PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF 'PARDON' IN TURKISH CORPUS

Melike Baş[*]

ABSTRACT

This corpus-based study aims at investigating the pragmatic uses of the word 'pardon' in Turkish. Concordance lines from Turkish National Corpus (i.e., TNCv.3) were analyzed and categorized in terms of the pragmatic and discourse functions of the word *pardon*. The findings reveal that the lexical meaning of *pardon* is extended into several illocutionary functions in addition to its dictionary definition: a light apology, self-repair, soft opposition, taking attention, interruption, request for repetition and metonymic use of fault/forgiveness. The quantitative findings demonstrate that *pardon* is more frequently used as a discourse marker than an apology form. The study shows how a single lexeme may gain different functions in language use independent of its original semantic content, and corpora provide invaluable data for discourse/pragmatic analyses.

Keywords: pardon, pragmatic function, corpus, discourse marker

TÜRKÇE DERLEMDE 'PARDON'UN EDİMBİLİMSEL İŞLEVLERİ

ÖZ

Bu derlem-temelli çalışma Türkçedeki 'pardon' sözcüğünün edimbilimsel kullanımlarını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Türkçe Ulusal Derlem'den (TNCv.3) çekilen eşdizim satırları, 'pardon' sözcüğünün edimbilimsel ve söylemsel işlevleri açısından incelenmiş ve sınıflandırılmıştır. Bulgular, *pardon* sözcüğünün sözlük tanımından farklı olarak çeşitli edimsöz işlevleri edindiğini göstermektedir: hafif özür aracı, öz düzeltme, yumuşak karşıtlık, dikkat çekme, söz kesme, tekrar etme ricası ve hata/affetme yerine metonimik kullanım. Bu işlevlerin sayısal dağılımları, 'pardon'un özür dileme ifadesi dışında daha yaygın bir şekilde söylem belirleyici olarak kullanıldığını göstermektedir. Çalışma, bir sözcükbirimin temel anlamsal içeriğinden bağımsız olarak dil kullanımında nasıl farklı işlevler kazanabileceğini ve derlemin

---
[*] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Amasya Üniversitesi, melikebas07@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-4104-8719

söylem/edimbilim çözümlemeleri için zengin veri sağladığını ortaya koyması açısından önem taşımaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: pardon, edimbilimsel işlev, derlem, söylem belirleyici

1. INTRODUCTION

This study is an attempt to identify the pragmatic and discourse functions of the lexical item 'pardon' in daily interaction. In Turkish, *pardon* is a highly routinized linguistic formulae that can be classified as a realization of politeness in social interaction. Borrowed from French, the word 'pardon' refers to "I apologize" or 'pardon me' (lit. *özür dilerim, af edersin*) in the Online Dictionary of Turkish Language Institution[1] and is generally categorized under the direct expressions of apology (Çetinavcı, 2012; Goffman, 1971; Gökdayı, 2008; Holmes, 1990). On the other hand, it is considered as a weaker form of apology in comparison to other forms. For instance, in her study on apology strategies of Turkish native speakers, Özyıldırım (2010) shows that 'pardon' is used as a 'light apology' form, which is not even regarded as a proper apology as the participants noted that they did not feel themselves really apologizing when they used the word.

Meaning is not restricted to the semantic content of words, hence depending on the context, pragmatic functions of words vary. In addition to the potential message carried by the lexical items in a sentence, which compose the propositional content of the sentence, there are also non-propositional part of a sentence "which signal the speaker's potential communicative intention" (Fraser, 1996, p. 168). As Aijmer indicates, in order to understand the meaning potential (i.e., "a network of related meanings (textual and interpersonal functions)") of a linguistic item, it is significant to investigate it within a communication situation (2015, p. 90). Since corpora provide "large collections of naturally occurring language", they are ideal in inspecting language in-use (Baker & McEnery, 2015, p. 4). Accordingly, this study examines the word 'pardon' within a corpus-based and discourse-pragmatic perspective to come up with its interactional functions (i.e., illocutionary acts) in everyday language use in order to unveil the multi-dimensionality of this lexical item.

2. Corpus Linguistic Analyses in Discourse-Pragmatic Studies

Corpus linguistics has provided a vast opportunity for an experimental examination of different aspects of language by reducing the biased interpretation of researchers. Computerized corpora have enabled researchers to test whether a particular lexical item or feature they encounter in everyday language is common across a large sample of speakers or not. Hence, corpus-based approach is seen as best implemented in empirically investigating

---

[1] https://sozluk.gov.tr/

"systematic patterns of variation" in grammar and use (Biber, 2009, p. 164). Corpus data provide both quantitative and qualitative analyses for researchers to come up with language patterns that are typical in certain settings. For instance, Baker (2006) demonstrates explicitly how corpus data can be used in discourse analysis to uncover the frequency counts, concordances, collocational networks, modality and metaphorical uses of the lemma ALLEGE.

On pragmatic grounds, corpora help us to distinguish the common contextual meaning of a lexical item beyond its semantic meaning. Discourse markers (also called discourse particles or pragmatic markers) are one of the research areas that gained importance thanks to corpus linguistics. These cover various lexical phrases (e.g., I mean, you know, etc.), adverbs (e.g., actually, frankly, well), interjections (e.g., ahh, oh) or conjunctions (e.g., and, because, but, so, etc.) with differing functions (Fraser, 1996; Özbek, 1998; Yılmaz, 2004). They would be considered as empty meanings or fillers, but now they are recognized as playing vital roles in the composition of discourse and performing various pragmatic functions (Brinton, 1996). In her book *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*, Aijmer proposes that discourse particles differ from ordinary words in the way that they can take on various pragmatic senses. Therefore, corpora, as a representation of genuine language use, "provide the opportunity to study the distribution and function of particles in extensive text extracts representing different registers" (2002, p. 3).

Corpus based research in Turkish discourse and pragmatic analysis has gained importance in recent years. For instance, to identify the interactional functions of *tamam* (lit. alright, okay, fine) in spoken language, Ruhi (2013) makes use of Spoken Turkish Corpus (STC), and reveals its several functions such as backchanneling, intensifying assertion, (partial) agreement, topic closure, introducing new topic, silencing, turn holding, and so on. Similarly, Erdoğan (2013) studies the interactional functions of the discourse particle *şey* (thing) in STC, and identifies the functions of self-repair, holding the floor, introducing a new topic and marking a topic shift and face-saving device in conversations.

Dinar (2016) examines the expressions 'başlatma' and 'başlarım' in Turkish National Corpus (TNC) and reveals how these two statements function as exclamation markers in different discoursal settings to express the emotion of anger as a result of gaining slang usage with a semantic shift. Işık Güler and Eröz-Tuğa (2017) carry out a pragmatic analysis of the Turkish interjection '(u)lan' in STC and the TNC and find out its various discursive functions including an interactional marker, a vocative interjection, an expletive, an intensifier in Turkish, and the emotional function. All these studies demonstrate that corpus is a vital tool in identifying the patterns of specific linguistic items as well as the diachronic semantic changes they have undergone.

Collocation analyses based on corpora also tell us about the semantic content and the profile of the lexical items, thus can be used in combination with discourse-pragmatic analyses. Collocations are "co-occurrence patterns observed in corpus data" (McEnery & Hardie, 2012, p. 123), hence are informative in describing the senses and functions of words. Adıgüzel (2015) studies the discourse particle 'hele' in TNC to identify its pragmatic functions and lexical profile (i.e., collocates, colligates, semantic preference and prosody) in detail. He reveals various distinct senses and functions of this particle that are not included in Turkish dictionaries.

Literature review reveals no study with a primary focus on the uses of *pardon*. This suggests that *pardon* deserves special attention in the research of pragmatic functions in Turkish. Therefore, in accordance with the previous corpus-based studies, the present study examines *pardon*, with the aim of identifying and accounting for the different uses and discourse-pragmatic roles it plays other than its dictionary definition.

3. Corpus Data and Analysis

A corpus-based approach (Biber, 2009; Tognini-Bonelli, 2001) was adopted in the study which helps us not only to describe the data qualitatively but also to come up with some quantitative findings. Corpus-based approach is generally described as "a methodology that avails itself of the corpus mainly to expound, test or exemplify theories and descriptions that were formulated before large corpora became available to inform language study (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001 p. 65). In other words, corpus evidence is employed largely as a storehouse of linguistic instances in interpreting and verifying particular views.

In the course of the research, Turkish National Corpus (TNCv3)[2] was used which represents present-day language and provides a balanced distribution of words for each text domain, time and medium of text. TNCv3 is a 50M+ word corpus including both written (98%) and transcribed spoken (2%) data between the years 1990-2013 (Aksan et al. 2012). The keyword 'pardon' was searched in the spoken and written domains of the TNC and all the concordance lines returned by the search engine were included in the analysis. Because of the frequency imbalance between the written and spoken data, we didn't seek to make a distinction between the two registers but to get a general categorization of functions.

It is important to note that it is not always easy to put the keyword in a single target category, as it may fulfil more than one function simultaneously. To tag the function of the keyword 'pardon' correctly, the surrounding co-text in the concordance lines was read carefully, and the most dominant discourse-pragmatic functions of the keyword in each line were discerned. 10% of the data was coded by an independent coder to check and

---

[2] https://v3.tnc.org.tr/

assure the reliability of tagging (Neuendorf, 2002). The interrater reliability was calculated as 90% agreement between the coders, and the disagreements were resolved through a post-coding discussion between the coders.

Corpus studies allow researchers to come up with quantitative data including collocational and categorical frequencies. In order to understand the lexical selection of the keyword 'pardon', its collocations were listed in terms of the Log-Likelihood (LL) values taken from TNC at the +2/-2 value based on the collocation-via-significance technique (McEnery & Hardie, 2012) (see the Appendix). As a final step, the frequencies and percentages of the functional categories are calculated to reveal what function(s) are more entrenched in language use.

4. The Pragmatic Functions of Pardon

TNC returns 642 matches (f=12.67 instances per million words) in 345 texts. The analysis of the concordance lines demonstrates several interactional functions of pardon: A light apology expression, a self-repair marker, a soft opposition marker, an attention-taking marker, a request marker for repetition and a metonym for fault/forgiveness. The quantitative findings of these functions are presented in Table 1. In the database, 25 lines (3.9%) were not classified under any of these categories due to the repetition of the same line, the use of the keyword as a proper noun or misspelling.

Functions	TNC	
	f	%
Light Apology Device	157	24.5
Self-Repair Marker	309	48.1
Soft Opposition Marker	54	8.4
Attention-Taking Marker	61	9.5
Repetition-Request Marker	29	4.5
Metonym for Fault/Forgiveness	7	1.1
N/A	25	3.9
Total	642	100

Table 5: The Frequencies and Percentages of the Interactional Functions of Pardon in TNC

The functions of self-repair, soft opposition, attention-taking, request for repetition can be subsumed under the general 'discourse/pragmatic marker' title, in accordance with the previous studies (Aijmer, 2002; Brinton, 1996; Fraser, 1996; Özbek, 1998). Table 1 demonstrates that *pardon* functions more frequently as a discourse marker than an apology marker in interaction. As a discourse marker, it more frequently performs the function of self-repair by outnumbering the other functions in the database with 48%. Its use as a

metonymy is more limited in comparison to other functions. These functions are discussed in depth in the following sections.

4.1. Pardon as a Light Apology Device

In accordance with its dictionary definition, pardon is commonly used as a shortcut apology form to compensate for a wrongdoing. In these cases, it performs as a remedial expression and is usually followed by an account of the situation as an excuse for the apology as described in the example (1).

(1)   (a)   **Pardon** ağbi, yumurtaları sahanın dışına kırmışım, […] (W-RA16B2A-0062-36)

        Pardon brother, I broke the eggs out of the pan, […]

    (b)   Oh **pardon**, elimdeki iğne yanlışlıkla size battı (W-SE36E1B-3294-406)

        Oh, **pardon**, the needle in my hand accidentally struck you.

      Although *pardon* is a polite remedial action in regulating social relations, its apologetical semantic load is lower in degree in comparison to other forms in Turkish. The example (2a) below describes a situation where a person unintentionally hurts a woman by throwing something at her but does not take the offense seriously therefore prefers more indirect apology forms. In the example, the hearer-oriented degraded apology expression *kusura bakma* (lit. overlook my offense) which has a lower directness level (Özyıldırım, 2010) is replaced with a less direct *pardon* in the second utterance followed by a self-defense as the offender believes that his behavior is not a big fault.

(2)   (a)   […] kısa boylu bir satıcı utangaç utangaç bana bakıyordu. "**Kusura bakma** yenge, şu arkadaşa atıyordum... Size rastladı."
        "Olur mu kardeş, bu kalabalıkta böyle şaka yapılır mı?"
        "**Pardon** dedik ya, yenge... Oldu bir kez, kasıt yok..."
        "Kaburgam kırıldı sanki, belki de kırılmıştır..."
        "Aslan gibi yengesin maşallah, şuncacık şey senin kaburganı kıramaz, ayıpsın valla!" (W-JA16B3A-0999-1)

        […] a short seller was looking at me embarrassedly. "**Sorry** sister; I was throwing it to that friend… It hit you."
        "Come on! Do you make such a joke in this crowd?
        "I said **pardon**, sister… It just happened; it wasn't intentional…"
        "It's like my rib is broken, maybe it's broken…"
        "You are like a lion, mashallah, this tiny thing doesn't break your rib, shame on you!"

      Goffman states that "often a brief apology is given for a minor offense and a protracted apology for something bigger" (1971, p. 116). In accordance with this account, depending on the seriousness of offence, *pardon* can be combined with other explicit expressions of apology such as *özür dilerim, kusura bakma, affedersin* (lit. I apologize, no offense, I am sorry, excuse me) as in (3a-b) or modified by the quantifier *çok* (lit. very, many, a lot) as in the example (3c). Speakers can also repeat *pardon* two or three times in conversations to highlight their honesty and seriousness (3d). In all these cases, the sincerity of the excuse increases by fulfilling the sincerity condition of the speech act of apology. In fact, *pardon* is at the top of the collocation list

identified through LL values, while *özür* (lit. apology, excuse) is also among the top ten words collocated with it (see the Appendix). This indicates that it is natural for language users to combine two apology forms to proclaim the genuineness of remedial work.

(3) (a)   Ay **pardon**, yanlış yöne doğru yürümüşüz, kusura bakmayın. (W-PI43C1A-0522-319)

Ay, **pardon**, we walked in the wrong direction, sorry about that.

(b)   **Pardon**, özür dilerim. Espri derken yanlış anlaşıldı di mi? (W-PI43C1A-0522-60)

Pardon, my apologies. Is it misunderstood when I said humor?

(c)   Çok afedersin kardeş. Çok **pardon**… Sıcak soğuk ne içersin... (W-FA16B1A-1170-495)

Very sorry, buddy, very **pardon**… Hot or cold, what would you like to drink…

(d)   Ahaa, **pardon pardon pardon**. Kafaya bak ya nereye gitti aklım? (S-BEABXY-0063-94)

Ahaa, **pardon pardon pardon**. Where did my mind go?

Corpus data reveal that the noun 'pardon' can be verbalized in Turkish by attaching the reciprocal suffix *-lAş* as in the example (4a), to mean 'saying pardon' to each another. In this setting, pardon acts as a polite expression of saying sorry to a stranger for an offensive act.

(4) (a)   […] biriyle hafif tertip çarpıştım. Karşılıklı **pardonlaştık**. (W-IA16B3A-0474-5)

[…] I collided with someone slightly. We **said pardon** mutually.

4.2. Pardon as a Self-Repair Marker

Pardon is often used as a self-repair strategy in both written and spoken language. The aim of self-repair varies; the speaker might use it to correct what they have previously said mistakenly. For instance, in (5a) the speaker changes the word 'summer' with 'winter', 'seven with 'fourteen in (5b) and 'village' with 'city' in (5c). The interjection 'ay!' (lit. oh, ouch, wow) which expresses fear, surprise or hesitation is strongly collocated with *pardon* to refer to noticing or remembering before correction as illustrated in (5a).

(5) (a)   Normalde yazın geliyor. Ay! **Pardon** kışın geliyor. (S-BEABXn-0349-41)

Normally it comes in summer. Ay! **Pardon** it comes in winter.

(b)   Şey, Gözdedeyim 7 maç oynamıştım. **Pardon** 3 kupon var, 14 maç […] (S-BEABXO-0060-24)

Well, I was in Gözde's place, I played 7 matches. **Pardon** there are 3 coupons, 14 matches […]

(c)   Bu hakkımız verilmezse köyümüzden, **pardon** ilimizden geçen tren raylarına kendimizi bağlamak da dahil, […] (W-HE39E1B-2836-423)

If we don't get our rights, we […] including tying up ourselves to the railroad tracks that pass through our village, **pardon** our city.

Additionally, speakers use pardon to make an addition to their ongoing utterance (6a-b). The new information is added after *pardon*. Also, in conversations, *pardon* functions as a time-saving marker giving some extra

time to the speaker to remember the thing they want to say. In such cases, it is commonly collocated with the hesitation marker *şey* (lit. thing) (Erdoğan 2013; Yılmaz, 2004) as in the example (6c) where the speaker aims to hold his turn while trying to remember the name of the movie High Voltage.

(6)   (a)   Tek başıma olduktan sonra neden olmasın, **pardon** bir de sen tabii! (W-SA16B2A-1394-496)

            As long as I am on my own, why not, **pardon** and with you, of course!

   (b)   Ben yazılarını da okumadım. **Pardon**, okudum ama yıllar önce. (W-TA16B1A-0919-4)

            I didn't read his articles either. **Pardon** I read it years ago.

   (c)   Oo! Taşıyıcı değil mi bu? Şey **pardon** Yüksek Gerilim... (S-BEABXO-0080-89)

            Oo! Isn't this Transporter? Well, **pardon** High Voltage…

Sometimes, speakers use a wrong word or sound on purpose and immediately correct it to create humor or sarcasm. Thus, in (7a) the words *keriz* (sucker) and *kriz* (crisis) and in (7b) *koyun* (sheep) and *sayın* (dear, honorable) depend on sound similarities and rhyming, while in (7c) *hırsız* (thief) and *işadamı* (businessman) an analogy is created between the two professions. Although the wrongly uttered word is replaced with the correct one after pardon, the aim is actually to emphasize the former one, hence such word plays create double meaning and irony in speech and writing.

(7)   (a)   Ama susmadan önce bir keriz, **pardon** kriz hikâyesi daha anlatmak istiyorum. (W-NH32D1B-2566-439)

            Before I stop speaking, I would like to tell you one more sucker, **pardon** crisis story.

   (b)   Haftaya […] bi kızın çarpıcı öyküsünü izlemek üzere hoşçakalın koyun, **pardon**, sayın seyircilerimiz!.. (W-JA16B4A-0799-262)

            Goodbye sheep **pardon** dear audience until next week to watch the stunning story of a girl, […]!

   (c)   […] ama benimkisi diplomalı hırsız, şey **pardon** yani diplomalı işadamı olsun diyorum. (W-CA16B3A-0577-293)

            […] but I say mine to be a certified thief, well **pardon** I mean certified businessman.

4.3. Pardon as a Soft Opposition Marker

Data analysis shows that *pardon* is used before questions or statements to object for the previously stated proposition by judging and questioning its validity. In these cases, *pardon* functions as a linguistic device that tones down the perlocutionary effect of an opposing utterance on the addressee, hence diminishing force of the face threatening act of opposition. In other words, it acts as a softener for saying something that the addressee does not want to hear or read, hence performs the role of a face-threat mitigator.

(8)   (a)   Tamam abi, koşmayız, sizin gibi öyle oturduğumuz yerde pinekleriz, insan koşmakla zaten bir yere varamaz ki, değil mi, **pardon!** (W-HG41C1A-1181-508)

            Okay brother, we won't run, we'll doze in the place we sit like you do, one cannot get anywhere by running anyway, right, **pardon**!

(b)   Benim üstüme ne vazife. Kadıncağız dürüst bir vatandaşsa, bu onun sorunu. Bana ne yani, **pardon**! (W-GG09C2A-0377-394)

It is none of my business. If the woman is an honest citizen, that's her problem. So what, **pardon**!

(c)   Bir de "Ay biz bunu zaten her sene yaparız hedede hödödöcüleri" var ki insanın "**Pardon** hangi arada bir derede buradaydınız biz 20 senedir koylardayız sizi görmüşlüğümüz yoktur" diyesi geliyor. (W-RE36E1B-3293-154)

There are also (people who say,) "We do this every year blah blah" that one says "**Pardon** when the hell have you been here, we have been in the bays for 20 years and never seen you before."

When it is collocated with the clitic *da* (lit. but) and the conjunction *ama* (lit. but) it functions as a multiword discourse connective (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005) that expresses contradiction, challenge and disapproval of a situation as exemplified in (9). *Pardon* here signifies the speaker's desire to lessen the face loss linked with the main message, hence can also be called as a 'mitigation marker' (Fraser, 1996).

(9) (a)   **Pardon ama** ikiniz de sürekli aynı şeyleri söylemeyi bırakır mısınız? (W-UA14B1A-1594-206)

Pardon but would you both stop saying the same things all the time?

    (b)   **[…] pardon ama** o zaman dürüst ve ahlaklı olsunlar da ekim için bilgi almaya gittiğimizde ekimi plastik cerrahımız yapıyor demesinler! (W-WI44F1D-5089-331)

[…] pardon but, they should be honest and ethical then and shouldn't say that their plastic surgeon does the transplantation when we go to get information for transplantation!

    (c)   **Pardon da** bi Angelina olabileceğini nasıl düşünürsün sen hadsizzzz? (W-ZI45E1C-5072-71)

Pardon but, how would you dare to think that you'll be an Angelina?

Together with the particle *yani* (lit. that is, I mean, you see), the fixed expression "pardon yani!" is formed that signals negative attitude, displeasure or protestation especially with the exclamation marker at the end of the phrase. *Yani* is a discourse marker with different functions depending on its occurrence in the utterance (Yılmaz, 2004). Yılmaz (2004) finds that its medial occurrence is essentially 'self-editing' whereby speakers explain a point in their prior talk. This is also observed in our data, as discussed in the self-repair section and exemplified in (7c). However, in the present case, rather than making a clarification, the speakers/writers point at something that disturbs them, and the reference to this phrase specifies their annoyance and rejection of a previous/following argument as seen in the examples in (10).

(10) (a)   Biz sizin iç işlerinize karışıyor muyuz? **Pardon yani**… (W-GG09C2A-0377-137)

Do we interfere in your internal affairs? **Pardon yani**…

    (b)   Corc'lardan borç istedik ama onlar biz Maykıl'ların işlerine burunlarını sokmaya kalkıştılar! **Pardon yani**... Bizi sömürgesi falan sanıyor galiba Corc'lar. (W-GG09C2A-0377-138)

We asked to borrow money from Corcs, but they tried to meddle in the business of us Maykils! **Pardon yani**... Corcs think we are colonized or something.

(c)   Ne sattığını anlamak için, ille de malı görmek lazım ki, alacaksak alalım. **Pardon yani!** Abuk-subuk yasakları koyup insanları çileden çıkaracağınıza, siz gidin de asıl sokakları pervasızca istila eden bu dayanılmaz gürültüleri yasaklayın! (W-GG09C2A-0377-117)

We need to see the product to understand what is sold before we buy. **Pardon yani!** Rather than drawing people mad with nonsense prohibitions, go and ban those intolerable noises that invade the streets.

4.4. Pardon as an Attention-Taking Marker

As an attention taking device, pardon basically acts as a form of address to draw the hearers' attention before asking a question. Therefore, it is mostly used in the sentence initial position or just after the term of address for this purpose. The questions may function as seeking for information, making a request or asking for permission to do something as exemplified in (11).

(11)   (a)   **Pardon** hanımefendi biriyle mi karıştırdınız? (W-OA16B4A-0178-198)

              Pardon ma'am, have you confused me with someone else?

    (b)   **Pardon**... Sizin isminiz nedir? (W-NA16B2A-0497-77)

              Pardon… What's your name?

    (c)   **Pardon** bir sorun mu var? (W-QA16B3A-3326-137)

              Pardon is there a problem?

    (d)   **Pardon** bi pipet alabilir miyim? (S-AAABXN-0004-5)

              Pardon may I get a straw?

    (e)   **Pardon**, geçebilir miyim? Şu sandalyeyi biraz çeker misiniz? (W-KA16B3A-0550-64)

              Pardon, can I pass? Could you pull that chair a little bit?

In an ongoing conversation, *pardon* may also function as a topic changing or turn switching device. In order not to sound impolite by interrupting bluntly, *pardon* signifies that a new topic is probably about to be introduced by the speaker. Taken from a radio program, (12a) exemplifies self-interruption; while talking about something else the programmer interrupts oneself to mention about something else. Similarly, in (12b) the speaker makes an addition to her speech to learn the names of her addressees before giving the floor to them. The example (12c) is from a TV debate program where one speaker interrupts the host by *pardon* to get the floor.

(12)   (a)   Dilerseniz ben beden dili konusunda... **Pardon** Bir soru var galiba. (S-AEABUZ-0021-28)

              If you wish, on the body language topic I… **Pardon** there is a question I suppose.

    (b)   […] bunu ayrıca belirtmek gerekir. Buyrun, **pardon** bu arada isimlerinizi de rica etsem. (S-ADABPZ-0134-75)

              […] it is necessary to mark this. Yes please, **pardon** by the way may I get your names?

    (c)   DC: Ali Bey, **pardon…**
          AK: Buyurunuz efendim.
          DC: Çok kısa bir şey daha söyleyebilir miyim? (W-KG43C4A-3334-416)

          DC: Ali Bey, **pardon**…
          AK: Yes sir.
          DC: Can I say something short?

4.5. Pardon as a Repetition-Request Marker

In conversations, *pardon* might be used as a request to the addressee for repetition in the cases of not hearing or understanding speech as in (13a), or of disbelief in the uttered statement as in (13b) so that the addressees are allowed to repeat or modify what they have said, and the addressors make sure whether they understood correctly or not. When it functions as a repetition-request, *pardon* is mostly used as a single word followed by a question mark or an exclamation mark to express astonishment, mistrust or skepticism. Different from the attention-taker pardon, which is used with a stress on the first syllable, when used to request for repetition in speech, the last syllable of the word is stressed.

  (13)   (a)   "Tuvalet nerde?" diye sordu Füreya.
             "Dışarda."
             "Pardon?"
             "Dışarda dedim, dışarda, avluda." (W-MA16B3A-0039-112)

             "Where is the toilet?", asked Füreya.
             "Outside."
             "**Pardon**?"
             "Outside", said I, "outside, in the yard."

        (b)   "Ben kendi güvenliğimi kendim sağlarım."
             "Pardon!"
             "Benim eski bir dostum vardır, kendisi bu konuda güvenebileceğim tek insandır." (W-RA16B1A-1496-213)

             "I'll provide my own security."
             "Pardon!"
             "I have an old friend who is the only person I can trust in this matter."

4.6. Pardon as a Metonym for Fault/Forgiveness

Metonymy is generally described as "a cognitive and linguistic process through which we use one thing to refer to another" (Littlemore, 2015, p. 1). It often includes employing a simpler or more concrete concept to signify something that is more complicated or more abstract (e.g., part for whole, producer for product). A limited number of examples in the database showed that *pardon* which is said after an offensive act may stand for the offense itself. As a result, based on the apology function of *pardon*, its meaning is extended to refer to excuse or mercy. For example, in the statement "There is no *pardon* in this game", to express the significance of making no mistake in a football match, or in the example (14a), *pardon* metonymically represents (the repetition of) fault/excuse. Also, as in (14b), *pardon* stands for the act of forgiving especially by legal institutions.

(14) (a) **Pardon'a** bir **pardon** daha. (W-PG37E1B-2932-164)

One more **pardon** to **pardon**.

(b) Bugünlerde **pardonlar** çoğaldı! […] Tavır, hakkında açılan iki davada beraat etti. (W-PG37E1B-2932-415)

Nowadays **pardons** have increased! […] Tavır was acquitted in the two lawsuits filed against it.

5. CONCLUSION

This corpus-based study focused on the pragmatic functions of *pardon* from natural language data, that is, from Turkish National Corpus and provided a first step in understanding its uses in Turkish discourse. The findings revealed that 'pardon' is a multifunctional lexical item that is used for a variety of purposes. Accordingly, it is not only a performative expression of apology as indicated in the dictionary definition, but also a discourse/pragmatic marker fulfilling different illocutionary acts, as well as a metonymic representation for fault or forgiveness located within the same conceptual domain. In this respect, the meaning potential of *pardon* does not comprise casual meanings or implicatures, yet the meanings and functions can be related to a core meaning of polite way of interacting with others. Depending on its function in discourse, *pardon* can be self-oriented (e.g., self-repair) or other oriented (e.g., apology, taking attention) as speakers/writers aim face-protection and politeness in the expression of their attitude, opinion or emotion (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

More specifically, the study shows that this French origin word as a request for forgiveness develops into a discourse marker in time in Turkish and today more frequently characterizes the discourse relationship between the two utterances rather than merely asking for forgiveness. As a direct apology expression, it is generally used alone in contexts where the faulty behavior is acknowledged but is believed to be less harmful and easy to be condoned. As a discourse marker, it creates a cohesive bond between two phrases, sentences or larger segments of discourse with the intentions of self-correction, opposition, taking attention and requesting for repetition. It is particularly conventionalized as a self-repair strategy in language as language users mostly resort to it to correct themselves, either impromptu or intentionally to create sarcasm.

Data analysis shows that pardon is interesting not only due to its multifunctionality but also due to its positional flexibility. It can occur initial, middle or final positions in a sentence with various roles. Moreover, the terms of address *bey* (mr.) and *abi* (elder brother), *ben* (I, me) in the top collocation list in the Appendix, and other terms such as *yenge* (sister, aunt), *hanımefendi* (ma'am) in the examples indicate that *pardon* can be used in varied contexts of (in)formality to address to both a person of higher status or a stranger and a familiar person. Thus, it is not specified to a restricted register in communication.

The study also demonstrates that corpus is helpful in examining the structural and interactional patterns of lexical items. 'Keyword in context' (KWIC) concordances and frequency data evidence qualitative and quantitative forms of analysis both of which are vital in corpus linguistic studies. Concordance lines provide contextualized data that illustrate clearly the functions of *pardon*. Additionally, collocation analysis reveals that it is commonly used with other discourse markers (i.e., *şey*, *yani, da, ama*) and interjections (i.e., *ay, oh, ha*), thus turns into a multi-word unit including the patterns "ay pardon, pardon yani, pardon ama, pardon da, ha pardon, (ya) pardon (ya), şey pardon." Paying attention to the clustering (collocations with other particles) of *pardon* help us identify its characteristic features more profoundly. Either as a single item or as a multiword unit, it sustains the semantic and pragmatic coherence in the flow of interaction.

As Aijmer (2002, p. 3) highlights, a detailed description of discourse markers has practical implementations in language teaching and lexicography. In the preparation of contemporary dictionaries, a contextual and corpus-based method will help lexicographers come up with various illocutionary meanings of lexical items. Also, for textbook writers and language teachers, teaching how Turkish native speakers use *pardon* with different discoursal functions will be more helpful for learners of Turkish to avoid incorrect uses or misunderstandings of this item. Finally, this study is limited to the concordance lines extracted from the corpus. For a deeper description of the structure and functions of *pardon*, the data can be expanded, and its lexical profile can be examined to identify its discourse prosody.

Appendix: The Top Ten Lexical Words That Collocate with 'Pardon' in TNC

	Word	Total Number in Written-Spoken Texts	Expected Collocation Frequency	Observed Collocation Value	The number of documents together	Log-likelihood Value
1	pardon	621	0.0079	52	21	819.6431
2	ay	16751	0.2122	25	24	189.8851
3	yani	50490	0.6396	30	18	173.5465
4	özür	2549	0.0323	9	6	83.5654
5	bey	18091	0.2292	13	9	79.7164
6	ha	5856	0.0742	10	9	78.3951
7	abi	4096	0.0519	8	7	64.8275
8	dedim	17527	0.222	11	10	64.4947
9	şey	65871	0.8345	15	15	58.6577
10	ben	102566	1.2993	17	17	56.4156

REFERENCES

Adıgüzel, M. F. (2015). Semantic and pragmatic analysis of the Turkish discourse particle hele: A corpus-driven study in lexical profiling. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, 12*(1), 63-92.

Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, K. (2015). Analyzing discourse markers in spoken corpora: *Actually* as a case study. In P. Baker & T. McEnery (Eds.). *Corpora and discourse studies: Integrating discourse and corpora*. (pp. 88-109). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Aksan, Y., Aksan, M., Koltuksuz, A., Sezer, T., Mersinli, Ü., Demirhan, U. U., Yılmazer, H., Kurtoğlu, Ö., Atasoy, G., Öz, S. & Yıldız, İ. (2012). Construction of the Turkish National Corpus (TNC). In *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2012)*. İstanbul. Turkey.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London/New York: Continuum.

Baker, P. & McEnery, T. (2015). Introduction. In P. Baker & T. McEnery (Eds.). *Corpora and discourse studies: Integrating discourse and corpora*. (pp. 1-19). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Biber, D. (2009). Corpus-based and corpus-driven analyses of language variation and use. In B. Heine & H. Narrog (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis* (pp. 160-191). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English: Grammaticalization and discourse functions*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Çetinavcı, U. R. (2012). Apologizing in Turkish language: An intracultural and intercultural exploratory study. *Contemporary Online Language Education Journal, 1*, 72-104.

Dinar, T. (2016). Türkiye Türkçesinde bir ünlemleşme örneği: başlatma - başlarım. *Gazi Türkiyat, 19*, 23-34.

Erdoğan, Y. (2013). Interactional functions of *şey* in Turkish: Evidence from spoken Turkish corpus. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, 10*(2), 33-52.

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Pragmatics, 6*(2), 167-190.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Gökdayı, H. (2008). Türkçede kalıp sözler. *Bilig, 44*, 89-110.

Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.

Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society, 19*(2), 155-99.

Işık Güler, H. & Eröz-Tuğa, B. (2017). Sözlü Türkçe derlemi ve Türkçe ulusal derleminde (u)lan'ın edimbilimsel bir incelemesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, 14*(2), 37-60.

Littlemore, J. (2015). *Metonymy: Hidden shortcuts in language, thought and communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McEnery, T. & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Özbek, N. (1998). Türkçe'de söylem belirleyicileri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 9,* 37-47.

Özyıldırım, I. (2010). The level of directness in Turkish apology forms in relation to the level of education. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 27*(1), 179-201.

Ruhi, Ş. (2013). The interactional functions of *tamam* in spoken Turkish. *Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, 10*(2), 9-32.

Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus linguistics at work*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Yılmaz, E. (2004). *A pragmatic analysis of Turkish discourse particles: Yani, işte and şey.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). METU, Ankara.