Referential Senses and Anaphoric Relations in Turkish and English Written Texts (*)

Ahmet Serkan TANRIÖVER (**)

Abstract: *This study has explored the use of anaphoric expressions and referential senses in Turkish and English short stories. In the study, some information, related concepts, types of anaphora, and some important problems about anaphora were presented.*

Furthermore, the selected stories of Ömer Seyfettin and O'Henry were analyzed and evaluated in terms of anaphoric relations and comparison of English and Turkish short stories in terms of anaphora was made by giving overall results.

In addition, Turkish language was compared with English language to find and demonstrate some particular linguistic and referential relations in both of these languages. In the course of exploring the issues related to 'anaphora' and 'reference', some new or neglected constructions were considered: most crucially to the argumentation, referential, particularly anaphoric relations between linguistic entities within Turkish short stories are observed and assessed in terms of Turkish language 'as a pro-drop language'.

Key Words: *Anaphora, referential senses, discourse analysis*

Türkçe ve İngilizce Metinlerde Anlamlararası Gönderme ve Artgönderim

Özet: *Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkçe ve İngilizce yazılı metinlerdeki (kısa hikâyeler) anlamlar arası göndermeler ile ilgili ilişkileri göstermektir. Çalışmada, artgönderim ile ilgili bazı bilgiler, bazı ilgili kavramlar, 'artgönderim' türleri sunulmakta, 'artgönderim' ile ilgili olan önemli sorunlar tanıtılmaktadır.*

Bunun ötesinde, Ömer Seyfettin ve O'Henry'den seçilmiş olan hikâyeler artgönderim ilişkileri bağlamında analiz edilerek değerlendirilmektedir.

Kısa hikâyelerden elde edilen çözümlemeli örnekler yardımıyla Türkçe ve İngilizce hikâyelerin artgönderimsel ilişkileri somutlaştırılarak, çalışmanın sınırları belirlenmekte, sonraki çalışmalar için öneriler sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Artgönderim, anlamlararası gönderme, söylem çözümlemesi*

Introduction

One of the most important aims of this research is to find out the use of anaphoric expressions and referential senses in Turkish and English short stories, and to compare them with each other to see whether there is any difference as regards the use of anaphora. In the study, some background information about the term '***anaphora***' and some related concepts are mentioned, types of anaphora are presented, and important issues related with the term are introduced.

The term '***anaphora***' and '***anaphoric reference***' have a remarkable place in the field of linguistics, particularly in semantics. Anaphoric reference occurs where the assignment of reference to one expression is dependent on that of another expression in the discourse (Clibbens, 1992).

According to Huang (1998), by means of a variety of expression types, reference to animate things including human beings, animals, plants, inanimate things including all kinds of objects, and events can be performed in English. These types of expressions can be grouped together as forms of '***nominal reference***'. They include proper names such as 'Hakan', definite and indefinite noun phrases – such as 'a/the car', and personal pronouns – such as 'he', 'she', or 'it'.

Referring expressions are employed to introduce a new referent. In this way, reference to some entity is established or reference to some entity which has been previously established in the discourse, or which can be assumed to be available to the listener from other source is maintained.

Definition of the Terms '*Anaphora*' and '*Reference*'

An anaphoric pronoun is literally a pronoun. It acts as a placeholder for its head and it determines its reference in the same way as its head (Barss, 2003).

As in every language, particularly in English, there are certain items which have the property of reference. These items make reference to something else for their interpretation. These are '***personals***', '***demonstratives***', and '***comparatives***'. These items can be considered as directives which indicate that information is to be retrieved from elsewhere. Most of them have some cohesive functions.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out that reference is a particular type of cohesion which signals the information for retrieval. The information to be retrieved has a referential meaning with regard to the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to. Cohesion lies in the continuity of reference and it is found when the same thing enters into the discourse for a second time (Onursal, 2003).

In its semantic dimension, reference has the property of definiteness or specifity. There is no need to use the definite article 'the' in every reference item which carries the meaning of specific identity or definiteness in its pure form. The specifity of a reference item can be achieved by reference to the content of situation due to the semantic nature of reference contrary to the grammatical nature of substitution. Substitution occurs in a

very strong grammatical condition, whereas reference is not subject to such grammatical restriction (Kiteley, 1981). Owing to the semantic level of reference, the reference item is not constrained to match the grammatical class of the item it refers to; however, it must match the semantic properties. But these semantic properties need not necessarily be encoded in the text; they may be retrievable from the situation.

Situational reference is the prior form of reference because of the fact that this kind of reference is found a lot more than the textual reference which may be called as the secondary or derived form of reference. The underlying philosophy of the distinction emerges from the fact that in the evolution of language situational reference preceded text reference. Literally, the word 'context' refers to 'the words that come just before and after a word, phrase or statement and helps you to understand its meaning' (cited in 'Oxford Advanced Genie' an electronic, computer-based dictionary) and this word can be combined with the expressions 'situational', 'context of situation' in a metaphorical aspect. Situational reference means referring to a thing as identified in the context of situation and textual reference means referring to a thing as identified in the surrounding text.

In linguistics, the term '*exophora*' or '*exophoric reference*' is used for situational reference while reference within the text or textual reference is called as '*endophoric*' (Cornish, 1999). Referential items may be either exophoric (situational) or endophoric (textual). If they are endophoric, they may be anaphoric (referring to the preceding text) and '*cataphoric*' (referring to the following text). In exophoric reference, lexical items (which can be proper names such as 'Serra', common names such as 'influenza' or verbs, like 'evaporate', etc.) have referential meaning which signals that reference must be attributed to the context of situation. Both exophoric and endophoric reference refer to an item to retrieve the information which is necessary for interpreting the passage in question from elsewhere. In every instance of reference whether endophoric (textual) or exophoric (situational), there is a presupposition that must be satisfied. Namely, the thing referred to has to be identifiable whether from the contextual situation or from the text itself.

Research Design

In this section of the study, the design of the study concerning referential senses, particularly anaphoric relations between words and expressions of sentences within texts is explained. Furthermore, Turkish language is compared and contrasted with English language to determine some specific linguistic and referential similarities and differences by giving clear explanations and examples about referential relations in Turkish and English written texts. The design of this chapter is as follows: firstly the method of the study is presented; secondly the referential analysis of the data obtained from a collection of short stories is explained.

Method

The referential data used in the study came from a corpus generated from a collection of randomly selected eight short stories written by Ömer Seyfettin, the well-known

contemporary Turkish short story writer, and W. O'Henry, the distinguished American short story writer.

O'Henry (1862–1910) is a prolific American short-story writer, a master of surprise endings who wrote about the life of ordinary people in New York City. A twist of plot, which turns on an ironic or coincidental circumstance, is typical of O'Henry's stories. William Sydney Porter, the real name of O'Henry, was an avid reader. O'Henry published 10 collections and over 600 short stories during his lifetime.

Although Ömer Seyfettin died at an early age, as one of the most remarkable and greatest authors of Turkish literature, he left so many short stories behind him which preserve its warm atmosphere and fresh interest of the reader communities still today. These stories which have a wide range of subjects from historical facts to the richness of actual life have satisfied the literary needs of the generations from the beginning of the 20th century.

The reason why these writers' short stories were selected to produce the corpus was that their stories are well-written and their plots are also easy to follow as there is not intricate language use. That is to say, the language used in their stories is plain and comprehensible. In addition, these writers are read by most of the people in their native lands. In the stories there is usually an expected ending with a moral message to convey to the reader.

The corpus used in the study consists of 7964 words in total. The number of the words used in these eight short stories of Ömer Seyfettin and of O'Henry is found to be 3401 and 4563 respectively. O'Henry's stories were found in the Internet and the collection of stories put to the internet sites mostly included longer stories compared with the stories written by Ömer Seyfettin.

Analysis of the Selected Stories

In this section of the study, first of all, sentences in each story of these two writers are separated from each other and numbered in order to produce a suitable condition for a clearer analysis and assessment of the referential and especially anaphoric relations within the texts. Secondly, in each sentence, all the referential items are determined and classified according to their linguistic and referential functions under one of the eleven referential branches such as '*personal pronoun*', '*object pronoun*', '*possessive pronoun*', '*reflexive pronoun*', '*demonstrative pronoun*', '*nominal–verbal–pronominal ellipsis*', '*possessive ellipsis*', '*demonstrative ellipsis*', '*lexical cohesion*', '*substitution*' and finally '*time adverbial*'. Two tables for the referential and anaphoric analyses of Turkish short story 'Kaşağı' and English short story 'A Little Talk about Mobs' are also given. Thirdly, all the referential items in each short story are counted and classified under the referential branches given above and illustrated in a table. Then, all the referential items of four Turkish short stories and four English short stories are counted and classified under eleven branches and given in eight tables. Finally, two illustrated tables of the summary accounts of all the referential items of four Turkish short stories and four English short stories are given in this research report.

Results and Discussion

As already mentioned in this research, '***cohesion***' refers to semantic relations within the text (Onursal, 2003). Some elements within the text are dependent upon the other elements within the text. To interpret any element is only possible by means of the interpretation of related item(s). In order to call a sequence of sentences as text, some sentences are supposed to be dependent on each other mutually. As Halliday and Hasan (1976) explained, 'cohesion' refers to the ties that bind a text together. Cohesion makes texts hang together. The term '***presupposition***' is strictly related with cohesion. Presupposition is a relation of cohesion between two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed.

(1)   Hasan korkar, yalnız binemezdi. Dadaruh ***onu*** kendi önüne alırdı. (Hasan was afraid of getting on a horse, - could not get on a horse alone. Dadaruh would take ***him*** to his front part.)   (*Kaşağı*-Ömer Seyfettin)

In this example, the word (3rd person object pronoun) '***onu***' presupposes the lexical item (proper noun) '***Hasan***' for its interpretation. This presupposition produced by the word '***onu***' provides cohesion between two sentences.

In Turkish and English, personals, demonstratives, and comparatives have the property of reference to something for interpretation.

(2)   Ağır bir tanıyla: — ***Burada*** tütün içilmez! dedi. (- said slowly that it is forbidden to smoke ***here***!)   (*Yalnız Efe*-Ömer Seyfettin)

This particular cohesion is called as '***reference***' and in example (2) singular demonstrative pronoun '***burada***' (***here***), as a referential item, refers to '**the head of sheer cliff**' anaphorically.

(3)   Yirmi senenin yazları, kışları, rüzgârları, fırtınaları, güneşleri ***onun*** granit vücudunu eritemedi. (The summers, winters, winds, storms and suns of 20 years could not melt ***his*** granite body.)   (*Forsa*-Ömer Seyfettin)

(4)   "You see, when little ***Willie Goldstein*** is sent by his mother for pigs' knuckles, with a nickel tightly grasped in his chubby fist, he always crosses the street car track safely twenty feet ahead of the car; and then suddenly turns back to ask his mother whether it was pale ale or a spool of 80 white cotton that she wanted.

(*A Little Talk about Mobs*-O'Henry)

Textual reference can be anaphoric or cataphoric. Two examples above (3) and (4) clarify this situation. In example (3), singular 3rd possessive adjective '***his***' refers to '***forsa***' anaphorically, but in example (4), proper noun '***Willie Goldstein***' refers to '***a little child***' cataphorically. As easily seen in example (3), personal pronouns and their associated adjectives are a major set of exponents of reference.

Substitution is another type of cohesive relation in which one item is replaced by another. Substitution is a relation between linguistic entities, namely words or phrases.

(5) Zırdeli halk **bahçe duvarlarının** etrafında toplanmış, gece gündüz, sabah akşam zurnalarla, davullarla kulakları yırtan bir gürültü koparıyorla. (Gathered round the **garden walls**, completely nuts people were making a deafening noise with clarinets and drums day and night, all the time.)

<div align="right">(Herkesin İçtiği Su-Ömer Seyfettin)</div>

In example (5), the word phrase '**bahçe duvarları**' (*the garden walls*) refers to '**the palace**' functioning as place adverbial anaphorically. At first sight, '**Bahçe duvarları**' refers to the garden walls of the palace, but it substitutes for '**the palace**' anaphorically.

Besides, ellipsis can be considered as a kind of substitution, but labeled as 'zero' substitution, because substitution needs an overt cue for a preceding word; whereas ellipsis involves the total deletion of an element (Külebi, 1990).

(6) (**onun**) Sırtında yırtık bir çuval vardı. (There was a torn sack on (**his**) back.)
(*Forsa*-Ömer Seyfettin)

Here, the total deletion of an element (3rd person possessive adjective '**his**') is encountered. Ellipsis may be found in different forms such as 'nominal ellipsis', 'verbal ellipsis', and 'clausal ellipsis'.

When more than one member of a particular lexical set appears in a given text, their inherent semantic closeness reinforces its cohesiveness.

(7) There is a horrible grinding and then a ripping sound, and a piercing shriek, and *Willie* is sitting, with part of his trousers torn away by the fender, screaming for his lost nickel. (*A Little Talk about Mobs*-O'Henry)

The example (7) provides an excellent illustration of '***lexical cohesion***'. Lexical cohesion item '***Willie***' refers to '***Willie Goldstein-a little child***' anaphorically. The parts which they denote (***Willie*-Willie Goldstein**) are themselves closely related. First name of a little child in the short story '***Willie***' is just one part of his full name '***Willie Goldstein***'. There is a part-whole relationship between them.

As explained before, the data coming from the corpus of the short stories selected from Ömer Seyfettin and O'Henry was analyzed and the results concerning the total number of reference items and their distributions in accordance with the types of reference were found. The overall results obtained from these analyses are presented for Turkish stories and English stories separately in the following table:

Table 1: Overall results of reference items

	Total Number of Words	Anaphoric Reference		Cataphoric Reference		Exophoric Reference		Total Reference Items
Turkish Stories	3401	853	%25	8	%0.23	10	%0.29	871 %25.6
English Stories	4563	766	%16.7	12	%0.26	7	%0.15	785 %17.2

The results in Table 1 showed that Turkish stories involve more reference items than English stories, but the percentage scores of anaphoric reference items of Turkish and English stories are close to each other. However, this difference between Turkish stories and English stories can be attributed to the structural difference between Turkish and English.

The distributions of reference items for the stories in the corpus of Turkish stories revealed that 'Forsa' had more anaphoric reference items (i.e. 309:18.5 percent) than the other stories. However, the percentage score of the anaphoric reference items in 'Herkesin İçtiği Su' is the highest (i.e. 179:26.7 percent). The other two stories included almost the same number of anaphoric reference items (i.e. 'Kaşağı': 183: 22.3 percent, 'Yalnız Efe': 182: 21).

The results of the reference items in English stories showed that although 'Hearts and Hands' is the shortest story (i.e. 165 words), it had the most anaphoric reference items (i.e., 18.9 percent). 'A Newspaper Story' had the lowest anaphoric reference percentage (i.e., 14.3 percent) whereas the other two stories' percentage scores were the same (i.e. 17 percent).

As to cataphoric and exophoric reference items, the percentage scores did not show any significant results implying that they were common in the stories both in Turkish stories' corpora and English stories' corpora.

Apart from the counts of reference items in the whole corpus and according to each story included in the corpus, the distributions of the reference items in connection with types of pronouns, as well as ellipsis, substitution and lexical cohesion were found for each story.

Anaphoric Relations in Turkish Short Stories

It is highly significant to point out that Turkish differs from English strictly in terms of referential and anaphoric relations between linguistic entities, particularly elliptical references as a result of being a pro-drop language. On account of being a pro-drop language, Turkish comprises and consists of extremely widespread elliptical use of nouns, pronouns, verbs, and possessives in both written and spoken language.

When the referential and anaphoric analyses of four Turkish short stories are studied and assessed carefully, one can easily realize that in these stories, the most frequently

used referential and anaphoric relation occurs in the elliptical forms which were counted up to totally 740 elliptical entities (as 524 nominal, pronominal, and verbal ellipses, 206 possessive ellipses, and 6 demonstrative ellipses).

In spite of the abundance of the usage of elliptical entities in nominal, pronominal, verbal, and possessive functions within the sentence structure, a Turkish reader does not come across with any linguistic or referential difficulty while reading this kind of short stories comprising great number of elliptical entities. Rather, they generally take advantage of various and different kinds of affixes attached to the verb for determining the actant of the action.

When compared to the total number of the elliptical entities in sum of the analyses of four English short stories, the total number of elliptical entities in Turkish short stories as 740 indicates one of the most distinctive differences between these two languages. While 740 elliptical entities existed in Turkish short stories, only 66 elliptical entities were found in English short stories.

Besides the elliptical forms as the most frequently used referential and anaphoric relation, there are 208 lexical cohesion items. Apart from the statistical information given above, some other statistical counts are pointed out here. In these four Turkish short stories, 56 object pronouns, 27 personal pronouns, 26 demonstrative pronouns, 13 reflexive pronouns, 10 possessive pronouns, 6 nominal substitution (associative anaphora) items, and 4 time adverbial items were counted.

In 'Kaşağı', there were 94 nominal, verbal, pronominal ellipses and 10 possessive ellipses. These were more than the half of the whole anaphoric references. In fact, the similar results for the same kinds of anaphoric relations were found in other three stories as presented in the tables. This was due to Turkish grammatical structure called 'pro-drop' language. As already mentioned, in pro-drop languages, the subject can be omitted but the verb in the sentence gives a clue about the number of the subject. Turkish has such a structure. The following example makes this point clear:

  (1) a. *Ben* okula gitti*m.*

        b. *I* school-DATIVE go-past-1st-person singular

              case-maker

        c. I went to school.

  (2) a. Okula gitti*m.*

        b. School-DATIVE go-past-1st person singular

              case maker

        c. Went to school.

As exemplified above, in Turkish, a sentence with a subject and without a subject is possible and in writing short stories this way of sentence production as observed in Ömer Seyfettin's stories is used.

In this story, there were also 58 lexical cohesion and 21 pronouns which varied as personal, object, possessive, and reflexive pronouns. However, just two nominal substitutions were identified throughout the whole story.

In each Turkish story, many pronominal elliptic structures were used. The following examples show the use of these structures in the story 'Kaşağı'.

(3) Ahırın avlunda oynarken aşağıda, gümüş söğütler altında görünmeyen derenin hüzünlü şarıltısını işitirdik. (While (*we were*) playing in the backyard of the garden, we were hearing the lommy flashing of the stream which was unseen under the silver willow.)   (*Kaşağı*-Ömer Seyfettin)

(4) Evimiz iç çitin büyük kestane ağaçları arkasında kaybolmuş gibiydi. (Our house seemed lost behind the huge chestnut trees of the inner fences.)
(*Kaşağı*-Ömer Seyfettin)

In example (3), the word '*işitirdik*' included a pronominal 3rd person plural ellipsis and in example (4), the word '*evimiz*' is a structure including a 1st person plural possessive ellipsis.

The referential and anaphoric analysis of 'Yalnız Efe' showed that there were 25 pronouns, 93 nominal, verbal, pronominal ellipses, 20 possessive ellipses, 40 lexical cohesion items, and 4 time adverbials, but no nominal substitution item and demonstrative ellipsis.

Among four Turkish stories, only 'Yalnız Efe' had no nominal substitution item and the fewest lexical cohesion items (i.e., 44: 5.1 percent), but it had more time adverbials than other three Turkish stories.

Due to the fact that Turkish is a pro-drop language, it is usual to come across with more nominal, verbal, pronominal, possessive, and demonstrative elliptical items than pronouns.

In this story, only two personal pronouns were found, while 'Kaşağı' had 5 personal pronouns, 'Forsa' had 8 personal pronouns and 'Herkesin İçtiği Su' had only 1 personal pronoun. Contrary to other three Turkish stories, no associative anaphora was found.

(5) ***Kendisi*** hiç erkeğe gözükmezdi. (She ***herself*** would not be seen by any man.)
(*Yalnız Efe*-Ömer Seyfettin)

In example (5), the word '**kendisi**' was used in the function of third person reflexive pronoun (as '***her***') to refer to the 'female soldier', the main character of the story. This function was also mentioned by means of the suffix '**-di**' added at the end of the verbs '**…görünmez-*di***'.

'Yalnız Efe' involved 4 time adverbials and had more time adverbial items than three other Turkish stories. An example of the anaphoric use of time adverbials from the story is given below;

(6) *O vakit* şairdim. (I used to be a poet *at that time*.)   (*Yalnız Efe*-Ömer Seyfettin)

Here, in this example the word phrase '***o vakit***' (at that time) refers to the youth of the narrator of the story and functions as a time adverbial item.

The distributions of anaphoric reference items for the stories revealed that there was a great similarity and close relationship between Turkish short stories. So, it is almost impossible to draw a clear-cut distinction between these stories in terms of percentage scores of the anaphoric items in the stories.

Again as the referential and anaphoric analysis of 'Forsa' shows, the highest percentage scores were found for both elliptical items (i.e. 228: 21.4 percent) and pronouns (i.e. 29: 2.7 percent). Furthermore, 'Forsa' involved more nominal substitutions (i.e. 3: 0.2 percent) than three other stories. In example (6), elliptical use of 3rd person pronoun within the story is exemplified.

(6) Kamburunu düzeltmek istiyormuş gibi gerindi. (__ stretched as if he wanted to straighten out his hump.)   (*Forsa*-Ömer Seyfettin)

As can be seen in example (6), the sentence taken from the story contained no subject pronoun. But, a native Turkish reader takes the advantage of the suffix or suffixes attached to the verb (i.e. gerin-***di*** or istiyor-***muş***) and by means of the clues taken from such suffixes, he determines the subject pronoun of the pronoun as singular 3rd personal pronoun.

Throughout this chapter, 'associative anaphora' (Mieville, 1999) was labeled as 'nominal substitution', especially in the referential and anaphoric analyses of the Turkish and English stories. It is quite rare to come across with associative anaphora both in Turkish and English stories. The percentage scores of the distribution of associative anaphora among the stories are too low as can be seen in the table of raw numbers and percentage scores of associative anaphora below:

Table 2: Raw numbers and percentage scores of the use of associative anaphora in Turkish and English short stories

Name of the Story	Anaphoric Relation	Number of the Anaphoric Items	Percentage of the Anaphoric Items
Kaşağı		2	%2
Yalnız Efe		-	-
Forsa		3	%0.28
Herkesin İçtiği Su		1	%0.1
A Little Talk about Mobs		10	%0.8
Hearts and Hands	Associative Anaphora	2	%0.2
A Newspaper Story		6	%0.4
The Cactus		7	%0.5

Example (7) shows the use of an associative anaphor involved in the story 'Herkesin İçtiği Su':

(7) Zırdeli halk ***bahçe duvarlarının*** etrafında toplanmış, gece gündüz, sabah akşam zurnalarla, davullarla kulakları yırtan bir gürültü koparıyorla. (Gathered round the ***garden walls***, completely nuts people were making a deafening noise with clarinets and drums day and night, all the time.)   (*Herkesin İçtiği Su*-Ömer Seyfettin)

In example (7), the word phrase '***bahçe duvarları***' (***the garden walls***) refers to '***the palace***' functioning as place adverbial anaphorically. At first sight, '***Bahçe duvarları***' refers to the garden walls of the palace, but it substitutes for '***the palace***' itself anaphorically.

Anaphoric Relations in English Short Stories

The comparison of distribution and percentage scores of referential and anaphoric items of Turkish and English short stories pointed out that there were a lot of referential and anaphoric differences between them.

In 'A Little Talk about Mobs', 116 personal, object, possessive, reflexive, and demonstrative pronouns, 22 nominal, verbal, and possessive ellipses, 47 lexical cohesion items, and 9 nominal substitution items were found.

This story had the lowest number of pronouns (i.e. 116) nearly more than twice the lexical cohesion items (i.e. 47). When compared with other three English stories, it involved only 116 different kinds of pronouns, while 'Hearts and Hands' had 118, 'A Newspaper Story' had 118, and finally 'The Cactus' had 178 pronouns.

The story 'A Little Talk about Mobs' had more pronouns on its own than all the pronouns of four Turkish stories. This story had more nominal, verbal and personal elliptical items (i.e. 22: 1.9 percent) than other three English short stories, more nominal substitution items (i.e. 9: 0.7) than all other Turkish and English stories.

(1) Some of them run to the nearest cigar store to get a rope; but they find the last *one* has just been cut up and labeled.   (*A Little Talk about Mobs*-O'Henry)

In example (1), the word phrase 'one' was used as associative anaphora to refer to 'the rope' anaphorically.

'Hearts and Hands' involved the fewest anaphoric items (i.e. 165) of all the English stories and it has lower possessive pronouns and associative anaphoric items than other three English short stories. Example (2) illustrates the use of one of the lexical cohesion items within the story.

(2) Here *the **linked couple*** seated themselves.   (*Hearts and Hands*-O'Henry)

In this example, the word phrase '***the linked couple***' functioning as the subject of the sentence refers to 'the two young men' within the story anaphorically.

'A Newspaper Story' had more demonstrative pronouns and lexical cohesion items, but less personal and object pronouns than other three English stories.

'The Cactus' gained the superiority in referential and anaphoric classes such as personal, object, possessive, and reflexive pronoun. It had more pronouns (i.e. 178) than other three English stories.

As in other three English short stories, no elliptical possessive, demonstrative and time adverbial item existed in this story.

The referential and anaphoric analysis of English short stories revealed that they had more (personal, object, possessive, reflexive, and demonstrative) pronouns, and nominal substitution items, but fewer (nominal, verbal, pronominal) elliptical items, lexical cohesion items than Turkish stories. The statistical results of referential and anaphoric analyses show the main differences between Turkish and English stories.

Conclusion

Comparison of Turkish and English Short Stories

After the processes of determining and analyzing the referential and anaphoric relations between linguistic entities within Turkish and English stories, one can come to an understanding of the linguistic and structural differences and similarities between Turkish and English.

As already mentioned in previous section, because of being a pro-drop language Turkish language includes extremely widespread elliptical use of nouns, pronouns, verbs, and possessives in written and spoken language, especially in these four Turkish short stories in question. In the referential and anaphoric analyses of the Turkish short stories, 736 nominal, pronominal, verbal, and demonstrative elliptical items were found. But, on the other hand, in written and spoken forms of English language, especially in four English stories, there is extremely rare elliptical use of nouns, pronouns, verbs, and possessives in written and spoken language. In the referential and anaphoric analyses of the English short stories, only 66 nominal, pronominal and verbal elliptical items were found.

The second huge linguistic and structural difference existed in the total number of the personal pronouns. In this respect, English language gains great importance and superiority when compared and contrasted with Turkish language. Whereas 290 personal pronouns involved in English stories, only 27 personal pronouns were found in Turkish stories. As to lexical cohesion items, there was a remarkable similarity between English and Turkish short stories. While 208 lexical cohesion items were determined in four Turkish short stories, only 150 lexical cohesion items were found in four English short stories.

The third great difference between them occurred in the referential and anaphoric class of nominal substitution, namely associative anaphora. Again, English short stories gained great importance and superiority when compared and contrasted with Turkish short stories. In English short stories, there were 25 nominal substitutions. But, in Turkish short stories, only 6 nominal substitution items were found.

The fourth important difference between the Turkish and English short stories was about possessive pronouns. While in English short stories, there were 133 possessive pronouns, there were only 10 possessive pronouns in Turkish short stories. In the account of other referential and anaphoric items under the referential classes of 'object pronoun', 'reflexive pronoun', 'demonstrative pronoun', there is an important similarity between the Turkish and English short stories.

Limits of the Study

This study determines, analyzes, and demonstrates the use of referential, especially anaphoric relations among linguistic entities in four Turkish and four English short stories of two respectable and remarkable short story writers to compare and contrast Turkish language with English language, to find some crucial linguistic and referential (anaphoric) differences and similarities between these two languages. So, it can be clearly seen that our study is limited by the referential and anaphoric analysis and explanation of some randomly selected Turkish and English short stories.

References

Barss, Andrew (2003). Anaphora: 'A Reference Guide'. Arizona: Blackwell Publishing.

Clibbens, John (1992). Comprehension and Production of Discourse Anaphora: 'A Club Publications.

Cornish, Francis (1999). Anaphora, Discourse, and Understanding: Evidence from English and French. New York: Oxford University Press Inc. Developmental Study'. Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, Ruqaiya (1976). Cohesion in English. New York: Longman Inc.

Huang, Yan (1998). Discourse Anaphora: Four Theoretical Models. Journal of Pragmatics. UK: Elsevier Science B. V.

Kiteley, Murray (1981). Substitution and Reference. Philosophical Studies, 40(2), 221-240.

Külebi, Oya (1990). Elliptical Sentences in Turkish. Journal of Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Ankara, pp.117-137.

Mieville, Denis (1999). Associative Anaphora: An Attempt at Formalization. Journal of Pragmatics 31. Switzerland: Elsevier Science B. V.

Onursal, İrem (2003). Cohesion and Coherence in Turkish Texts. İstanbul: Multilingual Publishing, Linguistics Series, pp.121-132.

Özkan, Bülent (2004). Text Linguistics and Text Linguistics Cohesion At the Story 'Onikiye Bir Var' by Haldun Taner". Çukurova University, Journal of Social Sciences Institute 13(1):167-182.

Türkan, Bilge and Yağcıoğlu, Semiramis (2006). Referential Cohesion and Bridging Reference in Turkish Scientific Texts: An Approach about Centering Theory. Journal of Linguistics. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University Publishing, pp.59-73.