations presented without any quotatives. We will also discuss how the use of the discourse markers *falan* ‘and so on’ as a frequent strategy alters the modality of the quotation. First, we will describe the distribution of the quotative *de-* ‘say’ in sentential level throughout our data. Then we will discuss the status of the quotative *de-* in the sentence. We will point out that albeit being a fully inflected matrix verb, *de-* in its multiple occurrence behaves like a discourse marker and fulfills the function of information flow organization. We will also raise and discuss certain interesting questions raised by *de-*’s unlikely distribution, regarding the quotative’s position, and the sentence’s prosodic features and argument structure.

#### 4.1 Parsing Criteria

In order to describe the sentential distribution of the quotative *de-*, we first parsed the DRS utterances into separate sentences. Then we categorized the positions in which *de-* occurs, and charted the number of sentences for each position that *de-* occupies.

In parsing the reported utterances, we classified main clauses with finite predicates as separate sentences. We also included coordinated sentences formed via

(a) *ama* ‘but’, (b) *ve* ‘and’, and (c) *de* ‘so that’ as two separate sentences. Sentences in (2) below, illustrates these structures.

(2)

a. Coordination with *ama*

Hatice: “Beni köpek olarak bağlayın buraya belediye kapı önüne ama oraya göndermeyin” dedim.

‘Tie me here in front of the municipality’s door as a dog but don’t send me there I said.’

b. Coordination with *ve*

Aslı: “bunlar” diyo, “referanslarını” diyo, “yüksek sınıftan alıcaklar” diyo.  
“ve bunlar” [diyo]

İdil : [hihihi]

Aslı: “yoksa anarşi olur” diyo.

‘Aslı: These she says will take their references from the higher class and these

İdil: hihihi

Aslı: Or else there will be anarchy.’

c. Coordination with *de*

Elif: Ben dedim ki “amaan versinler de bu evden kurtuliyim da nereye gidersem gidiyim”.

‘I said whatever, let them give me to whoever so that I get out of this house and go wherever.’

The structures illustrated in (3) below, on the other hand, are taken to be single sentences. These are sentences (a) coordinated via the suffix {-Ip}, (b) conditional sentences and (c) finite embedded clauses, (d) coordinated predicates which do not have any other overt constituents and sound as if they are part of the same phonological phrase and (e) false starts.

(3)

a. Coordination with {-Ip}

Nezahat: “Üçüncü karım da beni dolandırıp gitti” dedi.

‘He said my third wife ripped me off and left.’

b. Conditional

Nezahat: “Ama tanıklar gelmezse sen bu boşanmaktan ümidini kes” diyo.

‘But if the witnesses do not come forget about this divorce he says.’

c. Finite embedded clause

Elif: “Haberin var da geldin zannettim kızım” dedi.

‘I thought you came here knowing about it my child she said’

d. Conjoined predicates

Elif: “Git gir içeri baba gibi” dedim.

‘Go get inside like a father I said.’

e. False starts

Hatice: “Eğer” dediler “buradan çıkalım seni mahvedicez”.

‘Once we get out of here we’ll destroy you’

As can be expected, not all sentences yield themselves to a clear cut categorization.

One example that may be considered as problematic in this respect is false starts. We did not classify false start as separate sentences. We have considered them together with their repairs as single sentences. Analyzing them as separate sentences could have been another way of handling them. However, this latter categorization would render a more confusing picture at the end, producing a vast number of false starts, which cannot be categorized as sentences, at times even constituents. Thus, our choice in parsing false starts as parts of the sentences that they have the closest link to provides a less muddy analysis. Sentence (4) below illustrates this point.

(4)

- 1 Aslı: “ve” diyo “onların” diyo “zevkleri, onlar belirlerdi” diyo yani “şeyin
- 2 noollucaanı” diyo. ee “deer [verilicek] şeyin”
- 3 Ali: [hm-hm]
- 4 Aslı: “ne noollucaanı” diyo tamam mı.

‘Aslı: and she says their tastes, they determined what would be the thing, uhm

Ali: hm-hm

Aslı: what would be the valuable thing.’

Aslı in reporting the sentence she has read in a book starts her sentence with a false start in line (1), repairs it and then repeats and repairs the direct object by replacing the vague generic pronoun *şey* ‘thing’ in line (1) with the complex modifier this time in line (2) . In this case, we have categorized the whole utterance as one sentence with five quotatives.

#### 4.2. The Number of Quotative *de-* According to Sentential Parsing of Data

Parsed as such, we have come across sentences in which the number of the speech verb *de-* ‘say’ varies. Table 3 below shows the distribution of these sentences and tokens. The leftmost column shows the three major categories: zero quotative, single quotative and multiple quotative<sup>7</sup>. Under multiple quotative category, we have four subcategories, i.e. 2 *de-*, 3 *de-*, 4 *de-* and 5 *de-*, created according to the number of quotative that the sentence bears. The third column shows the number of sentences we have come across in our data fitting the criteria we have defined.

---

<sup>7</sup> Here, the terms zero, single, multiple refer to the number of occurrences of *de-*.

Table 3: Overall frequency of DRS with *de-* and no quotative in our data

	Number of Quotatives	Number of Sentences
No quotative	Ø	384
Single Quotative	1 <i>de-</i>	740
Multiple Quotative	2 <i>de-</i>	98
	3 <i>de-</i>	27
	4 <i>de-</i>	3
	5 <i>de-</i>	1
		Total number of DRS sentences(excluding <i>diye</i> and <i>falan</i> ): 1252

A parsing of our data according to the criteria discussed above yields a number of 384 sentences without any quotative markers, 740 sentences with only one quotative in them and 129 sentences with multiple quotatives. Within the multiple quotative type, the most frequent are those with two quotatives with a number of 98 sentences, followed by 27 instances of three quotative constructions. Four and five quotative sentences are scarce, found in three and one sentences respectively, however they do exist and constitute the most dramatic examples of the multiple quotative type.

Sentences in (5) below exhibit DRS constructions with different numbers of quotatives.

(5)

a. No quotative

Hatice: Anneme teklifte bulundum,

i. dedim “boşa bu adamı” dedim.

ii. “seni yanıma alıcam”

‘I made an offer to my mother.

i. I said divorce this man.

ii. I’ll take you in my apartment.’

b. One quotative

Nezahat: “Sen başkasıyla buluşmaya gidiyorsun” dedi.

‘You are going to meet someone else he said’

- c. Two quotatives

Selma: “Ben” dedim “madur bi insanım” dedim.

‘I said I am a disadvantaged person.’

- d. Three quotatives

Hatice: dedim “eyvah”, hani kadın evleri var ya, dedim “beni oraya gönderene kadar öldürün” dedim.

‘I said Damn, you know the women’s houses, I said kill me instead of sending me there.’

- e. Four quotatives

Aslı: “şey” diyo, “ya” diyo “eskiden” diyo “işte aristokrat(.)lar vardı” diyo tamam mı?

uhm well she says initially there were the aristocrats, right?’

- f. Five quotatives

Aslı: “ve” diyo “onların” diyo “zevkleri, onlar belirlerdi” diyo “yani şeyin noolucaanı” diyo.

ee “deer [verilicek] şeyin

Ali: [hm-hm]

Aslı: ne noolucaanı” diyo tamam mı.

‘Aslı: and she says their tastes, they determined what would be the thing, uhm

Ali: hm-hm

Aslı: what would be the valuable thing.’

Quotation (ii) in (5a) is an example of DRS construction without quotatives, and (5b) is an example of typical single quotative DRS construction with the quotative *de-* in sentence final position. (i) in (5a) and (5c) illustrate DRS with two quotatives. (5d), (5e) and (5f) are examples of three, four and five quotative constructions respectively.

In the following section, we will discuss the description of the sentential position of the quotative *de-* in our data.

### 4.3 Sentential Position of the Quotative *de-*

As a head final language, verbs in Turkish typically occur in sentence final position. However, it is common for the verb to occur in other positions in the sentence, which causes differences in the interpretation of the sentence, reflected also in its prosodic features of the sentence. Our data shows that although sentence final position is preferred for DRS, quotatives can also occur in other positions. However, interpretational effect of these marked occurrences are not the same as other predicates in terms of intonation structure.

In the following section, we will discuss the sentential distribution of the quotative *de-* in single and multiple types.

#### 4.3.1 Sentences with one Quotative *de-*

In our data, we observed that the quotative verb *de-* occurs in initial, medial and final positions. Table 4 below shows the number of single quotatives that occur in each position. The first column lists the different positions in which *de-* occurs. Notice that in the second line, *de- ki* is given as a separate category. This is because the quotative construction *de- ki*, which is the combination of the quotative *de-* and the complementizer *ki*, has a restricted distribution. It obligatorily occurs only in the quote initial position. We categorized *de ki-* separately rather than within the initial position category, since the former reflects a restriction and the latter reflects a choice.

Table 4: The number of *de-* as a single quotative in different positions

Initial Position	47
<i>de- ki</i>	19
Medial Position	219
Final Position	520

It is predictable that in a head final language like Turkish, the verb's tendency is to occur in sentence final position, and the distribution of *de-* reflects this tendency with 66% of it occurring in quote final position. Sentence (6) below illustrates quotative *de-* occurring in the quote final position.

(6)  
*de-* in final position  
Aslı: “Ben bunu yapıcım” diyosun.

“You say I’m going to do this.”

However, there is also a 27% of medially occurring quotative group, which also needs to be accounted for. The most favored position for the medially occurring quotative *de-* is following sentence initial vocatives, conjunctions and discourse markers. (7) below is a common example of how *de-* follows the vocative in medial position.

(7)  
*de-* in medial position  
Hatice: “Anne” diyorum “çoraplarımı saklıyorum”.

“I say mom I am keeping my stockings.”

As can be seen from Table 4, quotative *de-* occurring in initial position is fewer than *de-* occurring in the final and medial positions. Sentence (8) is one of the 47 sentences with initial *de-* we have found in our data.

(8)

*de-* in initial position

Elif: Dedim “ben Yılmaz’dan haber alamıyorum”.

“I said I haven’t heard from Yılmaz.”

One interesting point is that in Turkish, when the predicate is positioned in a non-final position, the elements to the right of the predicate undergo prosodic reduction (Özge, 2003) and are perceived as given or background information. However, this is not the case in reported speech, which seems to exhibit different prosodic and information structure properties than other types of sentences.

*de- ki* constructions present the same problem. There are also 19 tokens of *de- ki* “say that”, a combination of the quotative verb *de-* and the complementizer *ki* for which it is syntactically obligatory to occur at the quote initial position, exemplified by sentence (9) below.

(9)

*de- ki* occurring obligatorily in initial position

Nezahat: Dedim ki “bi daha ona paramı vermeyecem”.

“I said I am not going to give him my money again.”

The numbers and examples suggest that *de-* in single quotative type resembles a typical verb. However, a closer look reveals that especially the non-finally positioned quotative verbs behave differently in terms of distribution and prosodic features.

### 4.3.2. Sentences with Multiple Quotative *de-*

In this section we will discuss DRS sentences constructed with multiple copies of the quotative verb *de-*. In an early study based on impressionistic, non-spoken data, Tietze (1959) claims that the multiple quotative DRS construction is used by ‘old story tellers’ in order to keep reminding the audience that the quotation is still continuing. Although Tietze’s explanation of multiple quotative function differs from ours, it is significant that he notices the conversational and narrative properties of the structure.

#### 4.3.2.1. Sentences with Two Quotative *de-*

DRS with two quotatives is the most common type we have come across in our data with 97 sentences in total. Table 5 below shows the frequency of sentences with possible combinations of the two quotative constructions in initial-final, initial-medial, medial-final, and medial-medial positions. Initial-initial and final-final combinations are not logically possible.

Table 5: Two *de-* combinations in our data

Position of Quotatives	Number of Sentences
Initial – Final	22
Initial – Medial	7
Medial – Final	53
Medial – Medial	15

The most frequent combination is medial-final with 53 sentences. Following the medial-final combination, we have come across initial-final combination with 22 sentences, medial-medial combination with 15 sentences and initial-medial combination with 7 sentences. Sentences from (10) to (13) are examples of these possible combinations from our data.

(10)

Initial – Final:

Nezahat: Dedim hadi bir kez daha deniyim dedim.

‘I said I’ll give it one more chance.’

(11)

Initial – Medial:

Hatice: Dedi sen dedi git teslim ol.

‘She said go ahead surrender.’

(12)

Medial – Final:

Aslı: Genesis diyo işte biz dinlerdik diyo.

‘He said Genesis, we used to listen to it.’

(13)

Medial – Medial:

Selma: Bunu dedim uzatmanın dedim bi alemi yok

‘I said there is no point it continuing this.’

In sentences (11), (12) and (13) there are medially occurring quotatives. In sentence (11), the second *de-* is positioned between the vocative *sen* ‘you’ and the imperative verb *git* ‘go’, in (12) the first *de-* is between the topicalized direct object *Genesis* and sentence initial discourse marker *işte* ‘you know’ and in (13) where both quotatives occur in medial position within the complex subject, the first one is positioned after the direct object of the nonfinite clause and the second one is positioned between the possessive structure. As we see from the examples, the distribution of the medially

occurring quotatives in the two *de*- structures highly resembles the single quotative type.

#### 4.3.2.2. Sentences with Three Quotative *de*-

We have seen that in DRS sentences where there are two quotatives, there are examples of four logically possible combinations. In the case of the sentences with three quotatives there are only two logically possible different combinations realized: initial-medial-final and medial-medial-final. There are no instances of medial-medial-medial and initial-medial-medial combinations. Table 6 shows the distribution of the two combinations.

Table 6: Three *de*- combinations in our data

Position of Quotatives	Number of Sentences
Initial – Medial – Final	4
Medial – Medial – Final	22

Between these two combinations the latter is the more preferred one with 22 tokens, initial-medial-final combination occurring in 4 sentences. Below, sentence (14) illustrates the initial-medial-final combination and sentence (15) illustrates the medial-medial-final combination.

(14)

Selma: dedi “kızım” dedi “olur mu öyle şey” dedi

‘She said my child how can you think of such a thing?’

(15)

Aslı: “Bunların” diyo, “herzamanki gibi” diyo “hani klas, sınıf bilinci Olucak” diyo.

‘She says these will have class consciousness as always.’

Again, in line with our observation for single and two *de-* constructions, the distribution of the quotative is similar in three *de-* constructions. In sentence (14) the medially occurring second quotative follows the vocative and in (15) the medially occurring first quotative follows the genitive and the second quotative follows the adverb phrase of the possessive subject.

#### 4.3.2.3. Sentences with Four Quotative *de-*

With four *de-*, we come across only one type of configuration. There are only three examples in total, all of which have the medial-medial-medial-final combination. There are no examples of the initial-medial-medial-final combination which is also logically possible.

Sentence (16) below is one example of this type.

(16)

Elif: “Annem zaten” dedi “kayınvalidem” dedi “bakıyo” dedi “eve” dedi.

‘He said my mother, my mother-in-law takes care of the household.’

In (16), the first quotative is positioned between the adverb phrase and the repaired subject,<sup>8</sup> the second one between the repaired subject and the verb, and the third one

---

<sup>8</sup> Notice that Elif begins her report as if her future son-in-law called her *annem* ‘my mother’, but then switches to *kayınvalidem* ‘my mother-in-law’. This repair is ambiguous since we do not know whether it belongs to the son-in-law or Elif herself.

is between the verb and the oblique object. All three positions are possible for three, two or one quotative constructions.

#### 4.3.2.4. Sentences with Five Quotative *de-*

A DRS construction with five quotatives is indeed rare, and we have come across only one example of it in our data. Similar to the examples with four quotatives above, the example of this type does not have initially occurring quotative either, the combination is Medial – Medial – Medial – Medial – Final.

Sentence (4) repeated here as (17) below is the example of the five quotative DRS.

(17)

- 1 Aslı: *ve* diyo onların diyo zevkleri, onlar belirlerdi diyo yani
- 2 şeyin noolucanı diyo. ee deer [verilicek] şeyin
- 3 Ali: [hm-hm]
- 4 Aslı: ne noolucanı diyo tamam mı.

‘Aslı: and she says their tastes, they determined what would be the thing, uhm

Ali: hm-hm

Aslı: what would be the valuable thing.’

Here, the first quotative follows the conjunction *ve* ‘and’, the second one immediately follows the genitive noun. The third quotative is positioned between the verb and the complex direct object, after which the fourth quotative occurs. The fifth quotative occurs after the repair of the complex direct object.

The last two examples show that multiple quotatives, especially four and five *de-* structures clearly have a function in organizing the information flow. These

sentences bear false starts, repairs, and fillers which are all signs that the speaker is working hard to organize his/her speech. This function cannot be attributed to a main verb, and is a sign that in multiple quotative type, *de-* behaves more like a discourse marker.

#### 4.4. Zero Quotatives

We have discussed the distribution of *de-* in single and multiple quotative types. We will now discuss the distribution of *de-* in relation to sentences which themselves do not have any quotatives. DRS constructions without quotative markers have been referred to as “free direct speech” (Leech and Short 1981), “unintroduced dialogue” (Tannen 1986), “free standing quotation” (Clark and Gerrig 1990) and “zero quotatives” (Mathis and Yule 1994) in studies concerning English. We adopt Mathis and Yule (1994)’s terminology and refer to them as zero quotatives.

As we have pointed out in Table 4, in our data, there is a total of 384 DRS sentences with zero quotatives. Sentences with zero quotatives occur in different environments. In this section we will discuss three environments in which zero quotative sentences occur. In the first group we have those sentences which themselves do not have a quotative, but rely on the quotative verb of the previous or the following sentence for interpretation. The second group is composed of DRS which neither possesses quotatives nor has access to any in its environment. Finally,

in the third group, there are cases where the reporter systematically uses zero quotative DRS for one party and multiple quotative DRS for the other.

Example (18) below illustrates the first type of zero quotative DRS.

(18)

- 1 Hatice: Sabahleyin geldi,
- 2 “Hatice” dedi,
- 3 “efendim abla” dedim.
- 4 “Nasıl” dedi “beklediğin gibi mi buldun?
- 5 Yoo” dedim “ne bekliyodum ki.”
- 6 “Ben” dedi “biliyorum sen iki gün uyumadın.
- 7 Yorgunsun.
- 8 Hadi” dedi “yemeğini ye de
- 9 rahat rahat bi uyu.
- 10 Ben buradayım.”
- 11 Bana abla oldu o.

‘In the morning she came.  
Hatice, she said,  
yes maam I said.  
She said, Is it anything like you expected?  
Well, I said, what was I expecting?  
She said, I know you haven’t slept in two days.  
You are tired.  
Come on she said, eat your food  
and sleep well.  
I am here  
She was a big sister for me.’

The sentences in lines (7), (9) and (10) are zero quotative DRS. Notice that there is no speaker change before or after these quotations, they are attributed to the same reported speaker. (7) shares its subject and TAM information with the previous quote and (9) is conjoined with the previous sentence via *de* ‘so that’. (10) has a deictic point which is clearly different from the reporting context, and the *I* refers to the reported speaker, not Hatice. In these cases, the reported sentence lacks a quotative marker, but has access to one since it is immediately preceded or followed by another reported sentence as part of the same reported conversation. Thus the reported

sentence may be interpreted deictically and temporally parallel to those sentences and framing quotatives. Thus, by the aid of the quotative *de-* in the previous sentence, These sentences can be perceived as DRS produced by the woman at the shelter, without the need to refer to other interpretive devices.<sup>9</sup>

The second group of zero quotative DRS constructions occur where there are no surrounding quotatives. They not only lack a quotative within the sentence, but also there are no other sentences with quotative markers which precede or follow them. As discussed by Mathis and Yule (1994), in zero quotative reported sentences the audience relies on voice quality shifts, turn taking structure and sequential adjacency pair structure in order to interpret whether the sentence is DRS or not, and if so which reported speaker it belongs to, and so on. (Cooper-Kuhlen 1998).

Sentence (19) below is an example of this type.

(19)

- 1 Hatice: Çok maskaraydım. Yani maç seyredirdim, işte ne biliyim, taklit
- 2 çıkartırdım. Bazen çok hasta olurdu. Hiç ayağa kalkmazdım. Gelirlerdi,
- 3 “ya kalk ya eğlenceli değil burası kalk.”
- 4 Mesela banyoda hortum taktım kış günü bütün arkadaşları kış günü soğuk suya.

---

<sup>9</sup> Other quotative markers function similarly in being shared by immediate quotations. In (1) below, the quotative marker *diye* is shared by the three preceding sentences and the quotative *de-* is shared by the last two sentences which are attributed to Elif’s aunt.

- (1) Elif: Ha çocuk şey yaptı. Halamla sonra konuşuyodu işte aynı köyde halam evliydi? Halamın evinin marangoz işlerini yapmış, noolur hala biz- beni şey yap. Ara- aram-vesile ol da evlenelim. Noolur bak çok beğeniyorum ben seni diye. Yok abimden korkarım. Abim beni keser demiş.

‘Ah the boy did uhm. He was talking to my aunt, you know my aunt was married in that village. He did the fixing things at my aunt’s house. Pleese aunt do us- me the thing. Do something so we can get married. Please, I like her so much. No, I fear my brother. My brother would kill me.’

Notice that the quotative *diye* is a complementizer and does not carry TAM or agreement markers. Although it is widely used with other speech verbs, it can also be used on its own, as in this case. Here, the reporter/narrator prepares her audience for the coming DRS by introducing the characters mentioning that the man was talking to her aunt.

‘I was such a clown. I mean I watched soccer games, you know, I copied people. Sometimes I got really sick. I couldn’t even stand up. They would come, come on get up, it’s not fun here, get up. For example, I soaked them all wet with the tap water in a winter’s day.’

Notice that in the absence of a quotative marker, the immediately preceding sentence at the end of line (2) (*Gelirlerdi* ‘They would come’) serves as an introductory remark and prepares the listener for the quotation in line (3). It is in fact very common in zero quotative constructions for the speaking situation to be introduced with a preceding sentence (or sentences), which function to aid interpretation, since these introductory statements signal that a character in the narrative is about to speak. Thus, together with the voice shift the audience is informed that the reporter has switched into another’s voice.

Finally, in the third group, we have conversations including more than one character, and the reporter systematically represents the speech of certain parties with quotatives while he/she chooses to represent the speech of the other parties with zero quotative constructions. This systematic asymmetry in representation reflects the asymmetry in the positioning done by the narrator. Sentence (20) is an example of this type of zero quotative construction.

(20)

1 Elif: Sonra Neşe birkaç kere bi adamlan geldi burda. Sonra telefonda “o adam seni  
2 çok beğenmiş abla seni ona yapıym adamı evine al.” Yani ben burda içgüveysi  
3 alıcam. “Neşe” dedim ben telefonda. “Sen” dedim “kendin evlensene ilk önce.  
4 kocandan ayrıldın. Sen bana” dedim “bunca sene” dedim “ekmeğimi şeyimi siz  
mi  
5 verdiniz” dedim. “Ben evlenmeyi düşünsem sana mı sorucam” dedim “İstanbul  
gibi  
6 yerde. Ben kendim evlenicek olsaydım bulurdum şimdiye kadar” dedim. “Sen”  
7 dedim “bana getirme sonra elalemin insanını” dedim. “Ne getiriyosun evime”  
dedim. 8 Ondan sonra bu bi kere de sonra telefon etti “senin o emlakçı-”  
emlakçılığa başlamış

9 orda, “emlakçı damadınlan misilleme burda satışları beraber yapalım onun  
10 telefonunu ver.” “Valla” dedim “benim damatlar seni tutmamış” dedim.  
“Görüşmek 11 istemiyolar senlen” dedim. Telefonda. “Ööö siz sanki çok mu  
iyiydiniz düdü düdü düdü  
12 düdü.” “Kapat telefonu” dedim. “Daha bi daha da gelme buraya” dedim. Daha  
13 gelmiyo.

‘Then Neşe came here with a guy a couple of times. Then on the phone “sister, this man really liked you, let me arrange something, take him to your house. I mean I’ll take him in my house. I said Neşe on the phone. Why don’t you get married first? You are divorced. Did you give me my bread all these years? Do you think I’ll ask you for help if I wanted to get married in a city like Istanbul? If I wanted to get married I would have found someone by now. Don’t you bring me strangers. Why are you bringing them to my house? Then she called one more time after this. She started real estate business and she said give me the number of your son in law who is a real estate agent, we can work here together. I said, frankly my son-in-laws did not really approve you. They don’t want to be in contact with you. Baaaaah like you are good bla bla bla. I said hang up the phone. I said don’t you ever come here again. She is not coming anymore.’

In this excerpt, we can observe the asymmetry in the use of quotative *de-* for the two different characters of the narrative. Elif, systematically avoids using *de-* for the utterances of Neşe. In reporting her own utterances, on the other hand, she makes use of both single and multiple quotatives. In fact there is only one sentence in line (4) (*kocandan ayrıldın* ‘you are divorced’) which is reported without any quotatives.

Even that sentence is related to the previous sentence, modifying the proposition, and is not an authentic zero quotative DRS. Thus the interpretation of Neşe’s conversation again requires the usage of voice quality shift (Neşe’s voice is that of a know-all, poor mannered person, turning into non-human, whistle like, unpleasant screams at the end) and adjacency pair structure (suggestion-rejection, request-rejection, provocation-interruption). Notice that before each quotation of Neşe, Elif either mentions that she is on the phone with Neşe (*sonra telefonda* ‘then on the phone’ in line (1)), or that Neşe called (*Ondan sonra bu bi kere de sonra telefon etti* ‘Then she called one more time after this in line (8)).

We have described three different contexts in which zero quotative constructions occur. The first context was where the zero quotative DRS occurred with access to other DRS bearing quotatives. Being parts of the same utterance, these zero quotative sentences could be interpreted through the quotatives of the previous or the following sentences. The second context was where the zero quotative DRS had no access to other sentences bearing quotatives. The third context was dialogues where one party's speech was represented with quotatives, the others' speech was represented without quotatives. Whether within the report of a dialogue or the conversation of a single person, DRS with zero quotative, as we have defined and illustrated above, has significant functions within discourse, in terms of stance taking and positioning. We will discuss the discourse functions of this type of DRS in the next chapter.

#### 4.5. DRS with the Converbial *diye*

In this section, we will discuss DRS constructed with *diye*, pointing out that the causal meaning that *diye* carries in its nonquotative usage is carried over to its usage as a quotative. The subordinator *diye* is the converbial form of the quotative verb *de-*. It occurs (a) with quotations as the subject or object of verbs other than *de-*, (b) adjectival clauses indicating what something (or someone) is called and (c) adverbial clauses indicating reason, purpose or precaution. All these functions are related to the different meanings of the quotative verb form (Göksel & Kerslake 2005). Below are examples of these structures.

(21)

(a) “Akşam eve gelecek misin” diye sordum.  
‘I asked if he was coming home in the evening.’

(b) Sinem diye bi kız var mı sizin sınıfta?  
‘Is there a girl called Sinem in your class’

(c) Sen seviyorsun diye kek yaptım. (reason)  
‘I baked a cake because you like it’

Tatile gideceğiz diye araba kiraladık. (purpose)  
‘We rented a car because we were going on vacation.’

Yağmur yağacak diye şemsiye aldım.  
‘I took an umbrella because it would rain.’ (precaution)

In our data, there are 39 instances of DRS constructed with *diye*. In contrast to Göksel and Kerslake (2005)’s claim that *diye* obligatorily occurs between the quotation and the verb, our data reveals three types of configuration for quotative (Q) *diye*. These three types of configurations are shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Distribution of *diye* in data

Configurations	Number of Sentences
V (. . .) Q + (falan) diye	19
Q + (falan) diye + (. . .) + V	17
Q + diye	3

As seen in Table 7, the most frequent configuration is where the quotation is introduced by a verb and followed by *diye*. Notice that the verb and the quotation are not necessarily adjacent. However, the quotation and *diye* are required to be adjacent. It is possible only for the discourse marker *falan* ‘and so on’ to intervene between the quotation and *diye*, and as we will discuss shortly, *falan* is a frequently used discourse marker in reported speech both alone and with a quotative and has evidential functions. Example (22) below illustrates this type of DRS.

(22)

1 Nezahat: Sonra işyerindeki arkadaşlarım bana kızdılar “Aksaray’da ev tutulmaz,  
2 bekar başına orda nasıl kalırsın” diye.  
‘Then my friends from work we all mad at me saying “one cannot rent an apartment  
in Aksaray, how can you stay there being the single woman you are?”’

In this example, the verb *kız-* ‘to be angry’ introduces the quotation *Aksaray’da ev tutulmaz, bekar başına orda nasıl kalırsın* ‘One cannot rent an apartment in Aksaray. How can you stay there being the single woman you are.’ Notice that the main verb is not necessarily a speech verb. The quotative function is fulfilled by *diye*. Here the function of the quote is to express the content of the friends’ anger, through their own points-of-view.

As in (21a) above, the translations of DRS with *diye* into English is problematic. These sentences can both be translated as DRS and IRS, and in either case certain semantic content is left out. This is not surprising since, as seen in example (22), *diye* is used when the reporter highlights the propositional content of the quotation rather than its authenticity, which is a function of IRS. However, the point of view which determined the deictic elements, TAM and so on is that of the reported speakers, not the reporter, as is the case with DRS.

Moreover, in the configuration in (22), the quotation follows the main verb of the sentence. That is, it is in the post-verbal area, which is the domain for background information. This holds for the quotation in (22), Nezahat’s focus in including this quotation is not to provide the audience with information about what her friends from work actually said, but to give the audience the reason of their anger, which is shared knowledge for everyone living in Istanbul: that Aksaray is an

unsafe neighbourhood. As predicted, the post-verbal quotation here is intonationally flat.

The other configuration for DRS with quotative *diye* is where the quotation is followed by the converbial and the verb. (23) below illustrates this second type.

(23)

- 1 Hatice: Başlık parasıyla tekrar vermeye kalktılar, ben evi boş yere terk etmedim. Ben
- 2 kabul etmedim diye boğazımdan tutup annem mutfığa yasladı. “Sen benim üstüme
- 3 kuma mı geldin” diye benim bu omzumu ısırdiğını bilirim.

‘They tried to give me away for money again. I didn’t leave my home for no reason. My mother even held me from my throat and pushed me to the kitchen wall because I didn’t accept, and she bit my shoulder saying ‘are you my kuma<sup>10</sup>?’

In this excerpt, the quotation *sen benim üstüme kuma mı geldin* ‘are you my kuma?’ is the directly reported speech of Hatice’s mother. The quotation is an adjunct of the main verb *ısır-* ‘to bite’. Since verbs other than *de-* cannot take quotations directly, the converbial *diye* is used.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> *Kuma* which is generally translated as second wife or cowife refers to the woman who moves in to live with a man and his still married first wife. There may be more than one *kumas*, however since legally it is only possible to marry once, only one woman can carry marriage contract. The term is used derogatorily or jokingly, as is the case above, for people who are younger or who come later and take most of the attention and care (or try to do so) from an existing person in a situation or place, often in personal context.

<sup>11</sup> This structure is widely used with reported thought, where *düşün-* ‘think’ takes a DRS complement with *diye*, as in the example below.

Bi de o karısını öyle görünce (.) üzüldüm. Yani ben yaşıycaktım bunları diye düşündüm. (6)  
Bi kaçamadım.

‘And when I saw his wife like that (.) I was sad. I mean, I was going to live all these, I thought. If only I could have run away with him.’

Finally, there are rare cases of DRS where there are only a quotation and *diye*, but no main verb. We have only three of such sentences in our data, one of which is questionable, since the sentence is interrupted in the middle. One of the other two is given below.

(24)

- 1 Elif: Şey, sığara içiyomuş benimki, peşinden gezerlermiş hep. “Niye geziyo bunlar
- 2 allah allah neden bu kadar benim peşimdeler” diye? Meğerse onun attığı izmariti
- 3 içiyolarmış.

‘Well, my husband was smoking and they would follow him all the time. He was like “why are they walking around, why are they after me like this?” They were actually smoking the cigarette butts he threw away.’

In this example, the utterance of Elif’s husband is directly reported using only *diye* as quotative. However, as is the case with the zero quotative constructions, the introductory sentence, voice quality shift and the difference in point of view are all clues for the audience to interpret the quotation as DRS. Notice that although the DRS ends with *diye*, there is no falling intonation, which is also the case for the other examples. Thus, the sentence can be interpreted correctly as DRS, albeit with a sense of incompleteness due to lack of main verb.

As we have discussed and illustrated with examples, *diye*, the converbial form of the verb *de-*, also has quotative function. Although it is used with verbs in order to form DRS, the quotation has more of a diegetic function than a mimetic one, that is, the propositional content is more significant. The fact that the occurrence of verb-quotative-*diye* configuration is more frequent than quotative-*diye*-verb, which was pointed out to be the obligatory configuration by Göksel and Kerslake (2005) underlines the importance of propositional content over the authenticity.

We will now have a look at the discourse marker *falan* ‘and so on’ and its function within quotations.

#### 4.6. DRS with the Discourse Marker *falan* ‘and so on’

In this section we will comment on the use of discourse marker *falan* ‘and so on’.

The occurrence of *falan* in quotations is noteworthy, since it is so overspread that one may mistake it to be a DRS strategy in itself. However, in the context of quotations, *falan* still functions as a discourse marker and retains its epistemic functions.

The discourse marker *falan* is used within quotations in order to alter the modality of the quotation. *falan* is a discourse marker that comes after phrases or sentences and adds the meaning that what has been said is just one member (or n members) of the set of things which are all possible candidates for consideration. Thus it gives a sense of incompleteness and epistemic vagueness. Similarly, in quotations, *falan* adds the meaning that the reporter is marking his/her distance from the quotation and its faithfulness to its original by bringing the other members of the set to consideration. Below in (25) are two examples of *falan* used in a non-reporting context.

(25)

- 1 Ali: ya ama hani, baş kaldıran kesimin uyutulması olayı (.) ya ıı dersanedeyken hocam
- 2 söylemişti galiba , [bu mesela ]
- 3 Aslı: ((comes back)) [levisizm]
- 4 Ali: aaaa
- 5 Aslı: Levis.
- 6 İdil: Levis.
- 7 Ali: Matriks tablosu falan vardır ya matematikte

8 Aslı: Levis

9 Ali: Ya Hindistanlı adamlar bunu ezbere biliyolarmış *falan*.

‘Ali: But well you know, it’s tranquilizing the rebellious. Uhm, when I was at school my teacher told me, I guess, this [for example]

Aslı: ((comes back)) [Levisim]

Ali: uhmmm

Aslı: Levis.

İdil: Levis.

Ali: You know there is the matrix table and so on in maths.

Aslı: Levis.

Ali: I mean the guys in India have it all memorized and so on.’

In this example the discourse marker *falan* is illustrated as both occurring with a noun phrase and a sentence. The first *falan* occurs with a noun phrase in line (7) when Ali says *Matriks tablosu falan vardır ya matematikte* ‘You know there is the matrix table and so on in maths’, when he wants to point out to a topic in mathematics as an example for the point he is about to make. Here, the matrix table followed by *falan* implies that it could have been some other topic in mathematics as long as it can be used for the same purpose. The usage of *falan* here also implies that the exact name of the subject need not be matrix table, the speaker is just giving the gist of it. The second token is in line (9) where he says *ya Hindistanlı adamlar bunu ezbere biliyolarmış falan* ‘I mean the guys in India have it all memorized and so on’. He in this case, the speaker by adding *falan* at the end of the sentence marks the proposition as an example of in favor of his topic ‘tranquilizing the rebellious’, where one can possibly give other examples and Ali’s is just one.

*falan* is also used with reported speech, especially DRS and its usage can be considered as a marker of reporter interference since it signals that the reported utterance, though from the reported speaker’s point of view, is not necessarily the exact words of the speaker. The reporter is implying that he/she is providing the audience with a possibly incomplete or roundabout representation of the original

utterance. In our data, *falan* occurs both by itself and with other quotatives. *falan* obligatorily follows the phrase to which it attaches. Thus it also follows *diye* and {-*mİş*}. However, with the quotative verb *de-* we have two different configurations, since *de-* can occur in different positions within the quote. We have come across a total of 36 DRS sentences and one sentence with {-*mİş*} with *falan*. Table 8 below shows the frequency of different combinations *falan* can occur in.

Table 8: The frequency of DRS constructions with *falan*

DRS with <i>falan</i>	Number of sentences
Q + <i>falan</i>	11
<i>de-</i> + <i>falan</i>	10
<i>falan</i> + <i>de</i>	8
<i>falan</i> + <i>diye</i>	7
- <i>mİş</i> + <i>falan</i>	1

The first of these combinations is the one in which *falan* occurs with a quotation and no other quotative. Dialogue (26) below is an example of this kind of DRS.

(26)

- 1 Ali: ya bize çok kısa sağlık ekonomisi falan gibi şeyler öğretiler. haha şöle sıfır sıfır.
- 2 Aslı: sağlık ekonomisi mi, nasıl yani?
- 3 İdil: ( ) “sargı bezini üçlü pakette alın daha ucuz olur” falan.
- 4 Ali: (.) ya aslında şey olarak (2) ını ya şu bilinci oturtmaya çalışıyorlar ki hani ekonomide bi üretici tüketici hani=
- 5 Aslı: =hmm=
- 6 Ali: =ikisi arasındaki ilişkidir de, ıhmm saalık sektöründe şey giriyo işin içine tabi
- 7 yani tüketici için alıca ürünün sen seçiyosun.

‘Ali: Well they also taught us a little health economy and that kind of things, like zero zero.

Aslı: Health economy? What do you mean?

İdil: like buy band aids in packs of three, it’ll be cheaper.

Ali: Well actually they are trying to give the consciousness that in economy the

Aslı: hmm.

Ali: relationship is between the manufacturer and the consumer, but in health sector you choose the product that the consumer is going to buy.’

In the dialogue above, İdil’s utterance in line (3) is a DRS with *falan* that occurs without any quotatives. The interpretation of the DRS in this case is similar to that of zero quotative constructions and relies on turn taking structure, voice quality shifts and sequential adjacency pair structure. As we have pointed out, when *falan* occurs without any quotative, it attaches directly to the quotation and occurs without a main verb. In this sense, the utterances with quotations followed with *falan* are not full sentences syntactically. They obligatorily occur in contexts that rely on shared information between the reporter and the audience. Notice that this reported speech is a hypothetical one, no such dialogue has taken place. The dialogue itself is an example of co-authored narrative.

The second and most frequent usage of *falan* in DRS is with the quotative *de-*. As seen from the table, there are two configurations within this usage. One is where the quotative verb follows the converb, and the other is where the quotative verb precedes the quotation and thus the converb. Examples (27) and (28) below illustrate these two configurations. In (27) *falan* occurs with a sentence final *de-*.

(27)

- 1 Nezahat: Ondan sonra bana şey yapmamaya başladı. İmam nikah, bi yıl boyunca
- 2 resmi nikah yapmadı.
- 3 Interviewer: Hm.
- 4 Nezahat: “Bugün yarın, bugün yarın” diyip oyaladı. Bi de “borcumuz var, çok
- 5 alırlar, çok uğraştırıyo” felan<sup>12</sup> dedi.

‘Then he started doing these things. He didn’t marry me officially for a year. He kept making me wait saying that he would do it soon. He also said things like we have debt, it will cost too much, it will be too much trouble and so on.’

---

<sup>12</sup> *felan* and *filan* which we have come across in our data are dialectal variants of the discourse marker *falan*. One speaker may make use of either one of three forms although he/she may have stronger tendency towards one. Since they do not differ in meaning or function, the phonological differences will be neglected in our discussion.

In this dialogue, the function of *falan* where it marks the existence of other possible members of the set is very clear. Nezahat is giving a list of what her husband has said: *borcumuz var* ‘have have debt’, *çok para alırlar* ‘it will cost too much’, *çok uğraştırıyo* ‘it will be too much trouble’. Her intonation while uttering these members of the set is also that of listing. Thus, she is not reporting the exact words from a specific conversation with her husband, but the general idea he conveyed possibly in different conversations taking place over a stretch of time.

Excerpt (28) below illustrates *falan* occurring with an initial *de-*.

(28)

1 Ali: Şey dediler, “muakkak ameliyata alırken sööleyin. Sonuçlarını sööleyin. Ne  
2 olacak, ne olabilir. ihtimaller işte ölür, ölmez, ne olabilir. Bilgilendirin hastayı”  
diyo 3 kadın. “Ya” dedim “yani bu sonuçta estetik olarak da berbat bişey, yani hiç  
mi sorun 4 olmuyo” falan?

‘They said uhm, definitely tell them before the operation. Tell them about the outcomes. What is going to happen, what can happen. The possibilities, I mean she can die, she can live, what can happen. Give information to the patient the woman says. I said this is horrible aesthetically as well, doesn’t it cause any problems or anything?’

In the lines (3-4) of the reported dialogue above, which is between Ali and his professor, *falan* is used with initial *de-*. Here, different from the previous example, Ali is not giving a list of quotations, but he is reporting a specific dialogue. The usage of *falan* conveys to the audience that what is relevant is not whether the reported utterance is an exact copy or not, but its propositional content and contribution to the point the reporter is making.

Finally, *falan* combines with the quotative *diye* when the reporter uses a non-quotative verb. (29) below illustrates this combination.

(29)

1 Nezahat: Benim tek sorunum XX o kadar kavgamız olduğu zaman XXX “nası  
2 bunu yapar. Nasıl böyle bişey yapar, öbür kadınlara da mı böyle yapmıştı” falan  
3 diye  
4 söyleniyolardı, ben tanıklık için hepsini aradım. Hepsini aradım, her gün çıktım  
5 dışarıya konuştum. Hiç biri yanaşmadı. O benim için kötü oldu yani. Çünkü  
kavga  
ederken hep beni savunurlardı.

‘My only problem is XX when we were having all those fights XXX they were all complaining like how can he do this? How can he do such a thing, did he do this to the other women? I called them all to be my witness. I called them all, I went out everyday and talked to them. None of them accepted. So that was bad for me. Because when we were fighting they would always defend me.’

In this excerpt, Nezahat gives a list of what her friends were saying about her fights with her husband. The example is very similar to (28) above, the main difference being that of the main verb. The verb *söylen-* ‘complain’ requires the usage of *diye* in order to take a quotation.

The function of *falan* used with DRS is similar to its discourse marker usage in calling into mind the other members of a set of possible relevant items. Specifically with reported speech, this function is a way of marking the reporter’s interference. This way, the reporters imply that they are not aiming at a fully authentic reproduction, but that the propositional content of the utterance is more relevant.

DRS in general has epistemic modality functions in terms of marking the reporter’s attitude towards the quotation. The reporter, by framing and presenting a quotation as an exact copy of the reported speaker’s original utterance, marks the source of the utterance and underlines its authenticity, since it is clear from the structure that the quotation is produced by an agent different from the reporter himself/herself and is conveyed from that agent’s point of view as an exact reproduction of the original. Thus, he/she both asserts the utterance’s faithfulness and

underlines that he/she is not responsible for its content, assuming for himself/herself the role of the animator rather than the author (Goffman 1981). For this reason, Tannen observes that, “any anger and hurt felt in response to reported criticism is, for Americans at least, typically directed toward the quoted source rather than the speaker who conveys the criticism” (1989: 105-106).

With *falan*, the reporter becomes a marker which pulls DRS away from the mimetic zone towards the diegetic zone.

#### 4.7. Implications of Our Description of DRS

So far in this chapter we have described the direct reporting strategies in Turkish. The bulk of our description was devoted to the quotative *de-* since it is the most common strategy used for DRS. In this section, we will discuss how the use of *de-* in quotations raises certain interesting questions related to the quotative’s position in the sentence, the prosodic properties of the sentence and the argument structure.

We have pointed out a number of times in our discussion that the distribution of *de-* resembles that of a discourse marker rather than a main verb. The category of discourse markers itself is open to much debate. One problem is to define the category itself. Although it is taken for granted that discourse markers are lexicalized items with little or no semantic content which are loosely connected to the sentence structure, they are mainly defined according to their function. In a nutshell, discourse markers “function as instructions from speaker to hearer on how to integrate their host unit into a coherent mental representation of the discourse” (Hansen 1998),

including stance taking, linking and conversational management. Confusingly, these functions are also carried out by other devices as well, which include modal verbs, adverbs, parenthetical clauses, tag questions, conjunctions, speech formulas, nonlexicalized metalinguistic particles, etc. Thus, there is a disagreement among researchers as to which items can be accepted as discourse markers, where some argue that devices mentioned above should be included in the category and others argue that discourse markers are a universal lexical category and though other constituents can fulfill their function, they cannot be categorized as such.

Another criterion accepted in order to define the category of discourse markers is that of integratedness. Discourse markers are accepted to be peripheral to the syntactic structure of the clause, since their omission causes neither ungrammaticality nor change in the truth value of the proposition (Rouchota 1998:97). However, the degree of being peripheral also varies according to the function of the discourse marker. Fischer (2006) points out that there is a spectrum of integratedness with views where discourse markers are integrated into host utterances and serve connecting functions at one end and where discourse markers are independent and thereby serve conversation management functions at the other.

Within sentences, discourse markers can occur in initial, medial and final positions, where we can talk about two major, cross-linguistic slots available: preclausal and postclausal. Discourse markers serve in discourse management and speaker attitude marking in both slots. Thus, they are also closely linked to the epistemic modality of the sentence. Speakers, via the usage of discourse markers, mark their commitment to the propositional content of the sentence.

#### 4.7.1. Questions Regarding *de-*'s Position in the Sentence

Previously in this chapter, we have illustrated how the quotative verb *de-* is different in its distribution and function from typical verbs. In DRS, the quotative verb *de-* functions as the main verb, subcategorizing for an internal argument (i.e. the quotation) and external argument (i.e. the reported speaker). The quotative verb bears agreement markers that match with the  $\Phi$  features of the reported speaker. However, a main verb occurring multiply (except for repairs and reduplications) occurring inside their argument or adjunct phrases is very uncommon.

Many discourse markers, on the other hand, may occur multiply in the sentence, as required by the conversational management function and they have a less constrained distribution. The distribution of the discourse marker *işte* 'well' in excerpt (30) below illustrates this point.

(30)

- 1 Aslı: ((plays with her fingers and rubs her hands))
- 2 ya mesela *işte* diyelim ben *işte* böyle yapıyorum falan diyelim.
- 3 *işte* ben “↑aa niye yapıyorum ki aa” *işte* falan diye belki bunu çok *işte* basitçe
- 4 açıklıcam. ama dışardan bakan biri için ben şu anda mesela düşünüyorum,
- 5 kafamda bişeyler var falan *işte*, böyle (.)
- 6 yani (2) kesinlikle ya.
- 7 *işten* kendi paradigmanda düşünüyosun *işte*.

‘Aslı: ((plays with her fingers and rubs her hands)) well for example well let’s say I well am doing like this or something let’s say. Well I will say “↑wow why am I doing this wow” you know and stuff. Maybe I’ll explain it very simply. But for someone looking at it from the outside I am thinking at this moment, there’s something in my mind and stuff, you know. I mean, well definitely. You always think from the inside, through your own paradigm.’

Notice that there are two instances of *işte* ‘well’ in line (2). The first token is in sentence initial position between two other discourse markers *mesela* ‘for example’

and *diyelim* ‘for instance’ and the second token is between the subject and the verb phrase. In line (3) there are three tokens. The first one occurring in sentence initial position preceding the subject, the second one in sentence (quote) final position preceding the discourse marker *falan* ‘and so on/and stuff’, the third one inside the adverb phrase. In line(5) it occurs in sentence final position preceding the discourse marker *böyle* ‘like this’ and in line (7) it again occurs in sentence final position. The example above illustrates that the discourse marker *işte*, unlike can occur multiply in the sentence, in positions which are unlikely for other lexical categories, such as inside the adverb phrase *çok basitçe* ‘very simply’ in line (3).

We have illustrated the somewhat less constrained distribution of a typical discourse marker in Turkish. In order to argue for the similarity in the distribution of *de-* with discourse markers, a comparison with other main verbs is also necessary. Consider the following examples in *de* (31), (32) and (33) below, where we show the differences in the distribution of *de-* and the verb *san-* ‘incorrectly assume’ and *öğren-* ‘learn’:

(31)

- a. Ben [sen ev-e git-ti-n] san-dı-m.  
 I you home-DAT go-Past-2PSg think-Past-1PSg  
 ‘I thought you went home.’
- b. \*Ben [sen san-dı-m ev-e git-ti-n].  
 I you think-Past-1PSg home-DAT go-Past-2PSg
- c. \*Ben [sen ev-e san-dı-m git-ti-n].  
 I you home-DAT think-Past-2PSg go-Past-2PSg
- d. Ben [san-dı-m sen ev-e git-ti-n].  
 I think-Past-2PSg you home-DAT go-Past-2PSg

(32)

- a. Ben [sen ev-e git-ti-n] de-di-m.  
 I you home-DAT go-Past-2PSg say-Past-1PSg  
 ‘I said you went home.’

- b. Ben [sen de-di-m ev-e git-ti-n].  
 I you say-Past-1PSg home-DAT go-Past-2PSg
- c. Ben [sen ev-e de-di-m git-ti-n].  
 I you home-DAT say-Past-1PSg go-Past-2PSg
- d. Ben [de-di-m sen ev-e git-ti-n].  
 I say-Past-1PSg you home-DAT go-Past-2PSg

(33)

- a. Ben [sen-in ev-e git-tiğ-in-i] öğren-di-m.  
 I you-GEN home-DAT go-Nom-Poss-ACC learn-Past-1PSg  
 ‘I learned that you went home’
- b. Ben [sen-in öğren-di-m ev-e git-tiğ-in-i].  
 I you-GEN learn-Past-1PSg home-DAT go-Nom-Poss-ACC
- c. \*Ben [sen-in ev-e öğren-di-m git-tiğ-in-i].  
 I you-GEN home-DAT learn-Past-1PSg go-Nom-Poss-ACC
- d. Ben [öğren-di-m sen-in ev-e git-tiğ-in-i].  
 I learn-Past-1PSg you-GEN home-DAT go-Nom-Poss-ACC

The sentences in (31) illustrate finite complementation, which is also the case in DRS. (32) illustrates DRS constructions with the quotative *de-* and (33) illustrates nonfinite complementation. Notice that, both in (31) and (33) while it is possible for the main verb to be positioned between the subject and the object, positioning inside the object results in ungrammaticality. However, there is an asymmetry in the grammaticality of (31b) and (33b) as opposed to (31c) and (33c). While both (31b) and (31c) are ungrammatical, (31c) is much worse. They are different in that while in (31b) and (33b) the quotative verb is external to the embedded VP, in (31c) and (33c) it is inside the embedded VP. In (33), however, it is perfectly acceptable for the quotative verb to be positioned inside its direct object (i.e. the quotation) at all levels. We find this type of sentences in our data as well. The two sentences in (34) below provide examples.

(34)

a. Elif: “Kız” de-miş “ne güzel”.  
girl say-Mod what beautiful

‘She said how beautiful the girl is.’

b. “Çocuk-lar artık okul-a” de-di-m “gid-iyo-lar”.  
child-Plu now school-DAT say-Past-1PSg go-Prog-3PPl

‘I said “Listen, the children have started going to school”’

In (34a) the quotative verb is inside the predicate phrase in a nominal clause. (34b) is very similar to the made up sentences in (32), where the quotative is positioned inside the VP after the place adjunct. The quotative *de-* occurring in these positions which are unlikely for other main verbs is an indication that *de-* does not behave like a typical main verb.

#### 4.7.2. Questions Regarding the Prosodic Features of DRS with *de-*

In the previous section we have pointed out that the information structure properties of the quotative verb *de-* is also closer to a discourse marker than a main verb. The verb is the essential element for determining the information structure of the sentence.

In Turkish sentences with regular predicates, focus and topic positions are preverbal. Postverbal position is limited to background information. Focus and topic are also expressed via sentential stress, focused information bearing heavy stress and topicalized information bearing secondary stress. Background information in the postverbal position, on the other hand, is never stressed (Erguvanlı 1984, Goksel & Kerslake 2005).

In DRS with *de-*, this is not the case. It is also possible for the constituents in the postverbal domain to receive stress. Thus, the relative position of the constituents according to *de-* does not affect their role in the information structure like it does with other verbs. That is, in a DRS sentence with nonfinal *de-*, although the dialogue may be introduced as a narrative via an abstract, the postverbal constituents do not necessarily constitute shared information, and it is rarely the case that they are mentioned previously in discourse as such. Example (35) below illustrates how the distribution of stress in postverbal domain is different in sentences with the quotative *de-* as the main verb.

(35)

- 1 Elif: Ben kendi kendime bunu, boza: yapa: ziyan ede yapa ö:rendim. Anladın
- 2 mı? Pratik böyle. Ölçüyle mölçüyle deil. Anladın mı? Ama öyle güzel
- 3 yapıştırıyodum ki çocukların üstüne.
- 4 Sonra Cozefin bu dedi “çocukların üstüne ÇOK güzel şeyler giydiriyosun,
- 5 bunları KİM dikiyo?”
- 6 “BEN dikiyorum” dedim.
- 7 “Ya” dedi “bizim TERZİ makinacı” dedi “BIRAKMIŞ” dedi.
- 8 “Üç günlük” dedi “ORTADA kaldılar” dedi.
- 9 “Bize” dedi “ÜÇ günlük gelir GİDER misin” dedi.
- 10 “Atölyeye GÖTÜRİYİM ben”.
- 11 Dedim “kocama SORMAM lazım”. Sordum.
- 12 “E ÜÇ günlükse gönderirim ama DEVAMLI çalışamazsın” dedi bana.

“I learned this by myself, by practice. You see?

Practically. Not with measures or anything. You see? But I made them fit real nice on the kids.

Then this Josephine said “You dress your kids so nicely, who makes these clothes?

I said “I make them.”

She said “Well, our sempstress has quit.

For three days. They are helpless.

Will you work for us for three days?

I’ll take you to the workshop.”

I said “I have to ask my husband.” I asked.

He said “Well, if it’s for three days, you can go, but you cannot have a regular job” to me.

The excerpt above is from Elif’s narrative about how she started working. The reported dialogues have both final and nonfinal single and multiple quotatives. The stress bearing words are marked with capitals in all reported sentences. The sentences in lines (4) and (11) are examples where the quotative *de-* occurs in initial position. Thus in these instances both quotations are in postverbal domain. In line (4), the initial quotative *de-* is followed by two sentences. In both sentences, there are focused particles bearing stress. In the first sentence the stress is on *çok* ‘very’. In the second sentence, it is on the wh- word *kim* ‘who’. In line (11) the stress is on *sormam* ‘my asking’. If these sentences were not DRS sentences but other types of finite complements, the postverbal constituent would not bear stress.

The significant difference is that, in DRS sentences with *de-*, while the quote itself is an argument of the quotative verb, it does not determine the internal structure of the quotation. Although the quotative is phonologically inside the quotation, syntactically it is positioned outside the quotation and frames it. Osima (2006) proposes that the quotation is opaque with regard to the rest of the sentence. One can even say the quotative verb is peripheral to the quotation. Sentences (36) and (37) below illustrate the difference in information structures of a scrambled embedded verb and a scrambled quotative verb.

(36) Elif: “Tutturamazsınız hiç bişey burdan” dedim.  
 ‘You cannot get anywhere with this.’

(37) Hatice: “Anne” diyoruz “bizi niçin bu kadar çok doğurdun?”  
 ‘We say mother why did you give birth to this many children?’

In sentence (36), the verb of the embedded clause is in sentence initial position. The following constituents (i.e. the direct object and the adjunct phrase) are both in the post-verbal domain and unstressed. In sentence (37), on the other hand, the quotative

verb *de-* occurs right after the vocative and is followed by the direct object, the reason adverb (in the form of *wh-*), the quantity adverb and the verb of the embedded clause. *Wh-* elements are inherently focused and receive stress, thus in Turkish, they do not occur in the post-verbal position except in echo questions. This example shows that the verb of the quotation *doğur-* ‘give birth to’ determines the domains relevant for the information structure of the sentence, not the quotative verb.

#### 4.7.3. Questions Regarding Argument Structure

One final topic we would like to address regarding the status of *de-* as the main verb of the sentence is related to the argument structure.

As required by the Projection Principle (Chomsky 1977), lexical information is syntactically represented. Thus, the number of arguments a predicate can take is determined in its lexical make up and this is reflected in the sentential structure. Moreover theta criterion similarly asserts that each argument is assigned one and only one theta role and each theta role is assigned to one and only one argument. The violation of theta criterion creates ungrammaticality crosslinguistically.

The occurrence of multiple quotatives is problematic when looked at from this point of view. In sentences with multiple *de-*s, if each token is taken as a separate verb, that is, if we assume that there is a single quote for multiple *de-*s, there will either be theta roles which are left unassigned or arguments which are assigned more than one theta role (that is, the same theta role more than once) depending on the number of tokens. However, these sentences are grammatical, which shows that theta criterion is not violated.

That theta criterion is not violated calls for alternative solutions. One attempt for explanation could be that perhaps there is only one quotative *de-* which functions as the main verb of the sentence and the others are copies which do not possess the verbal property of assigning theta roles. If this is the case, the second question which immediately arises is that which one is the real verb and which ones are the semantically empty copies? Making such a differentiation is impossible as well as irrelevant for the function multiple quotatives fulfill within discourse.

Another attempt for explanation could be that perhaps the complements of *de-s* are not sentences but the fragments. That is, when a sentence has more than one quotative, each quotative will take one fragment as its argument. However, this explanation would lead to a very confusing picture. The nature and domain of these fragments as well as the position of the quotative in relation to its fragmental argument must be specified. This is not an easy task, because the quotatives are semantically identical and we cannot differentiate its arguments as such. As for prosodic domains, there is no such thing as each quotative occupying a single prosodic domain. Thus, a prosodic parsing of arguments is also impossible. Ultimately, arguing that each fragment is an argument would mean that speakers produce these fragments separately, which is not the case. The fragments created by multiple quotatives are closely connected to one another as constituents of the same embedded clause. There is no motivation for positing such an argument. It would also render a confusing picture where, for example, genitives of genitive-possessive constructions which are frequently separated by quotatives, produced with no syntactic relation to their possessives. Moreover, we would be left with a serious number of vocatives and discourse markers, which do not really have reporting value

if they are separated from the reported utterance. In the following sections we will argue that the reported utterance is the domain of our analysis in more detail.

We have discussed how the quotative verb *de-* behaves unlike a main verb in relation to its complement. Being able to penetrate into the quotation, occurring multiply, not determining the information structure domains and not violating the theta criterion in its multiple usage are characteristics which separate *de-* from other verbs. Moreover, *de-* in multiple type fulfills functions such as stance taking and information management. All these characteristics are shared by discourse markers which raises the question whether *de-* is a main verb or a discourse marker and if *de-* is a discourse marker, what is the main verb of the DRS?

#### 4.8 Conclusion

In this chapter we have discussed the distribution of main DRS strategies in our conversational data. Quotative *de-* is the most common strategy of reporting in Turkish, with its two different types (i.e. single and multiple) motivated by the difference in function. Although *de-* is a main verb subcategorizing for the quotation as a complement, it does not behave like one in its multiple occurrence. We have pointed out that this function is resemblant of a discourse marker, since the quotative *de-* seems to be exempt from distributional and prosodic restrictions. *diye*, the converbial form of *de-*, also has reporting function and is used with verbs other than *de-* which cannot take quotation complements. Similar to its non-quotative function, *diye* adds a sense of causality to the DRS and thus is used widely in evaluations

within narratives. In this chapter, we have also discussed the usage of *falan* with quotatives. Again similar to its non-quotative function, *falan* in quotations marks the epistemic status of the quotation as inexact by calling into mind the other possible reproductions which could have been provided by the reporter.

The classification we have made in this chapter will provide the base for our analysis of how DRS with the quotative *de-* and with zero quotative are used by narrators in order to represent the narrative characters and do identity work through such representations.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### FUNCTIONS OF DIRECT REPORTED SPEECH IN NARRATIVE

In the previous chapter we have described the frequency and the distribution of different DRS strategies in our data. The examination of that distribution reveals that the type of the DRS based on the number of the quotative verb it bears (i.e. single quotative, zero quotative, multiple quotative) varies according to the function the DRS serves within the narrative. In this chapter, we will focus on the functional properties of three different types of DRS constructed with single quotative *de-*, zero quotative and multiple quotative *de-*. The processes of positioning and relational identity work operate at levels which are beyond the sentence. Thus in this chapter, we will not limit our analysis to the sentential level, but investigate conversations and narratives.

In narrative context, when the function of the DRS is to render a reproduction of an utterance as a narrative clause unfolding the complicating action or an evaluation providing commentary on the narrative, the reporter uses single quotative type. We will categorize that this type of DRS functions as ‘event description’.

When the narrator aims to provide a purely mimetic reproduction of an utterance, he/she chooses the zero quotative strategy. We refer to this strategy as ‘theatrical representation’ with zero quotative. Different from the event description, theatrical representation does not function to further the plot of the narrative. The

main aim of the reporter in using theatrical representations is to render a vivid reproduction of the desired quotation and thus give voice to a certain attitude rather than merely provide a verbal reproduction.

DRS with multiple quotatives, on the other hand, occurs when the narrator is directly working towards relational identity construction. We will refer to this second type of DRS as fulfilling the ‘character assertion’ function, which provides a richer and more complicated positioning strategy in which the reporter/narrator positions the characters vis-à-vis each other as well as himself by introducing them to the audience as part of his/her own identity work. In the following sections we will analyze with examples how event description and character assertion functions are fulfilled via the usage of different types of DRS.

### 5.1 Event Description with DRS

As we have pointed out, event description with DRS is made with single quotative constructions. These DRS utterances are often positioned within narratives of events or states, that is, in cases where the narrator/reporter is not making use of DRS to directly elaborate on the relational identity issues, but to reproduce an utterance as a narrative clause. They are also widely used in evaluations and in non-narrative contexts they function to illustrate or strengthen a point by providing evidence.

DRS constructions with the speech verb *de-* ‘say’ in the single quotative type is the unmarked way of reenacting past utterances in spoken discourse. Studies

focusing on the English language show that it is used in the climactic points of narratives (Mayes 1990) and has evidential functions. These functions rest on the fact that DRS provides a more mimetic reproduction of the utterance and thus add vividness and theatricality to the narrative, and because it presents quotations from the speaker's point of view, it marks the source of the information.

One function of single quotative type DRS is that of narrative clause. In this function, the short, single-quotative type DRS constructions are embedded within the narrative and serve to carry the plot further. The following example in extract (1) below shows how DRS with single quotative is used as narrative clause. Here, Nezahat is telling the interviewer the story of how she found her first job in Istanbul.

Nezahat is a handicapped woman who has come to Istanbul to consult a doctor about having an operation. After that she decided to become a permanent resident of the city instead of going back to her hometown. Spending some time staying at her relatives' apartment without any employment, she decided to apply to the labor placement office for a job upon suggestions from some strangers she met on the bus. The narrative below is related to her decision making process, specifically on how she met those strangers, who are residents of Istanbul, on a bus she regularly takes.

(38)

- 1 Nezahat: Burada üç ay dayımın kızının evli bi kız kardeşi vardı Ataşehir'de.
- 2 Interviewer: Hı.
- 3 Nezahat: Ataşehir'de. Bi yirmi gün orda kaldım.
- 4 Interviewer: Hı-hı.
- 5 Nezahat: Yirmi gün kaldıktan sonra hep otobüste şeyler.
- 6 Adamlar bana şey soruyolar “niye iş, çalışıyo musun”
- 7 “çalışmıyorum” diyorum.
- 8 Interviewer: Hm.
- 9 Nezahat: “İşçi bulma kurumuna kaydını yaptırsana iş için” falan dediler.
- 10 Interviewer: Hm.

11 Nezahat: Bir iki söylemeyle ben işçi bulma kurumunun Bahçelievler'de şubesine başvurdum.

'Nezahat: Here my cousin had a married sister in Ataşehir.

Interviewer: Hm.

Nezahat: In Ataşehir. I stayed there around twenty days.

Interviewer: Hm-hm.

Nezahat: After I stayed there for twenty days, the people on the bus ask me *are you working*,

I say *I am not working*.

Interviewer: Hm.

Nezahat: They said *why don't you register to the labor placement office*.

Interviewer: Hm.

Nezahat: After they said a couple of times I went to the Bahçelievler office of the labor placement office.'

In dialogue (38) above, the narrative Nezahat tells about how she registered at the labor placement office relates to a major change in her life. After her registration she found a job and transformed from a guest staying at her relatives' apartment to a working resident of Istanbul. She decided not to go back to her home and her family located in another city in order to continue her life in Istanbul, where she had come temporarily for medical reasons. She also moved out of her relatives' apartment and began building up her own life.

Nezahat's choice to present the decision making process of transition from one state (that of being a guest) to the other (that of being a resident) as a dialogue taking place between herself and the people she has met on the bus is significant. Notice that the identity of the people on the bus is irrelevant and thus unclear-unspecific. The only significant characteristics they bear are that they are regular commuters, they know how one can find a job in Istanbul and they are eager to give advice. Moreover, Nezahat presents the dialogue as taking place *hep* 'all the time', and the speech verb *sor* 'ask' and the first de- is marked with the imperfective – (*I*)*yor*.

Although in (38) there is a dialogue between the bus people and Nezahat, there is only one *de-* ‘say’ used in quoting Nezahat’s talk in line (7). In quoting the other party’s utterance, the speech verb *sor-* ‘ask’ is used. When used with direct quotations, *sor-* is accompanied by the particle *diye* (similar to English ‘like’), which we have discussed in chapter 3. Both quotatives in this example are in sentence final position, but as we will see in other examples, this distribution is not obligatory.

In this dialogue the highlighted characteristic of the discourse is the speech acts and the adjacency pairs: first the people on the bus ask Nezahat a question (whether she is working or not), then she answers the question (that she is not working), and then they make a suggestion (she should register to the labor placement office), after that she takes action. In this dialogue Nezahat presents herself as a newcomer who does not know how things work in the new city. She is passive, as she only answers the questions and fulfills the suggestion. The anonymous people on the bus, on the other hand, have a more active role. They are presented as regular commuters of that certain bus, the audience infers that they are residents of Istanbul. They are practical people who know Istanbul and how to get by in the big city. They also have knowledge about what a handicapped person in Nezahat’s situation should do in order to find a job. Thus, though anonymous, Nezahat follows the advice of these people who are presented to the audience as dependable sources of information regarding how one can pursue employment in Istanbul.

During narratives speakers also make use of summaries and underline the points they have previously made. In doing so, they use DRS with single quotative. In extract (39) below, Selma is summarizing how she has ended up at the shelter, at

the end of the interview. Unlike the other participants, she did not have domestic violence issues with her husband. The major problem was the husband's family and how he valued them above his wife and children. After the husband decided to move his family to Ankara to reunite with his parents and relatives, Selma started feeling worried about the safety of her children, because the family was involved in begging (as a profession) and heavy drinking. When she realized that her attempts to make her husband leave his parents and return were in vain, she decided to get a divorce. In extract (39), she is in a way re-narrating the whole event she has been talking about for the past half hour in fast forward.

(39)

- 1 Selma: Ondan sonra hani kızıma da öyle yaparlar diye, beni de hani anlamazlar
- 2 benim sözüm de geçmez diye, korkusuyla ben buraya geldim. Ondan sonra işte bu-
- 3 dediğim gibi döndürmeye çalıştım dönmedi, ben de artık bıktım. O zaman dedim
- 4 “boşanalım.” Böyle yani. Benim konumum bu.

‘After that I was afraid that they would do the same thing to my daughter and they wouldn't listen to me and I came here. Then as I said I tried to make him come back but he didn't. So I was fed up. Then I said let's get divorced. That's it, that's where I stand.’

In (39) above, Selma in her recapitulation of her narrative, makes two different uses of *de-*. The first one functions as a summarizing dialogue and the second one marks the climactic point of her narrative. Here the two quotatives precede the quotations. The first quotative comes after the adverb phrase and the discourse marker introducing the sentence. The second quotative again follows the adverb phrase.

This example of DRS functioning to give the summary of Selma's divorce story is also meaningful from the representation point of view. As the audience (the interviewer) knows the original story, having just listened to it, she knows that Selma is not reproducing or reenacting a specific utterance (Tannen 1989), but is again

giving the gist of what she has been talking about during the interview that she has ‘tried to make him come back but he didn’t. So she was fed up’. She has never uttered these two sentences word by word during the interview, but the message that the total of her narrative conveys can indeed be summarized as such. This type of reported speech is different from what has been classified as DRS as a verbatim reproduction of an original utterance, and the fact that it reproduces what has never actually been uttered is the key point in Tannen’s using it as an example in her argument that reported speech is in fact constructed dialogue. In this specific instance, the postposition *gibi* ‘like’ implies that the following is not an authentic reproduction but a roundabout rendition of the original utterance.

Selma uses the second quotative to quote herself in expressing her decision to divorce, as a narrative clause within the bigger narrative of events she has gone through. Her decision of divorce is the climactic point of her narrative (most probably of her life as well). The switch to DRS at climactic points of narratives is also observed in other languages (Larson 1978, Glock 1986, Macaulay 1987). Again, as a narrative of a decision-making process, the climactic point where Selma presents her decision follows the list of supporting facts leading to her decision: that she was afraid they would treat her daughter badly, that they would not listen to her, that the husband did not return to his family and she was fed up. Backed up with all these acceptable reasons, Selma’s decision is well justified. Strengthening her decision of divorce with sound causes, Selma positions herself as a reasonable woman who thinks about all the pros and cons before making a decision. Moreover, she reports the decision making process as one of her own. She excludes the husband from the picture completely. Elsewhere she notes that her husband still wants to be with her,

that he still loves her. Selma, reporting herself as the one who suggests the divorce, also claims agency.

We have defined event description as a type of DRS which occurs as narrative clauses within larger narratives and functions to unfold the narrative plot. These are shorter sequences of reported utterances, since the reporter's aim (or focus) in producing event description type DRS is not to reproduce a whole speech, but to provide an engaging narrative clause at certain points of narratives. DRS with single *de-* we observe above in example (39) fits event description type, since it occurs as a narrative clause at the climax of Selma's narrative of her divorce, carrying the plot further.

We have discussed that DRS can both occur as independent main clauses or embedded clauses with various functions. When the DRS occurs as a nonfinite embedded clause, single quotative type is used. In extract (40) below, the DRS is in the form of a relative clause, modifying the subject of the matrix clause. In this excerpt Nezahat is talking about her relationship with and feelings for her friends at the shelter, in the context of her life plans after leaving the shelter. Positioning herself apart from the other women at the shelter, Nezahat at various points in the interview mark how her views and attitudes are different from the others in general. In this specific example, she points out how this different mindset makes it impossible for Nezahat to move in with any one of the women at the shelter.

(40)

- 1 Nezahat: Hala güvendiğim insan yok burada.
- 2 Interviewer: Burada derken, sığınma evinde mi?
- 3 Nezahat: Ben şey düşünüyorum, çünkü birlikte artık eve çıkan çok arkadaşımız
- 4 var.
- 5 Interviewer: Hm.
- 6 Nezahat: Ama ben burada göremiyorum kendi kafa dengimi, beni gerçekten

7        çekebilecek XX XX insan bulamıyorum burada. “Ben bunu çok sevdim,  
onunla  
8        ayrı eve çıkmak istiyorum” dediğim bi insan yok.

‘Nezahat: There is still noone I trust here.

Interviewer: You mean at the shelter?

Nezahat: I think, because there are a lot of people here who decide to share an apartment.

Interviewer: Hm.

Nezahat: But I don’t see anyone I can get along with here. XXX. There is noone that I say *I like this person, I want to share an apartment with her.*’

The excerpt above is from a narrative where Nezahat is talking about her current state and plans for the future. Although the conversation can be considered as one relating to identity, it is not the subject matter but the reporter’s aim that is significant in determining the function of the DRS. Nezahat’s focus here is not on elaborating on the character of herself or her roommates, but on presenting a dialogue in order to put forth a speech act (an assertive)<sup>13</sup> and further the plot in a way. Thus the focus is on the quotation’s propositional value of presenting Nezahat’s criteria in choosing a roommate.

DRS is crosslinguistically used in expressing reported thought. Especially in narratives of decision making, it enables the audience to follow how the narrator interprets the line of events in the narrative and the underlying motivations behind his/her actions. Extract (41) below is an example of reported thought. This time Nezahat is narrating the the maltreatment she has received from her husband and the hardships she has gone through during her marriage. The husband, who had a water delivery shop and made sufficient money, also collected Nezahat’s handicapped pension and often left her penniless and as such, threw her out several times.

---

<sup>13</sup> According to Searle (1976), assertives “commit the speaker (in varying degrees) to something being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition. All of the members of the representative class are assessable on the dimension of assessment which includes true and false” (10).

(41)

- 1 Nezahat: Dışarıda sokakta kaldım yani uzunca bi süre. Özürlü  
maaşımı  
2 falan veriyodum ona. Beni birkaç defa dışarı attığında su alıcak dahi bi  
3 param yoktu, çünkü hepsini ona veriyodum.  
4 Interviewer: Cüzdanını XX.  
5 Nezahat: O zaman anladım dedim ki “ben- bundan sonra aklım  
başıma  
6 geldi. Hiç bi paramı vermeyecem ona.” Çünkü sonradan öğrendim  
benim  
7 paramı kullandığını.

‘Nezahat: For a long time I was on the streets, homeless. I was giving him my disability grant too. When he kicked me out a couple of times I didn’t even have the money to buy water, because I gave everything to him.

Interviewer: Your ID XXX.

Nezahat: Then it dawned on me. I said now I see. I won’t give any of my money to him. Because I found out later that he was using my money.’

In this dialouge, Nezahat is telling the interviewer the utmost trouble she has had to go through: how she had to live on the streets and did not even have the money to buy water, because she gave all her money to her husband. This narrative is another example of decision making narratives which mark the crucial points in the narrator’s life. Nezahat’s decision of not giving her money to her husband anymore is the first step to her ultimate separation from him. She chooses to convey this message to the audience from the perspective of her previous self, as a character in the narrative rather than the narrator, providing a representation of her past self at the moment of her realization that changed the course of their relationship. Thus the construction is direct reported thought, whose form is identical to DRS. In terms of narrative position, this narrative clause occurs at the climactic point of this subnarrative as well. Thus, as we have noted for the other examples above, the switch to DRS is expected.

Extract (42) below illustrates another instance of DRS constructed with single *de-*. In this dialogue Selma is making a point that one can find a spouse anytime he/she wants but the kids are irreplaceable, but so is mother according to her husband.

(42)

- 1 Selma: Yani o yüzden ben dediğiniz şimdi şöyle bi şey de vardır ıı istediğiniz  
2 zaman evlenebilirsiniz, o sizin elinizde istediğiniz yerde koca bulunur. Ama  
3 evlat bulunmaz.  
4 Interviewer: Tabi.  
5 Selma: E onun için de eş bulunur anne bulunmaz. Onun için de öyle.  
6 Interviewer: Hm.  
7 Selma: Yani evladı falan gözünün önünde diil. “Benim için de” diyo “anne  
8 bulunmaz” Benim de annem var ben insan değil miyim? Ben de annemi  
9 seviyorum. Ama ben annemden bir sene iki sene boyunca ayrı kalabiliyorum.  
Ki  
10 hiç telefon bile açmıyorum bazen. ‘

‘Selma: So for that reason you know there is uhm you can get married whenever you want, it’s up to you, you can find a husband anywhere; but you cannot find the children.

Interviewer: Sure.

Selma: Well and for him you cannot find the mother. For him it’s like that.

Interviewer: Hm.

Selma: I mean he doesn’t care about the kids or anything. He says *for me mother cannot be found again*. I have a mother too, am I not a human being? I love my mother too. But I can be separated from my mother for a year or two. Sometimes I don’t even call her.’

In this example Selma uses DRS to reenact a point her husband made that caused their separation. Selma’s main motivation for not wanting to live with her husband’s parents was her children’s safety; she believed that they weren’t safe with them.

Selma quotes her husband’s words as he rejects leaving his mother. She both uses this DRS as evidence for the fact that his mother was always more important to him than his wife and children. At the same time she distances herself from what he says.

Juxtaposing it with her point of view, that she also has a mother but her priority is always her children, she positions her husband in contrast with her. In doing so,

Selma is almost completely nonjudgmental. Although she is presenting her case with arguments, examples and folk wisdom and aims at persuasion of the audience (which she achieves, as far as the interviewer's responses are concerned), she proceeds by not condemning her husband or victimizing herself but by elaborating on the state of things from a distance as they led them to their divorce.

In this section we discussed DRS structures with single *de-*, which occur as narrative clauses or evaluations in narratives which function to give accounts of events or states. As such DRS constructions have identity construction functions, because they convey to the audience how the characters in the narrative react towards certain events or conditions. In a way, the narrators use DRS to the extent that it provides evidence for the reality of the identity the narrator is constructing for the character in question. In the next section, we discuss the function of DRS with zero quotative.

## 5.2. Theatrical Representation with Zero Quotative

DRS with zero quotative has a number of different functions. As discussed in the literature, it serves to add a dramatic effect by enabling the reporter to enact the utterance rather than describe it. It gives a sense of urgency by reducing the linguistic distance between the utterances which correlate to temporal distance. It also gives voice to attitude (Mathis and Yule 1994).

It has been observed that in the absence of quotative markers, other devices are used in order to separate the quote from its surrounding context. These devices

include certain elements which precede the quotation such as exclamations or vocatives as well as the sequential turn taking structure. Moreover, the characters can be differentiated from one another and from the narrator via intonation and voice quality (Klewitz and Couper-Kuhlen 1998, Günthner 1998, 2000).

In the following extract the narrator, Hatice, tells about her daily life at the women's shelter. Hatice is one of the long term residents of the shelter, and she seems to have accepted the place as her home. Much of her narratives about the life at the shelter are about the rules and principles of the place that govern the communal life. Hatice positions herself as in full compliance with these rules and principle, at times she positions herself against those who did not internalize the norms of the shelter life to the extent that she has. Extract (43) below illustrates Hatice's relationship with her roommates. DRS with zero quotative is given in quotation marks.

(43)

- 1 Hatice: Biz bi yatak güreşi yaparız. Mükemmel. Bazen otururuz birimiz ağlarız,
- 2 hep beraber ağlarız. Yani (.) ben mesela sabah işe giderim dağınık bırakırım.
- 3 Alelacele. bi bakarım gelirim elbiselerim katlanmı:ş, çamaşırlar düzgün, dolabım
- 4 düzgün, yatağım düzgün. Bazen düzeltilmediği zaman ba-
- 5 ((Hatice)) “niye düzeltilmedi.”
- 6 ((Roommate)) “ya ben senin kocan mıyım karın mıyım düzELTSENE burayı niye
- 7 böyle bırakıyosun.”
- 8 Bi bakarsın birimiz çocuğunu atmışızdır birimizin üstüne. Her şeyle o
- 9 sorumludur. Ya birbirimize öyle bi bağlıyız ki anlatılır gibi değil.

Hatice: We do some pillow fighting. Perfect. Sometimes we sit and one of us cries, we all cry together. I mean (.) for example I go to work in the morning and leave a mess. In a rush. I come back and find my clothes folded, the laundry fixed, my closet neat, my bed made. Sometimes when they are not fixed,  
((Hatice)) why isn't it fixed?  
((Roommate)) Am I your husband or wife? Why don't you fix this place, why do you leave it like this?

Sometimes we let one of us to take care of our kids, she will be responsible for everything. We are so attached to one another, I cannot even begin to describe.

Hatice, in this example, tells about the activities she engages herself in with her roommates, such as pillow fighting, crying and cleaning up each other's mess. While she is listing the activities that comprise the cleaning up in the form of the narrative (that she comes to her room and finds her clothes folded, closet neat, bed made) she embeds another small narrative within that narrative. This embedded narrative is introduced with the phrase *Bazen düzeltilmediği zaman* "sometimes when it is not fixed" (i.e. when her roommates do not help her with the room) followed by a dialogue between Hatice and her anonymous roommate, in the form of two DRS sequences with zero quotative.

The sequence begins with a false start *ba-* which signals that Hatice might have intended to use the sound verb *bağır-* "to scream", but she changes her mind and presents the dialogue without the intervention of quotatives. In the absence of a quotative phrase, Hatice makes use of voice shift, she utters the DRS in a higher volume and pace with staccato rhythm. She also makes use of gestures and facial expressions. She looks around the room and raises her hands as she is asking her roommate why she has not cleaned up the place. When she is enacting the roommate as answering Hatice's question, she raises the volume and pitch of her voice even higher, thus setting the roommate's utterance off from her own. Gestures also accompany the enactment of the roommate's utterance. She moves her hands up and down rapidly as people do when they are communicating complaint or disagreement.

This part of the dialogue is also interspersed with laugh particles. Such particles do not belong to the original utterance but are included by the reporter to

provide evaluation about the reported speaker and/or utterance. As Günthner (2000) points out in her analysis of complaint stories, these particles provide a layering of voices where the voice of the reported speaker and the reporter are blended, and through the usage of laugh particles the reporter conveys that the statement is ridiculous. In this case, Hatice does the contrary. Without the evaluative function of the laugh particles, the dialogue is very open to be interpreted as a negative one. However, the purpose of Hatice in reporting this dialogue is to show her close and positive relationship with her roommates. Thus, her evaluation shows to mark her attitude towards her roommate's reaction as sympathetic. She takes it as a joke and responds cheerfully, as if the complaining tone is just a mock-complaint.

The narrative itself is more generally on the codes of relationship and how daily life is (and is supposed to be) carried out at the shelter. As women who share similar stories and who are suffering in similar conditions they are dependent on one another. They share the responsibility of keeping the shelter neat, they help each other out with the children, they share laughs and cries and as we will discuss in one of the examples in the next section, they share their belongings. In these examples, Hatice narrates all these as expected conducts. The narrative itself is in the aorist, indicating that these are characteristic features of their relationship. Hatice, by giving the codes of their relationship and by enacting how she and her roommate handle the situation in cases where the code is violated, positions herself as superior in terms of knowledge and application of the codes; because she is enacted as the one who is pointing out that the code has been violated. She is also positioned as superior in terms of labor division, since she is the one (at least at the time of the narrated event) that goes to work and earns money, whereas the roommates stay at the shelter and engage themselves in the chores.

In example (43), the zero quotative fulfills the theatrical representation function we have described. Here, Hatice adopts this strategy in order to illustrate her point that she has a very intimate relationship with her roommates and that they depend on each other for various things. The quotation does not really further the plot, but it provides an enactment of an already made point.

Moreover, zero quotative constructions function to denote the urgency in the dialogue (Mathis and Yule 1994). The quotative markers in utterances separate them from one another and cause them to be distanced from one another. With zero quotatives, this distance does not exist. Speakers in some contexts make use of this formal difference in order to achieve representational goals, where the linguistic distance between two utterances corresponds to temporal distance, and the absence of such distance conveys urgency (that the two utterances follow one another immediately). In example (43) together with the fast pace, this adjacency in the dialogue between Hatice and her roommate implies that the original talk itself was fast paced, the utterances following one another rapidly, without pauses or hesitations.

One other function of DRS with no quotatives is to present evidence for a claim made in the narrative. The following extract is from Elif's narrative about how she took care of her two baby brothers. Having lost their mother at an early age, the two boys were raised by Elif. She positioned herself as their mother. In the interview, many years later, she positions her younger self as an anxious and over-protective care taker. Example (44) below illustrates how Elif uses DRS with no quotative when telling how she protected her brother from the kisses of strangers.

(44)

- 1 Elif: Böyle ben anasıyım sanki onların. Her şeyi isterler benden. Hep ben onların  
2 hizmetini her şeyini ben yaparım.  
3 Ece: Beraber oyun falan oynuyo muydunuz? Ama yaşları küçüktü heralde  
4 seninle=  
5 Elif: Onlar iki kardeş oynardı erkek çocuk ya. Ben oynamıyodum onlarla.  
Sade  
5 işlerini yapıyodum işte. Seviyodum. İşte mesela doğdu şey Rayiz. Büyüğü.  
6 Böyle gözüne toz geçicek diye ödüm kopardı gözlerini alır göğsüme  
kapatırdım  
7 hep. Birisi öpecek diye ödüm kopardı “haayır yaklaşma öpme ço- kardeşimi.”  
8 [Böyle koru- çok korurdum]  
9 Ece: [Baya çok seviyosun.]  
10 Elif: Çok korurdum onları.

‘Elif: I was like their mother. Whatever they wanted, they asked me. I did all the care taking and everything.

Ece: Did you play games together? But they were much younger than you=

Elif: The two boys played together. I didn’t play with them. I only did their caretaking. I loved them. For example Raif was born. The older one. I would freak out thinking that dust would get in his eyes. I would keep his face in my chest. I would freak out thinking that someone would kiss him. No, stay away. Don’t kiss my brother. [I would protect him like this all the time]

Ece: You loved him so much.

Elif: I protected them all the time.’

The DRS here functions to exemplify Elif’s behavior towards the dangers her brother was exposed to in favour of her identity claim that she was protective. Here, the DRS has support function, because this type of reported speech “increases the strenght of an argument without contributing to the thematic development of the discourse” (Vincent and Perrin, 1999, p. 298). Thus, the DRS can be omitted without any change in the coherence of the utterance. This shows that, different from the event description type, zero quotatives do not function as narrative clauses which unfold the complicating action. In the example above, Elif’s enactment of her past utterance does not carry the plot further. It does not give information as to what happened next in the course of events. It merely builds on Elif’s narrative clause *Birisi öpecek diye ödüm kopardı* ‘I would freak out thinking that someone would kiss him.’ and gives voice to it. It adds theatricality to the narrative by acting out the reproduction.

Moreover, DRS with zero quotative can be thought of as “giving voice to attitude”, where the speaker is not constructing a dialogue with two or more people in it, but exemplifying the attitude he/she is expressing (Mathis and Yule 1994). This function is illustrated further and clearer in the following extract, where Elif is expressing her anger at her deceased brother in her narrative about how the other brother took possession of all his property. She is making claims that the reason her brother gave the right to all his possessions to the other brother must be that he had a lot of debts and that he received some money from him in return.

(45)

1 Elif: Manyaaak. Geri zekalı. Heralde biyerlere borçlandı bu. Beş on  
2 kuruş para aldı. Daha da alacağı vardı. O ara öldü. Vekalet vermişti ya  
3 tamam oturdu malın üstüne. Çok kızdım ama. “Lan sen benim  
sayemde  
4 mal sahibi oldun salak. Öbür tarafta da çocukların var birazcık sen  
azıcık  
5 kendine gelsene. Neye kardeşine vekalet veriyosun sen. O zaman  
6 oğlanlarına versene.” Ya ama işte para aldı heralde.

‘Elif: Maniac! Idiot! He probably had debts. He took a little money. He had more to take. Around that time he died. And he had the procuration so he got all the property. But i was so angry. *You idiot, you had property thanks to me. And you have kids too, why don't you pull yourself together? Why are you giving procuration to your brother? If you are going to do it, why don't you give it to your sons?* But then again, he probably got money (for it).’

While Elif is expressing her anger towards her brother, she switches into a conversation with him. In fact, it would be incorrect to call it a conversation with her brother, because this conversation is directed towards the brother but it is more like a monologue. This example is of quite a marginal type, because unlike other examples of DRS in which an utterance at a certain time and place in the past is reproduced in the reporting context, this constructed monologue originates at the reporting context (the time it is produced) and is directed towards a past context. It is in fact the reverse of DRS. However, it is relevant for our analysis as it shares two crucial

features with DRS: it has two deictic points and it is used in character representation. Elif is demanding her say in a past dialogue which never existed and at the same time she is positioning herself as an angry person, whose efforts have all been in vain because of the thoughtlessness of her brother. In this monologue directed to her deceased brother, Elif enacts her past anger. The angry voicing starts with the monologue itself, after she informs the audience that she was very angry. Soon as the monologue ends and Elif switches back to her narrative, the voicing changes. She calms down.

Lack of a quotative has a stylistic function of making the DRS more dramatic, which enables the reporter to enact the utterance rather than merely tell it (Mathis and Yule 1994). Zero quotatives are used as a stylistic choice in order to enhance the mimetic quality of DRS. Same argument has been made for other features of DRS such as voice quality, intonation and prosody. Although shifts in intonation and voice quality are observed in all types of DRS in general, continuous and ardent uses of it imply a tendency towards speaker choice in favor of dramatization. In the case of our data, Elif and Hatice are the two participants who make the most frequent use of intonation and voice quality in their DRS utterances in general. They also make very frequent use of DRS with zero quotatives, which reflects the consistency of these speakers in making choices in favor of more theatrical reproductions. DRS with zero quotative also gives a sense of urgency to the quotations by reducing the linguistic distance between the utterances which correlate to temporal distance. This type of DRS also gives voice to attitude (Mathis and Yule 1994), that is the point of the dialogue is not to reproduce a past utterance, but to act out the attitude behind that message.

### 5.3. Character Assertion with DRS

#### 5.3.1. Character Assertion with Multiple *de-*

What is special about the quotative verb *de-* is that unlike other main verbs in Turkish, an utterance can have multiple copies of it. When the reporter is talking directly about or working towards the relational identity of a party, he/she makes use of multiple quotative forms. What we mean by working towards the relational identity of the characters is that the usage of multiple quotatives enables the narrator to emphasize and reinforce the positions of the character in the narrative over and over again. Thus, different from the two types of DRS we have discussed above, character assertion function focuses on the reported speaker and his/her position in the narrative rather than merely reproduce a past utterance.

Multiple quotatives are mostly observed when the speakers are dealing with longer sequences of DRS, or when they are presenting both parties having a dialogue, in cases where the purpose of the narrative, (i.e. the tellable thing) is the dialogue itself. In fact, these dialogues are specifically dedicated to doing identity work, since they reveal (and at the same time construct) the position of the reported speaker vis-à-vis the other characters, including the narrator.

The presence of examples with multiple *de-s* may raise the question whether there is a cognitive motivation behind the usage of multiple quotatives. It is true that the quotative *de-*, in multiple usage, behaves like a discourse marker in organizing the information flow of the sentence. The fact that in all four and five quotative

examples there are false starts and repairs followed by quotatives supports the idea that the reporters may be making use of quotatives in order to organize their utterances. We have also noted that Tietze (1959) identifies the function of the multiple quotatives as signs in long stretches of utterances for the audience signaling that the quotation is still continuing. However, as we showed regarding the zero quotatives, the difference in the deictic points, voice quality, intonation, the exclamations or vocatives as well as the turn taking structure within the quotation fulfill this function. Hence, reporters do not need quotatives in order to set the quotation apart from the reporting context. Moreover, that quotatives may fulfill a cognitive function does not change the fact that they do occur in dialogues which are specifically dedicated to doing identity work and they contribute to this process.

The occurrence of multiple quotatives in DRS is very interesting, in that at first glance it seems to work against the idea of DRS. As we have discussed in the previous sections, what differentiates DRS from other types of reported speech is accepted to be a seemingly reduced manipulation on the part of the reporter. The reporter, supposedly without any interference, reproduces a past utterance for the consideration of the audience. Multiple quotatives, on the other hand, render a more fragmented structure, constantly broken by the verb *de-* ‘say’ bearing the TAM and agreement markers on them. The multiple copies of the quotative verb disrupt the mimetic nature of the DRS and pull it towards the diegetic zone. Although they do not cause any deictic shift they render continuous reporter interference. The repetitious usage of the speech verb *de-* ‘say’ conveys to the listener that the reporter is not demonstrating or reenacting a previous utterance, but is re-telling and/or talking about it.

Moreover, the TAM markers on the quotative verb work in a way opposite to the function of conversational historical present (CHP) which functions to “present events as if they were occurring at that moment, so that the audience can hear for itself what happened, and can interpret for itself the significance of those events for the experience” (Schiffrin 1981:59) and thus reduce the distance between the narrative and the listener (Perelman 1979). These quotative verbs, bearing the TAM and agreement markers distance the DRS from the present (i.e. narrating) discourse by constantly reminding the audience the separation between our time and the narrative time. The agreement markers on the quotative indicate the existence of the narrative characters as separate beings from the reporter, disabling the reporter to play the part of the speaker.

The character function of multiple quotatives arises from the fact that, although the mimesis function is reduced by continuous reminding of reporter interference, there is still the evidence and empathy function. The quote is presented from the speaker’s point of view, a feature that makes DRS seem more authentic, and being directly exposed to the speaker’s utterances (achieved by voice quality and prosody as well as point-of-view) makes the listener empathize more easily. Thus, the reporter using DRS with multiple quotatives provides the listener with a seemingly faithful reproduction of the speaker’s original utterance and at the same time keeps reminding him/her that the speaker as an agent with a purpose produced these words, which the reporter as an agent with a purpose reproduces. Each token reminds the listener of this function again and again underlining the relational identities in question.

In this section, we will analyze how positioning of characters in the narrative is achieved through the usage of multiple quotatives. We will also have a look at how the co-occurrence of multiple quotatives with zero quotative functions to exhibit (and construct at the same time) the asymmetry between the two narrative characters.

Reporter/narrators make use of narratives taking place both in institutional and non-institutional contexts. A number of participants in our data narrate their court experiences as very important and determining incidents within their life stories. Narratives taking place in institutional contexts are significant for doing identity work because they are special contexts in which the narrator is exposed to authority. As argued by De Fina 2003, people in narrating their encounters with authority figures, take the chance to present themselves as virtuous and righteous people. This observation holds for Selma, who in example (46) below is telling about her divorce. While telling that she has no money to cover the legal expenses, Selma embeds the conversation she had with the lawyer about payment options.

(46)

1 Selma: Hiç bi şekilde mahkemeye avukata hiç bi şekilde para veremiyceemi  
2 kağıtta belirtmiştim. “Ama” dedim “ev temizliği olur, o anda olursa cebimde  
3 veririm” dedim. “Ama olmazsa” dedim “veremem. Yalancı çıkmak  
4 istemiyorum” dedim. “Bu işe bağlı” dedim. “O anda olur, o anda olmaz”  
5 dedim. “Yani ben” dedim “mağdur bi insanım” dedim. “Ama” dedim  
6 “boşanmak istiyorum” dedim.

‘Selma: I stated in the paper that I cannot pay for the court or the lawyer at all. But I said if I go to cleaning and have money in my pocket at that moment I pay. But if I don’t I cannot pay I said. I don’t want to you think that I am a liar then. It depends on work. I may or may not have it. I mean I am a disadvantaged person, but I want to divorce.’

In (46) above, Selma’s purpose of embedding the DRS in her narrative is conveying her concern that she will be perceived as a liar if she has to break a promise later on.

The quotatives are again distributed in sentence final position as well as within the

sentence. The first quotative follows the conjunction *ama* 'but', the same sentence has a second quotative positioned at the end of the sentence. The third quotative is positioned between the conditional clause and the main clause. The fourth, fifth and sixth quotatives are at sentence final positions. In these sentences, although there is only one quotative per sentence, because the sentences are very short and there is no person change or additional information, the effect is a DRS in which only one person's speech is presented and that speech is broken into smaller units by the quotatives.

Excerpt (46) has significant positioning functions. Selma, in reporting her conversation with the lawyer, takes the opportunity to highlight certain positive characteristics she assumes to possess. In her narrative account she is trying to make it clear to the lawyer (and to the audience) that as an honest person, although she is willing to pay what is necessary, she cannot make promises that she may not be able to keep. She is in fact asserting her character as a responsible person, a woman of her word, who cares about what people think of her. At the same time she positions herself as a woman who is aware of how legal processes are carried out and that she knows that the service she receives requires payment. However, she underlines her position as a 'disadvantaged' person. Selma makes it clear that considering the circumstances, if she fails to pay, it will be the result of neither dishonesty nor ignorance.

Reporters make use of institutional narratives not only in doing identity work for themselves, but also in positioning others. Extract (47) below is from Elif's narrative of her divorce. This dialogue again takes place in an institutional context, a courtroom during trial. Here, Elif tells about how the judge warned Ece's father (i.e.

Elif's son-in-law), engaged to her mother at the time, about talking against Elif's husband, and the son-in-law defended his mother-in-law.

(47)

1 Elif: “Şahitleri dinleyince kırırverdi kalemi” dedim. “Ne biçim insan bu böyle  
2 koca tutulmaz” da dedi. Valla öyle dedi adam.  
3 Ece: Harbi?  
4 Elif: Valla öyle dedi. Şey. Fatmaanımdan sonra babanı dinledi. Babana dedi  
5 ki yalnız, “oğlum” dedi “bu kızını vermez sana” dedi. “Kaynatana sen karşı  
6 şey yapıyorsun.” “Annem zaten” dedi “kayınvalidem” dedi “bakıyo” dedi  
7 “eve” dedi. “Bunun” dedi “hiç, at yarışından kumara, kumardan at yarışına,  
8 bu evin erkeği değil ki” dedi “zaten” dedi. “Vermesin” dedi. “Vermesin”  
9 dedi. Ondan sonra filan. Ondan sonra üçüncü şahidi dinlemedi işte babandan  
10 sonra kalemi kırdı pat diye.

‘Elif: When he listened to the witnesses he just broke his pen I said. He also said what sort of a man is this, you cannot keep a husband like that. I swar the man said so.

Ece: Seriously?

Elif: I swear he said so. Well. After Fatma he listened to your father. He said to your father, son, he won't give his daughter to you. You are doing this to your father-in-law. My mother, my mother-in-law takes care of them. He is not the man of the house, all he does is gambling and horse racing. So what if he doesn't give, he said. Then he didn't listen to the third witness after your father. He broke his pen just like that.’

The dialogue between Ece's father and the judge contains 13 tokens of *de-* in total, 4 attributed to the judge and 9 to Ece's father. Notice that the first *de-* is not used with a DRS, but with *öyle* “so”, an adverbial used with *de-* as a vague referent, following sequences of DRS to provide a vague summary of the previous utterance. In the judge's quote, the first quotative *dedi ki* “said that” precedes the quote and is followed by a sentential adverb *yalnız* “but”. The following two quotatives divide the utterance into three. The first one following the vocative *oğlum* ‘my son’ and the second one the clause *bu kızını vermez sana* ‘He won't give you his daughter’.

Interestingly, the judge's quote continues after the last *dedi* and is adjacent to Ece's father's quote in lines (6), without any boundaries to separate the two. This

shows that the multiple quotatives, especially in the case of DRS with more than one party, does not serve to mark DRS boundaries or speaker changes. One speaker's speech is separated from the other's by the slight pause at the end, the turn taking structure and the indexicals in the clauses, the pronouns, person markers and the possessives help the listener interpret which utterance belongs to whom. The quotative referring to Ece's father's utterance comes only after the subject and the adverbial of his quotation. The quotatives split his reported turn into nine sections. The subject and the adverbial, the subject repeated (and/or repaired)<sup>14</sup>, the verb phrase, the oblique object. In the second sentence the subject, the prepositional clauses and the IP, adverbial clause. The third and fourth sentences are both one word IPs, separated from each other by the quotative.

In this example the usage of multiple quotatives fit the character assertion function, because both the judge and Ece's father are important as characters for Elif's narrative, as they show how an authority figure and a close relative react to her plight. More important than that, by reporting the talk between the judge and Ece's father about the negative character of Elif's husband (that he is irresponsible, he never takes care of his family, he is into gambling and horse racing, he is easily agitated, etc) and the positive qualities of Elif herself (she is the only provider of her family, she is a sufferer, etc) Elif conveys her own point of view and her way of positioning herself and her husband in a seemingly objective manner. Since none of these are her own utterances, she is merely reporting a past conversation, which has

---

<sup>14</sup> The repair here is ambiguous, as it is not clear whether it is the reported speaker or the reporter who initiates it. It can either be the son-in-law repairing the address form he used to refer to Elif, first saying 'my mother' and then correcting himself and saying 'my mother-in-law' or it can be Elif's repair on the part of how she is reporting her son-in-law's utterance.

taken place during the trial. Hence, the context boosts the objectivity and impartiality.

Relational identity work is also significant in familial contexts. In our data there are numerous examples of participants engaging themselves in narratives about their relationships with their families and relatives. In these narratives, reported speech gives voice to the characters and enables the narrator to depict the characters' interactions and dialogues, which is essential for positioning them vis-à-vis each other. In extract (48) below, Hatice is talking about her relationship with her children, focusing on how helpful and thoughtful they are, embedding a small narrative about a conversation between her and her son as an illustration of her point:

(48)

- 1 Hatice: Hatalarını, şeylerini yaptığı her şeyi bana anlatırlar ve benim
- 2 her söylediğim söze güvenirler, yardımcılar yani, .çok büyük
- 3 destekler.Büyük oğlum hatta para biriktirmiş, “annecim” dedi,
- 4 okuldan verdikleri harçlıkları biriktirmiş, “bu parayı” dedi, “al
- 5 istersen” dedi, “ev tutarken” dedi “sana biraz yardımcı olur” dedi.
- 6 Interviewer: Gerçekten mi?
- 7 Hatice: “Hayır oğlum” dedim. “Ben” dedim “alıcım, evimizi tutucam,
- 8 o zaman sen bana babalık yapıcaksın. Kardeşlerinin babası
- 9 olucaksın.”
- 10 Interviewer: O kaç yaşında şimdi?
- 11 Hatice: On iki yaşına girdi.

‘They tell me all their mistakes, everything that they do. And they trust every word I say. They are very helpful I mean, They are a great support. My older son even saved the money they give him at the school. He said mommy, take this money, it may help you a little when you rent a new apartment. I said no my son. I said I will rent our apartment, then you will be the man of the house, you will be the father of your siblings.

Interviewer: How old is he now?

Hatice: He just turned twelve.’

Her point of telling this dialogue is to illustrate specific traits of her and her son's character: his being considerate and supportive of her and her being encouraging yet strong and protective. She is talking about the character of her son in the context of

their relational identities, making use of multiple quotatives in DRS for this function. The quotatives divide the son's quote into five. The distribution of the quotatives is also interesting. The first quotative follows the vocative *annecim* 'mommy', which is pushed even further from the rest of the reported speech by the clause she inserts to elaborate on the context (that he saved the money they gave him at school). The second quotative follows the direct object *bu parayı* 'this money'. The fourth one follows the conditional clause *istersen* 'if you want', which comes after the main verb *al* 'take' of the previous clause. The second sentence has two quotative verbs, the first occurring after the adjunct clause and the second at the sentence final position. In her turn, Hatice uses two quotatives, one following the vocative and the other the subject.

The narrative in which the reported dialogue is embedded follows Hatice's generalization about her children's character traits and the tone of their relationship and ends with an implied comment on her own character, which she does not state explicitly but the audience is called to infer from her part in the dialogue. Just as her children are supportive and giving to her, she is supportive, strong and giving towards them. She takes pride in expressing that her children are ready to help, however she also makes it clear that she is not the kind of mother who will put such a burden on her children. As such, she is positioning herself as a mother who possesses certain essential characteristics of a mother. Thus, although the directly reported dialogue seems to provide the retelling of a conversation that has taken place between the two, she –from the very beginning- draws the frame within which she intends the dialogue be interpreted.

DRS with multiple quotatives, which is related to character assertion, also includes DRS which are related to character based relational identities with friends and acquaintances. In (49) below, Hatice tells an anecdote to illustrate her relationship with one of her roommates.

(49)

1 Hatice: Ya birbirimize öyle bi bağılıyız ki anlatılır gibi değil. Yani bi  
2 öz kardeş bi abla kardeş böyle geçim edemez. Kavga ederiz bi odanın  
3 içinde, barışıırız bi odanın içinde. Ya mesela gelir benim dolabımı  
4 açar,almış yeni aldığım pantolonumu t-shirtümü giymiş çıkmış dışarı.  
5 Bağırıyorum “ya diyorum niye giyiyosun kardeşim.” “Napiym” diyo  
6 “ya” diyo “hoşuma gitti ver de bi kere de giyim”. “Kızım” diyorum  
7 “ben ona para saydım.” “ Ya” diyo “ablam değil misin” diyo  
8 “vereceksin tabi” diyo. Ya e bişey söyle söyleyemezsin böyle biz  
9 birbirimiz için doğmuşuz.

‘Hatice: Like for example she opens my door, took and wore the new pants and t-shirt I just bought and went out. I scream, I say why are you wearing them? So what she says, I liked them, let me wear them for just once. Girl, I say, I paid money for that. Well she says, aren’t you my big sister, you will give it to me.’

While narrating her life in the shelter, Hatice provides the narrative above, whose point is to illustrate that something which would be perceived as an intrusion into her personal space, i.e. her roommate’s wearing her clothes without asking for permission, is rather a pleasant part of their daily routine. It is in fact part of the friendship codes we have discussed above. The example was given within a larger narrative in which Hatice was telling about her current life in general. The fact that this particular narrative starts with the aorist, shifts briefly to the perfective *-miş* and continues in the imperfective *-iyor*, functions as the CHP shifts, marking the complicating part of the narrative as more lively and scenic (Schiffrin 1981).

The speaker’s attitude towards her experience, although her language and voice quality in the DRS seems to indicate that she is/was upset, is positive. This, we

can understand from the context. Before giving her narrative account of how her roommate wore her clothes without asking for permission, Hatice again frames the narrative leading the audience towards the interpretation she aims by explicitly stating that they get along so well that even siblings cannot achieve such a relationship and even the fights reflect the intimate and loving nature of it. Following the opening, she continues with her narrative as an example of her point, starting with *ya mesela* 'see, for instance'. As a senior resident of the shelter, Hatice feels very much at home. She positions herself as some kind of true and permanent resident. Moreover, the fact that she works and has the money to buy clothes entitles her to act as an *abla* 'older sister' towards her roommates. According to Hatice's account, the other residents, in return, accept this asymmetry. They refer to her as their *abla*. As such, the residents act according to their positions. While the younger ones act demanding and spoiled with expectations of being treated with tolerance and understanding, Hatice does not hesitate to yell at them and boss them around. Hatice notes that all this is normal behavior within the context of sisterhood at the shelter, as required by the code. That is she positions both the roommates' claim to the right to wear her clothes and her authoritative attitude as acceptable.

We have seen how narrators use reported speech in order to position characters within their narratives. This positioning is done according to the narrators' point-of-view and casts the characters in different lights as their relational identities to the narrator require. In the following example in (50), which is from Selma's narrative of her telling how her husband's family was a bad influence for their marriage, Selma uses her mother-in-law's voice to show how she continuously compared herself with Selma, telling her son that a mother is always more precious than a wife.

(50)

1 Selma: Bilmiyorum o daha tatlı oluyomuş, hani eşimin daha doğrusu devamlı  
2 eşimin kafasına girerdi kayınvalidem. “Oğlum” derdi “karı daha mı tatlı  
3 geliyo” derdi. Şimdi onlarda biraz kaba konuşma var ya. “Karı” derdi “daha  
4 mı tatlı geliyo” derdi. “Ama” derdi “anayı bulamazsın” derdi ona. “Aklına  
5 sok” derdi yani. Ondan sonra o da onun aklınca bana derdi ki “ben karıyı her  
6 yerde bulurum anayı bulamam.” “Valla” dedim ben de artık onların diline  
7 uymaya başladım. Çünkü çok zoruma gidiyo. “Ona bakarsan benim nerem  
8 eksik? Ben de kocayı bulurum da” dedim “anayı bulamam” dedim. “Ben”  
9 dedim “senden daha iyisini bulurum” dedim.

‘I don’t know, she is supposed to be sweeter, I mean my mother-in-law used to brain-wash my husband. She would say my son is your wife sweeter for you? Now, you know they talk rudely. Is wife sweeter for you she woul say. But she said to him you cannot find mother. Put this in your head. Then he would say to me I can find a wife everywhere but I cannot find a mother. I swear I said, because I started talking like them, because it makes me upset. Nothing is wrong with me. I said I too can find a husband but not a mother. I said I find a better husband than you.’

This excerpt is actually from Selma’s narrative of her relationship with her brothers.

Selma has very loose ties with her family. She does not visit her mother regularly and she has no contact with her brothers. Throughout her story, she works to render her loss of contact well justified. One argument she posits is that the brothers abandoned their responsibilities for the family once they got married. While narrating this story, she uses a saying she has heard from her mother-in-law and she immediately switches to an embedded narrative of how her mother-in-law continuously referred to that saying. Although on the surface the function of the narrative is to elaborate on the saying *karı daha tatlı oluyo* ‘wife is sweeter’, the true function is to tell about the characters of and the relations among her mother-in-law, her husband and herself. During the whole interview, she has been telling how her husband’s family was the only problem in their marriage. Here we see how Selma represents the mother as effecting her son and turning him against his wife. Thus, in this narrative which Selma embeds in her life story, she positions her mother-in-law as a demanding and selfish person who does not want to give up on her control over

her son. The husband in turn is positioned as a meek mother's boy who lives under his mother's influence. When it comes to Selma, she positions herself as a relationally positive character who has put up with all the maltreatment and indifference from her husband and his family, even justifying her 'bad language' holding them responsible.

The significant point in the context of multiple *de-* is character assertion. As long as this context is provided, it is possible to observe multiple quotative in DRS which does not directly reproduce past spoken conversations. What is significant is that the DRS generally constitutes the narrative itself and aims to position the person who is being reported by conveying his/her attitude. This could as well be a book summary, as in (51) below, in which the speaker tells about a specific writer's attitude towards culture and working class.

(51)

- 1 Aslı: =içimden bi ses öyle söylüyo. ya işte bu sabah okuyodum da bişeyler. ııı  
2 (3) adamın biri, yani kadının biri daha doğrusu çıkmış bu işte ellilerde falan?  
3 amerikada şeyi (.) araştırıyorlar, ya bu popüler kültürü falan yine işte,  
4 araştırıyorlar? kadın şey diyo, ya diyo eskiden diyo (4) işte aristokrat(.)lar  
5 vardı diyo tamam mı? ve diyo onların diyo zevkleri, onlar belirlerdi diyo yani  
6 şeyin noolucanı diyo. ee deer [verilicek] şeyin  
7 Ali: [hm-hm]  
8 Aslı: ne noolucanı diyo tamam mı. onlardan süzülen bitakım şeyler de alt (.)  
9 katmanlara inerdi diyo. onlar da bi şekilde diyo, bunu-bunu diyo, şey yapardı  
10 diyo. ııı uygulardı diyo hayatlarındaydı yani o tür öeler. fakat şimdi diyo, bi  
11 işçi sınıfı çıktı di(h)yo tam(h)am mı. bunlar diyo özgürlüklerine hihih  
12 özgürlük demiyim? bunlar artık ukalalaştı falan?=  
13 İdil: =ihhıh=  
14 Aslı: =ve bunlar artık kendi kendilerine belirliyorlar bişeleri ve işte çok fazla  
15 oldukları için yani her zaman o (.) elit kesim daha minör oldu-minörite  
16 oldu için=  
17 İdil: =hı hı=  
18 Aslı: artık diyo bunlar diyo belirliyo falan diyo. hiçbir şekilde diyo saymıyorlar  
19 o eliti diyo yani. tanımıyorlar diyo yani. ha? amaaan diyo yani. kültürü şey  
20 olarak tanımlıyo, (2)  
21 Ali: herkezin [sahip olamicaa]  
22 Aslı: şimdiye [kadar düşünülmüş] en iyi şeyler, bulunmuş en iyi şeyler. ve

23 bundan sonra üzerinde devam edecek o alt yapı falan gibi. anlatabiliyo  
24 muyum? ve, işçi sınıfının ve (2) bu orta sınıfın dourduu şeyi, orta sınıf işte  
25 biraz uraşırsa elit olabilecek(.)ler olarak görülüyö? ondan sonra, bunların  
26 diyo (4) ↓ne diyodum ben ya? ne diyodum ben? (2.5) cümlemi unuttum.=  
27 İdil: =işçi sınıfı çok terbiyesiz.  
28 Ali: [hahaha]  
29 Aslı: [ha] bunların diyo, oluşturduğu bu popüler kültür bu anarşizm diyo.  
30 İdil: (.) hı hı  
31 Aslı: ondan sonra, bunların diyo, işte eitimden şey eğitemezsin falan dedin  
32 ya, bunların eitilmesi lazım, bunlara o formasyonun verilmesi lazım diyo.=  
33 İdil: =ıfıfıf=  
34 Aslı: bunların diyo, herzamanki gibi diyo hani klas, sınıf bilinci olucak diyo.  
35 bunlar diyo, referanslarını diyo, yüksek sınıftan alıcaklar diyo. ve bunlar [( )  
36 diyo]  
37 İdil : [hihihi]  
38 Ali: ( )  
39 Aslı: yoksa anarşi olur diyo. ( )  
40 İdil: ( )  
41 Aslı:  
42 İdil: çok sinirlenmiş ya yazık. ne kadar rahatsız olmuş..=

‘Aslı: =something tells me so. So I was reading something this morning. Uhhh (3)  
a certain man, a certain woman actually, came up in the fifties when they were  
researching about pop culture and stuff in America, she came up and said in the old  
times there were aristocrats, right? And their taste, they decided on what to value.  
And certain things come down to the lower classes from them. And they in a way  
applied these things. These elements were in their lives. But now, there is this  
working class, right? And these, their freedom, hahaha I shouldn’t be saying  
freedom, these know alls?=  
İdil: =Hahaha=  
Aslı: =and they determine certain things by themselves and because they are many  
and the elite is always a minority, they do the determining and they don’t respect the  
elite at all. They don’t recognize, I mean. Pffffff she says. She defines culture as  
what do you call (2),  
Ali: What everyone [cannot have]  
Aslı: best of [what has been thought] and discovered until now. And what will  
become the base for the continuation of it. Am I making it clear? And what the  
working class and (2) and this middle class fills, she sees middle class as those who  
can be the elite if they give a little effort, so these she says (4) what was I saying?  
What was I saying? (2.5) I forgot my sentence.=  
İdil: Working class has no manners.  
Ali: [hahaha]  
Aslı: [ha] the culture these bring about is this anarchy she says.  
İdil: (.) hm-hm.  
Aslı: So she says these, you said you cannot educate and stuff, must be educated,  
they need to be given the training.  
İdil: =hahaha=  
Aslı: These will have the class awareness like they always did she says. These will  
take their references from the upper class she says. And these [she says]  
İdil: [hahaha]

Ali: XXX.  
Aslı: She says otherwise there will be anarchy.  
Idil: XXX.  
Aslı: XXX.  
Idil: She got so mad, poor thing. How annoyed she is.’

In this excerpt Aslı is telling about a book she has read. Although the starting point of the discussion was to illustrate the previous argument about the reception of art and education, it quickly turns into giving the account of the book’s content. The usage of multiple quotatives make the representation of the personal attitude of the writer towards art, culture, education and society the main aim of this narrative. Aslı positions the writer as an aggressive person who has no tolerance for the lower classes overriding the elite. Notice that there are a couple of laugh particles and giggles throughout the reporting of the book, and in places where Aslı feels like the writer is being over-aggressive she adopts a staccato rhythm, breaking the sentences into small segments with the quotatives, up to five *de*-s per sentence, as if the more assertive the reported speaker gets the more character assertion the reporter applies. The fact that the final reaction of one of the parties (*çok sinirlenmiş ya yazık. ne kadar rahatsız olmuş* ‘She got so mad, poor thing. How annoyed she is’) is directed towards the writer’s attitude rather than the ideas she is putting forth proves that this DRS functions to do identity work for the writer and is received as such.

As the various examples in this section illustrate, in DRS where the reporter aims to elaborate on the character/identity issues of the speakers, we observe multiple quotatives. This usage in Turkish is only limited to the speech verb *de-*, no other quotative element has multiple copies in the sentence. *de-* fragments the quotations and weakens the theatrical nature of DRS, where the speaker as the author of the utterance becomes the most significant element in the DRS.

### 5.3.2 Multiple Quotative and Zero Quotative Co-occurrence

To further support our claim that different quotative strategies (i.e. zero, single, multiple quotative) are not random but serve different relational identity purposes, we should consider the cases in which different usages are juxtaposed with each other in a consistent way. In some cases, narrators systematically use multiple quotatives for one character and zero quotative for the other character. The asymmetry in the choice of FRS reflects the asymmetry the narrator works towards in terms of positioning the characters.

Recall that in the previous section we discussed how using multiple quotatives function to assert and highlight the existence and position of the characters producing the original utterances. These cases support our argument that the usage of different types of DRS correlates to different functions of positioning. Speakers are well aware of these differences and they make conscious choices. In the following extract Elif reports a telephone conversation with her nephew and Elif's sister-in-law.

(52)

1 Elif: Ondan sonra bana telefon etti, oğlu askerden gelmiş. “Hala: (.) senlen  
2 annem de konuşmak istiyö. Sana gelmek istiyoruz.” Aldı telefonu, “abla:  
3 nasılsın iyi misin?” “İyiyim” dedim. Ondan-, “gelmek istiyoruz da acaba  
4 kabul eder misin” ((pathetic voicing)). “Ben” dedim kimseyi kapıdan  
5 kovmadım şimdiye kadar” dedim. “Çingeneyi bile kovmadım” dedim. “Ama”  
6 dedim “kendini bilmeyen insan, yaptıklarını unutan” dedim “çingene gibi  
7 gelir” dedim.

Elif: Then she called me. Her son came back from the army. Auntie, mom wants to talk to you too. We would like to come and visit you. She took the phone, sister how are you, are you fine? I said I am fine. Then, we would like to come, would you welcome us? I said I never shooed anyone from my door. I didn't even shoo away a gypsy, I said. But, I said, the one who doesn't know himself, the one who forgets what he's done comes like a gypsy.

In this narrative of the telephone conversation she had with her nephew and his mother, Elif tells about how she receives her relatives' offer to visit her. Due to various past issues, her relationship with them is very tense and cold. This antagonistic relationship between them is reflected in the dialogues. The DRS of the nephew is preceded by a frame where Elif informs the audience that her relatives called her, preparing her for the coming DRS. The DRS itself is not preceded by a quotative phrase, but it starts with a vocative *hala* "aunt", thus the listener knows that the utterance is directed to her rather than produced by her.

Her voice quality and intonation also changes with the quotation. The nephew's words are uttered with a slower rhythm, higher pitch and lower volume. Same observation holds for his mother's utterance. Both convey a sense of submission and respect, as if the quoted party knows that Elif is rightfully upset with them. Notice that both DRS constructions belonging to the nephew (*hala*: 'aunt') and his mother (*abla*: 'big sister') begin with a vocative whose last syllable is lengthened, a strategy used to arise affection and sympathy when pleading. In contrast, reports of Elif's own utterances are always in a confident, lower pitched tone with a faster, staccato rhythm.

Moreover, there is the usage of multiple quotatives, which constantly mark Elif as the author of her utterances. In this example, Elif contrasts her position with those of her nephew and his mother not only by intonation and voice quality but also by the systematic asymmetry between DRS with no quotatives used in reporting the antagonists and DRS with multiple quotatives used in reporting Elif. The asymmetry functions as an evaluation in which Elif conveys her attitude towards the quotes and their original speakers. While she marks herself as confident and wise, she

linguistically manifests her contemptuous point of view towards the other parties by merely giving their quotes without reference to their selves, which the listener identifies through the intonational differences and the turn taking structure. Her intonation in reporting their utterances presents the other parties as pathetic as well as insignificant.

The previous extract illustrated how the reporter/narrator presents her evaluation of the narrative characters through the usage of DRS with no quotative. Dialogue (53) below illustrates how the same narrator (i.e. Elif) marks the change in her evaluation of a character by switching from a no quotative DRS to multiple quotative DRS. This is another piece of evidence for the psychological reality of these reporting strategies. In this dialogue Elif narrates her first encounter with her mother. Her mother was driven away from her home and family and Elif, being very young at the time, did not have any memory of her. Thus in the dialogue below, Elif emphasizes her surprise and negative attitude towards the stranger whom she would very soon find out to be her own mother.

(53)

- 1 Elif: Onla- oyun oynuyoruz, beraber, hemen bi kadın- bi kadın bana geldi bi
- 2 sarıldı? Dedim “bu ne (.) kimsin” dedim.
- 3 “Ben senin annenin yavrum.”
- 4 “Allah allah” dedim. “Nerden çıktın sen” dedim “ya.”
- 4 Ece: Ay inanmaz ki insan.
- 5 Elif: Hee. Hemen bana ciklet verdi:, şeker verdi:. “Kızım” dedi “işte böyle
- 6 böyle, büyüyünce anlarsın” dedi “bilmemne” dedi.
- 7 Sonra (.) yanımdaki arkadaşlar da “bu annen biliyo musun” dediler.
- 8 “Babannen öbürü” dediler.

‘Elif: We are playin together, right then a woman came to me and hugged me. I said what is this? Who are you? I am your mother my child. For heaven’s sake, I said. How did you get here?’

Ece: Yeah, who would believe.

Elif: Right. Right then she gave me bubble-gum and candy. She said my daughter this is what happened, you understand when you grow up, this and that. Then my friends said you know this is your mother. The other one is your grandmother.’

In the dialogue above, Elif narrates her first encounter with her mother. While playing with her friends, the mother comes and Elif, not having seen (or remembering to have seen) her, is surprised and annoyed. After setting the scene, presenting the characters and mentioning the complicating action (that the strange woman gave her a hug), Elif switches to DRS to present the peak of her narrative, which is common in narratives and is thought to be a consequence of its theatrical nature (Li 1986). Notice that in her reported dialogue with her mother, Elif uses multiple quotatives for herself and no quotatives for her mother, the functions of which we have discussed for the previous extract. The intonation and voice quality also cast the two characters in different lights. Parallel to extract (52), Elif enacts her dialogue with a low pitch and fast pace in a strong, slightly annoyed tomboy tone, as opposed to the vulnerable, pathetic tone of her mother, who is speaking slowly in a soft, whisper-like voice. The wording is also very strong in Elif's utterances, directly confronting the mother, using impolite expressions such as *Allah Allah* (an expression used for expressing unpleasant surprise, can be translated as "For heaven's sake!") and *ya* (a discourse marker expressing annoyance at an unexpected interference that disrupts the desired course of events).

The interesting point of this dialogue is that once the mother gives Elif the candies, and gains her attention and acknowledgment as a character in the narrative, her utterances gain quotatives. In a way, the mother is transformed from a tennis ball thrower which gives Elif the cues to react upon to a full character/participant in the dialogue. That is, the juxtaposition of Elif's multiple quotatives and the mother's zero quotative shows that before being acknowledged as a character, the mother only speaks (i.e. is reported to have spoken) to give Elif the grounds to reply as she does. The transition from zero quotative to multiple quotative corresponds to a transition to

being an acknowledged character for the mother. Notice, however, that this time the DRS of the mother is in the form of “vague referents” (Tannen 1989), we understand that she has talked to Elif, most probably about the things she has gone through, but Elif chooses to omit all the propositional content of the original utterance. She just conveys the unhappy, miserable tone of her mother via her intonation.

#### 5.4. Conclusion

In this chapter we discussed how DRS is employed in narratives. We have defined two functions: event description and character assertion. In event description type, we observed single quotative DRS and zero quotative DRS functioning as narrative clauses and evaluations. We emphasized the theatrical nature of zero quotative DRS which was adopted as a stylistic choice, where the point is not the positioning of the narrative characters vis-à-vis one another, but the positioning of the narrator vis-à-vis the audience through the reported dialogue. In character assertion type we discussed DRS with multiple quotatives, that is with multiple *de-*. In this type, the aim of the narrator is to position the characters vis-a-vis one another, through the repetitive use of the quotative *de-* which constantly reinforces the existence of the narrative characters' voices as separate from one another and from the narrators

## CHAPTER SIX

### CONCLUSION

While the discourse functions of reported speech has been of interest to many scholars working on different languages, so far there has been no study devoted to this kind of analysis with Turkish conversational data. The aim of this thesis was to describe strategies that speakers employ in order to report speech directly and the contribution of the most frequent DRS strategy (that with the speech verb *de-*) to positioning and identity construction within the context of personal narratives.

In the first chapter, we outlined the general research field and the problem that was of interest to us. Starting off with Bakhtin's notion of polyphonic discourse, and Vološinov's analysis on the functions of reported speech, we applied it to conversational narratives and saw how one's speech constantly bears the speeches of the others. That is, much of what we say is what other people have previously said. This reporting did not take place without a reason or consequence, but the narrators gave voice to the characters in their narratives in line with a general attempt. The question we worked our analysis around in the following chapters was how narrators make use of different reporting strategies in positioning themselves, their audience and the speakers they report in order to construct a network of relational identities.

Chapter two presented an overview of reported speech and identity within narrative studies. We defined narratives as tools that organize personal experiences in such a way as to make them meaningful. This entails that narrators do not merely present a fixed course of events or set of characters, but they construct these as they go. Thus the organizational function of narratives fits nicely with the views of

identity which take it as a process rather than a finished product. Obviously, narrators make use of numerous linguistic strategies as they are working with the accounts of their past experiences in order to construct relational identities for the characters. The use of reported speech is one of the most important linguistic strategies devoted to the mentioned purpose, since it seemingly allows the characters to speak for themselves. Although it is traditionally analyzed as an evaluative tool, DRS is not limited to the evaluation. It can also be used in narrating events, as narrative clauses or as whole narratives. In fact, the narratives we have analyzed under the multiple quotative type were reproductions of past dialogues, where the narrative itself was that of a past conversation.

Chapter three gave a general overview of the type of our data and characteristics of the participants. We also discussed the main questions we had to deal with regarding the analysis of our data. The type of data used in research on narrative and identity as well as reported speech has significant consequences. Although much of the work has been done with data from formal interviews, it is claimed that the structure of a formal interview is different than that of a natural conversation, the interview not reflecting the dynamics of everyday conversational narratives. There are also concerns whether certain linguistic strategies are specific to a certain age/gender/social group or not. Hence, we aimed to use a more heterogeneous data in which the participants varied in age (20s-70s), gender (male-female), education (elementary school dropout-university graduate), social background (upper middle class-homeless) as well as the speech situation (peer conversation, formal interview, family interview bordering on natural conversation) and register (formal-informal). Although we did not have equal number of participants in each group, we did not observe the features mentioned above to cause

differences in the usage of reported speech. For instance, we only had one male participant. However, we did not observe any difference caused by the gender difference, we find such a differentiation irrelevant. Further research may focus on whether any one (or more) of the features are significant for group specific usages or forms with more data.

Chapter four gave a description of DRS strategies in Turkish. We parsed the utterances with RS into separate sentences and categorized them according to the quotative marker used. Then we gave an account of the distribution of the quotative *de-* in our data, as the most frequent RS strategy. We identified each token at the sentential level and made an inventory with the number and position of the tokens. The sentential distribution of *de-* raised questions regarding the verb/discourse marker categories as well as levels of representation, which are beyond the scope of this thesis. However, these issues constitute very interesting questions for further research. We found that, sentences with more than one quotative verb and sentences with no quotatives systematically occur and need to be accounted for. In this chapter we identified our domain of analysis as the reported utterance rather than the reported sentence for the quotative *de-*, based on its distribution and function together with its argument structure. The definition of domain provided the basis for the functional analysis of DRS with *de-* in the following chapter.

In chapter five we focused on the function of *de-* within the narrative context and accounted for the difference of single and multiple quotative types. Organizing experiences into meaningful stories includes organizing and presenting the characters in those experiences. Narrators handle this process through positioning. They represent the characters as relevant to the function of their narrative, since the actions and utterances of these characters provide the grounds or justifications for the other

characters' actions or utterances. Traditional analyses discuss DRS with de- with reference to only single quotative type. We discussed three different types of DRS: DRS with single de-, DRS with multiple de- and DRS with zero quotative. All three types are related to positioning, since they are all used in presenting characters' voices and points of views. However, they also have differing functions. DRS with single quotative functions similar to the DRS constructions that have been studied in the literature. DRS with multiple quotatives are used in complete narrations of conversations/dialogues/monologues. As such they do pure character presentation. The character assertion function stems from the fact that the continuous usage of the quotative with the agreement markers keeps pointing to the existence of the speaker as a separate being from the reporter. DRS with zero quotative is again studied in the literature and functions to enhance the mimetic quality of the quotation.

Reported Speech constitutes a significant proportion of the narratives in our data. Narratives are used as meaning making devices for the experiences and the case with most experiences is that agents (or experiences) are not isolated from the other people around them. While they are giving more acceptable and desirable shapes to their experiences, the narrators do the same for the characters in those experiences, not only to themselves but also to the others around them. Thus, organizing experiences also require organizing characters, making positioning a significant feature of narratives. Especially in the case of the life stories in our data, marked by traumatic incidents and dramatic decisions, positioning characters is very significant for the interviewees in order to rationalize experiences, justify courses of action and thus achieve continuity of self. By constantly reporting past utterances of themselves and others, they seek a settlement between past and present selves of themselves and of those around them.

## REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. "Discourse in the novel". In Bakhtin, Mixail M. (ed. and translated by Emerson, Caryl and Michael Holquist), *The dialogic imagination* (=University of Texas Slavic Series 1). Austin: University of Texas Press, 259–422.
- Banfield, A. (1973). "Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech". *Foundations of Language* 10:f1–39.
- Bauman, R. (1986) *Story, Performance, and Event: Contextual Studies of Oral Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baynham, M. (1996). "Direct speech: what's it doing in non-narrative discourse". *Journal of Pragmatics* 25,1:f61–81.
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (2001). Self-making and world-making. In J. Brockmeier and D. Carbaugh (eds.) *Narrative and Identity: studies in autobiography, self and culture*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp 25-37.
- Bucholtz, M., A. C. Liang and L. Sutton (eds.) (1999). *Reinventing identities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversions of identity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Buttny, R. (1998). "Putting Prior Talk into Context: Reported Speech and the Reporting Context." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 31(1): 45-58.
- Carranza, I. (1998). Low narrativity narratives and argumentation. *Narrative Inquiry*, 8(2): 287-317.
- Chafe, W. L. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1977). "On *Wh*-Movement". In Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, eds., *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 71-132.
- Clark, H. H. and R. J. Gerrig. (1990). "Quotations as demonstrations". *Language* 66,4:f764–805.
- Coulmas, F. (1985). "Direct and indirect speech: general problems and problems of Japanese". *Journal of Pragmatics* 9:f41–63.

- Couper-Kuhlen, E. (1998). *Coherent voicing: on prosody in conversational reported speech* (=Interaction and Linguistic Structures 1). Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft.
- De Fina, A. (2003). *Identity in narrative: A study of immigrant discourse*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Erguvanli, E. (1984) *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fischer, K. (ed.). (2006). *Approaches to Discourse Particles*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2006). Small and large identities in narrative (inter)-action. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin, & M. Bamberg (Eds.), *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Glock, N. (1986). “The use of reported speech in Saramaccan discourse”. In Huttar and Gregerson (eds.), 35–61.
- Goffman, E. (1974/1986). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. York, Pennsylvania: Northeastern University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Göksel, A. and C. Kerslake (2005). *Turkish: a comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Güldemann, Tom. (2008). *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Günthner, S. (1997). “The contextualization of affect in reported dialogues”. In Niemeier, Susanne and René Dirven (eds.), *The language of emotions: conceptualization, expression, and theoretical foundations*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 247–76.
- Günthner, S. (1998). “Polyphony and the ‘layering of voices’ in reported dialogues: an analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech”. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31: f685–708.
- Günthner, S. (2000). “Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede: Formen der Redewiedergabe in Alltagsgesprächen”. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 28,1: f1–22.
- Hansen, M. (1998). “The semantic status of discourse markers”. *Lingua* 104:235-260.
- Hickerson, K. (2006). *Everyday (re)enactment: reporting strategies in everyday talk-in-Interaction*. PhD Dissertation. University of Texas at Austin.

- Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: toward an understanding of voice*. London: Taylor Francis.
- Keizer, E. (2009). The interpersonal level in English: reported speech *Linguistics*, 47, 845-866.
- Kerby, A. (1991). *Narrative and the self*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Klewitz, G. and E. Couper-Kuhlen (1999). "Quote-Unquote: the role of prosody in the contextualization of reported speech sequences. *Pragmatics*, 9: 459-485.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. And J. Waletzky (1967). Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (ed.) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*, pp. 12-44. Washington: University of Washington press.
- Larson, M. L.(1978). *The functions of reported speech in discourse* (=Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields 59). Dallas / Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas.
- Leech, G. N. and M. H. Short (1981). *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. New York: Longman.
- Lehrer, A. (1989). "Remembering and representing prose: quoted speech as a data source". *Discourse Processes* 12:f105–25.
- Li, C. N. (1986). "Direct and indirect speech: a functional study". In Coulmas (ed.) *Direct and Indirect Speech*, pp29–45. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Linde, C. (1993). *Life stories: the creation of coherence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Macaulay, R.K.S. (1987). "Polyphonic monologues: quoted direct speech in oral narratives". *International Pragmatics Association, Papers in Pragmatics* 1,2:f1–34.
- Mathis, T. and G. Yule. (1994). "Zero quotatives". *Discourse Processes* 18,1:f63–76.
- Mayes, P. (1990). "Quotation in spoken English". *Studies in Language* 14,2:f325–63.
- McHale, B. (1978). "Free indirect discourse: a survey of recent accounts". *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3:f249–87.
- Miguel, O. and Doris C. (2004): "Prosody as marker of direct reported speech boundary", In *SP-2004*, 263-266.

- Ochs, E. and L. Capps (1996). Narrating the Self. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 25, 19-43.
- Ochs, E., and L. Capps (2001). *Living narrative: Creating lives in everyday storytelling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.'
- Oshima, D. Y. (2006). *Perspectives on reported discourse*. PhD Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Özge, U. and Bozşahin, C. (2010). Intonation in the grammar of Turkish. *Lingua*, 120:132-175.
- Perelman, C. (1979). *Logik und Argumentation*. Königstein, Ts.: Athenäum.
- Philips, Susan U. (1986). "Reported speech as evidence in an American trial". In Tannen and Alatis (eds.), 154–70.
- Ricoeur, P. (1980). Narrative time. *Critical Inquiry*, 7(1):169-190.
- Ronkin, M. (2001). *Represented Speech, Positioning, and identity in a Pakistani family-centered narrative*. Unpublished paper, Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Washington, DC: December.
- Roncador, M. (1988). 'Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede: nichtwörtliche direkte Rede, erlebte Rede, logophorische Konstruktionen und Verwandtes' *Linguistische Arbeiten* 192. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rouchota, V. (1998) 'Procedural Meaning and Parenthetical Discourse Markers', in A. Jucker and Y. Ziv (eds) *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, pp. 97–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society*, 8(2): 165-187.
- Schiffrin, D. (1981). "Tense Variations in Narration." *Language* 57.45-62.
- Sternberg, M. (1982). "Proteus in quotation-land: mimesis and the forms of reported discourse". *Poetics Today* 3,2:f107–56.
- Tannen, D. (1986). "Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative". In Coulmas (ed.), 311–32.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse* (=Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 6). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 98–133.
- Tietze, A. (1959). "Die Eingliederung der wörtlichen Rede im Türkischen". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 55:f89–121.

- Toolan, M. (2001). *Narrative: a critical linguistic introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Vincent, D. And L. Perrin (1999). On the narrative vs non-narrative functions of reported speech: a socio-pragmatic study. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3: 291-313.
- Vološinov, V. N. (1986). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1974). “The semantics of direct and indirect discourse”. *Papers in Linguistics* 7,3:f267–307.
- Wiesemann, U. (1990). “Researching quote styles”. *Notes on Linguistics* 51:f31–5.
- Wooffitt, R. (1992). *Telling Tales of the Unexpected: the Organisation of Factual Discourse*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action, a strategy for research and analysis*. New York: Teacher’s College Press.