

## A Neo-Humean Analysis of Turkish Discourse Markers “ama” and “fakat”

Safiye İpek KURU GÖNEN (\*)

**Abstract:** Discourse markers are important elements that build up relations between events and speech acts as well as between words and sentences. Recent years have witnessed a growing interest in the analysis of how various discourse markers function and how they contribute to discourse. However, studies on Turkish discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” are rare and how these discourse markers contribute to different relations in discourse is an issue open to investigation. Although there are a few number of studies focusing on the coherence relations of “ama” and “fakat” according to various discourse relation classifications there is no previous research on the Neo-Humean analysis of these discourse markers. Moreover, the contribution of these markers to the discourse according to their position in the sentence is not analyzed previously. The aim of this study is to fill this gap by investigating how discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” contribute to coherence relations in different text genres when analyzed from a Neo-Humean perspective and to find out how discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” contribute to coherence relations when they are used in sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final positions from a Neo-Humean perspective. The results of the study provide valuable insights into understanding what kind of coherence relations these markers contribute to in written discourse.

**Key Words:** Discourse markers, Coherence relations, Neo-Humean analysis, Text-based analysis of discourse markers

### Türkçe’deki “ama” ve “fakat” Bağlaçlarının Neo-Humean Analiz Yöntemine Göre İncelenmesi

**Özet:** Bağlaçlar, kelimeler ve cümleler arasında olduğu kadar olaylar ve konuşma eylemleri arasında da ilişkileri inşa eden önemli öğelerdir. Son yıllarda, çeşitli bağlaçların işlevleri ve söylem açısından katkıları üzerine giderek artan bir ilgi olduğu dikkat çekmektedir. Ancak, Türkçe’deki “ama” ve “fakat” bağlaçları üzerine yapılan çalışmalar oldukça az ve bu bağlaçların söylem içerisindeki farklı ilişkilere katkısı da araştırmaya açık bir çalışma alanı oluşturmaktadır. Çeşitli söylem ilişkileri sınıflandırmalarına göre “ama” ve “fakat” bağlaçlarının söylem içi tutarlık ilişkilerine odaklanan az sayıda çalışma olsa da bu bağlaçların Neo-Humean analiz yöntemine göre incelenmesi üzerine bir çalışma bulunmamaktadır. Ayrıca, bu bağlaçların cümle içindeki pozisyonuna göre söyleme ne kattığı daha önce üzerinde çalışılmamış bir konudur. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Neo-Humean bakış açısından incelendiğinde “ama” ve “fakat” bağlaçlarının farklı metin türleri içerisindeki tutarlık ilişkilerine katkısını araştırmak ve bu bağlaçların cümle başı, cümle ortası ve cümle sonu kullanıldığında söylem içi tutarlığa katkısını yine Neo-Humean bakış açısına göre inceleyerek alanda bu tarz çalışmalara olan boşluğu doldurmaktır. Çalışmanın sonuçları bu bağlaçların yazılı söyleme tutarlık ilişkileri açısından neler kattığının anlaşılmasına ışık tutmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Bağlaçlar, Tutarlık ilişkileri, Neo-Humean analiz yöntemi, Metne dayalı bağlaç analizi

\*) Öğr. Gör., Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi.  
(e-posta: ipekkuru@anadolu.edu.tr )

## Introduction

Discourse markers are lexical items that signal relations between propositions, events or speech acts (Hutchinson, 2004). Schffrin (1987) views discourse markers as indication of the location of utterances within the merging structures, meanings and actions of discourse and she defines discourse markers as sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk. Although the term “discourse markers” are labeled in various terms by different researchers such as discourse connectives (Blakemore, 1987; Maat and Sanders, 2006), pragmatic markers (Schffrin, 1987; Fraser, 1990), sentence connectives (Halliday and Hasan, 1976), discourse operators (Redeker, 1990), discourse signaling devices (Polanyi and Scha, 1983) and pragmatic operators (Ariel, 1994), they are considered to build up relations between the words or sentences they are connected to in general.

In the recent years, there has been a growing interest in the theoretical status of discourse markers, what they are, how they function , what they signal as well as how single discourse markers such as “but” operate and pattern (Fraser, 1999). However, no consensus has been achieved among researchers about the definition and the functions of these markers in discourse (Knott and Sanders, 1998; Lenk, 1998; Maat, 1998; Vivanco, 2005; Taboada, 2006; Izutsu, 2007). Although it is difficult to find a common list of attributes of discourse markers, some of the commonly accepted features are that they appear as independent and detachable from the constructional unit they occur in, they may appear at the beginning, at the end or in the middle of a constructional unit, and that their omission does not affect the syntactic or semantic acceptability of the constructional unit in which they appear. Hence, the importance of discourse markers lies not in the syntactic or semantic aspects of the constructional unit, but in the pragmatic aspects of message construction, which is the reason for their use in particular communicative contexts (Yılmaz, 2004).

Discourse markers’ lacking meaning does not mean that they do not carry meaning at all. According to Risselada and Spooren (1998) discourse markers can be defined as natural language expressions whose primary function is to facilitate the process of interpreting the coherence relations between a particular unit of discourse and other, surrounding units and aspects of the communicative situation. Different relation types that discourse markers convey are proposed by researchers in the literature. In order to better understand the role and importance of discourse markers, relevant literature should be clearly examined.

## I. Review of Literature

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), what makes a text coherent is the cohesive relationships within and between the sentences which create texture. This is what distinguishes text from something that is not a text. They classified the relations discourse markers signal into four broad categories. These are; additives which provide additional information (such as and, or, furthermore, similarly, in addition), adversatives which include contrastive relations of expectations (such as but, however, on the other

hand, nevertheless), causal relations (such as, so, consequently, for this reason) temporal relations which include the time relations or sequential relations in a text (such as then, after that, finally, an hour later). Halliday and Hasan (1976) put forward that rather than the particular cohesive marker, it is the underlying semantic relation that has the cohesive power. However, the presence of the cohesive markers constitutes textness.

Schiffrin (1987) pointed out that some discourse markers relate only the semantic reality (the “facts”) of the two sentences while others, including “so”, may relate sentences on a logical (epistemic) level and/or a speech act (pragmatic) level. Hutchinson (2004) classifies discourse markers as the ones which include polarity (signal a concession, contrast or denial of expectation such as *since, but, though, on the grounds that*), veridicality (imply the truth of both arguments of a discourse relation such as *and, then, so that*), and type (signal additive, temporal and causal relations such as *and, but, as soon as, although, because*).

Another discourse relation classification is proposed by Kehler (2002). Kehler’s (2002) analysis of coherence relations is based on a famous philosopher Hume, who proposed three connections among ideas, namely resemblance, contiguity in time and place, and cause or effect. Affected by Hume’s ideas, Hobbes (1990, cited in Kehler, 2002) is the first researcher who pointed out that Hume’s principles can be used as a basis for coherence relations. Kehler’s (2002) analysis of coherence relations is highly influenced by Hume and he categorized the coherence relations that exist in the text in a Neo-Humean fashion.

### 1.1. Neo-Humean Categorization of Coherence Relations

The main categories of coherence relations according to Kehler’s (2002) Neo-Humean analysis are cause and effect relations, resemblance and contiguity relations. Kehler (2002) assumed that for each multi-clause utterance the receiver identifies a relation that applies over a set of entities from the first sentence or clause and a corresponding relation over a second set of entities in the second sentence or clause. Hence, coherence is achieved as a result of a common or contrasting relation between two sentences. Each category in Kehler’s (2002) analysis involves a set of relations along with a specification of the constraints that each imposes.

#### 1.1.1 Cause-Effect Relations

Cause and effect relations include a path of implication identified between the prepositions denoted by the utterances in a text. The main category of cause-effect includes sub-categories of relations such as *result, violated expectation* and *denial of preventer*.

**Result:** In this relation, hearer infers P from the assertion of the first sentence (S1) and Q from the assertion of the second sentence (S2), where normally  $P \rightarrow Q$

- (1) Jack wanted to become a lawyer. He went to law school to make his dreams come true.

The implication in this sentence is that Jack's going to law school is the result of his desire to become a lawyer. According to Kehler (2002), definitions of other relations in this category can be derived by reversing the clause order and optionally negating the second proposition.

**Explanation:** Hearer infers P from the assertion of S1 and Q from the assertion of S2, where normally  $Q \rightarrow P$

- (2) John bought a new BMW to his girl friend. He wanted to show her that he loves her so much.

Here, why John bought a new car to his girl friend is explained in the second sentence. Thus, the second sentence functions as an explanation to John's buying a car proposed in the first sentence.

**Violated Expectation:** Hearer infers P from the assertion of S1 and Q from the assertion of S2, where normally  $P \rightarrow \neg Q$

- (3) Jane wanted to spend whole weekend with Jack, but her parents arranged a family meeting at the weekend to which she should attend.

In this sentence, Jane expected to spend whole weekend with Jack but her expectations were violated that she was unable to spend the weekend with Jack as her parents arranged a family meeting. Since Jane had to attend this family meeting, her expectations about being with Jack were not fulfilled.

**Denial of Preventer:** Hearer infers P from the assertion of S1 and Q from the assertion of S2, where normally  $Q \rightarrow \neg P$

- (4) George refused to introduce an initiative to allow government funding for faith-based charitable organizations, even though he wanted to satisfy the right wing of his party.

Here, George wanted to satisfy the right wing of his party, but he did an action which would probably not contribute to his wishes. Hence, George's introducing an initiative is an action which would not satisfy the right wing of his party.

### 1.1.2. Resemblance Relations

Resemblance relations include commonalities and contrasts among corresponding sets of parallel relations and entities based on comparison, analogy and generalization.

**Parallel:** Hearer infers p (a1, a2,...) from the assertion of S1 and p (b1, b2, ...) from the assertion of S2, where for some vector of set of properties q, qi (ai) and qi(bi) for all i.

- (5) Dick is worried about defense spending. George is concerned with education policy.

Here, parallel entities are Dick and George corresponds to parallel entities defense spending and education policy.

**Contrast:** There are two types of contrast relation. Either the relation inferred or a set of properties of one or more of the sets of parallel entities can be contrasted.

**Contrast (i):** Hearer infers  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_1$  and  $\neg p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_2$ , where for some vector of set of properties  $q$ ,  $q_i(a_i)$  and  $q_i(b_i)$  for all  $i$ .

(6) Jerry wants a raise in his salary, but John opposes it.

**Contrast (ii):** Hearer infers  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_1$  and  $p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_2$ , where for some vector of set of properties  $q$ ,  $q_i(a_i)$  and  $\neg q_i(b_i)$  for some  $i$ .

(7) Jerry wants a raise in employee’s salaries, but John wants a raise in research projects.

**Exemplification:** Hearer infers  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_1$  and  $p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_2$ , where  $b_1$  is a member or subset of  $a_i$  for some  $i$ .

(8) Republican presidents often seek to put limits on federal funding of abortion. In his first week of office, George W. Bush signed a ban on contributing money to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services.

As seen above, exemplification holds between a general statement followed by an example of it. Generalization resembles to exemplification, but the ordering of the clauses is reversed.

**Generalization:** Hearer infers  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_1$  and  $p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_2$ , where  $a_i$  is a member or subset of  $b_i$  for some  $i$ .

(9) In his first week of office, George W. Bush signed a ban on contributing money to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services. Republican presidents often seek to put limits on federal funding of abortion.

Negation can be added to generalization and exemplification relations for two versions of exception relations.

**Exception (i):** Hearer infers  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_1$  and  $\neg p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_2$ , where  $b_i$  is a member or subset of  $a_i$  for some  $i$ .

(10) Republican presidents do not usually put limits on federal funding of abortion immediately upon entering office. Nonetheless, in his first week, George W. Bush signed a ban on contributing money to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services.

**Exception (ii):** Hearer infers  $p(a_1, a_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_1$  and  $\neg p(b_1, b_2, \dots)$  from the assertion of  $S_2$ , where  $a_i$  is a member or subset of  $b_i$  for some  $i$ .

(11) In his first week, George W. Bush signed a ban on contributing money to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services. Nonetheless, republican presidents do not usually put limits on federal funding of abortion immediately upon entering office.

**Elaboration:** Hearer infers p (a1, a2, ...) from the assertions of S1 and S2.

In elaboration relation, two eventualities described are in fact the same.

- (12) The new Republican president took a swipe at abortion in his first week of office. In a White House ceremony yesterday, George W. Bush signed an executive order banning support to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services.

Two sentences above actually talk about the same thing. However, the second sentence elaborates on the first sentence and explains it in more detail.

### 1.1.3. Contiguity Relations

There is only one class of relation in this category, namely Occasion. Kehler (2002) talks about two versions of Occasion.

**Occasion (i):** Hearer infers a change of state for a system of entities from S1, inferring the final state for this system from S2.

- (13) George picked a book. He began to read.

Here the events are in chronological order. There is the subsequent flow of events follow each other.

**Occasion (ii):** Hearer infers a change of state for a system of entities from S2, inferring the initial state for this system from S1.

- (14) Larry went to a restaurant. The baked salmon sounded good and he ordered it.

In this sentence, contrary to the first version of Occasion, there is no subsequent sequence and hearer this time infers the unsaid events (Larry went to a restaurant, had a set, looked at the menu, etc.). These unsaid events can be predicted via world knowledge.

In the case of Turkish discourse markers, there are a few studies conducted. Specifically studies on the Neo-Humean analysis of coherence relations are scarce and there is a need to identify how Turkish discourse markers function according to Kehler's (2002) coherence relations. Among a large body of Turkish discourse markers, "ama" and "fakat" ("but" in English) which on the surface seem to convey contrastive relations worth studying as there are not many attempts to date to reveal their functions in the discourse.

## 1.2. Turkish Discourse Markers "ama" and "fakat"

Turkish discourse markers "ama" and "fakat" have origins in Arabic and now are used in modern Turkish and other Turkic languages (Hacıeminoğlu, 1992; Korkmaz, 2004; Üstünova, 2006; Rüstemova, 2007).

Many researchers asserted that "ama" and "fakat" are among the simple discourse markers which are used to connect words or sentences and which lack meaning on their own (Hengirmen, 1999; Gencan, 2001). Bolulu (1991) puts forward that although discourse markers in Turkish are thought to lack meaning on their own, they indeed convey meaning in discourse. Discourse markers are considered to have an important role

for understanding the coherence relations in a text (Rüstemova, 2007). Ergin (1977 cited in Baştürk 1995) claims that discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” have the same function and that they connect the sentences with the prior ones. Moreover, Gencan (2001) assumes that these markers convey contrastive relations. In one of the pioneering research on Turkish, Jaubert (1823 cited in Baştürk 1995) proposes that “ama” is a discourse marker and it has a contrastive function. Çelik (1999) stated that “ama” and “fakat” can be used to signal contrastive relations and they can be translated into English as “yet”, “but”, and “however”. “Ama” can also appear as “amma” in daily usage. Doğan (1994) in his pragmatic analysis of the functions of “ama” puts forward that “ama” has two functions in discourse: denial of expectation and contrast. The following example shows how “ama” is used for denial of expectation:

(15) Umut: Benimle evlenir misin?

*Would you marry me?*

Selin: Seni seviyorum **ama** seninle evlenemem.

*I love you but I can't marry you.*

Umut, who is the receiver of Selin's message, would probably interpret Selin's message “I love you” and then arrive at the proposition “if she loves me, she will marry me” and then the conclusion “she will marry me”. However, Selin denies the expectations of Umut and the discourse marker “ama” includes denial of expectation that Umut's expectations are not fulfilled.

According to Doğan (1994), in its other function, “ama” includes a contrastive relation as in the following example:

(16) Amcamın eli çok açıktır **ama** yengem her kuruşun hesabını yapar.

*My Uncle is very generous but his wife is very mean.*

In this sentence, the generosity of the uncle is emphasized over his wife being a very mean person. Hence, when the receiver first hears the message “my uncle is very generous”, he identified the uncle as a generous person. However, the second message “his wife is very mean” is conveyed through a contrastive relation in the sense that the uncle's wife is not generous, instead she is mean.

In his analysis of “ama”, similar to Doğan (1994), Baştürk (1995) assumes that “ama” can be used for negation and denial of expectation. In his example, after dinner electricity is gone. Curtains are opened for light to come in. At this point five year old girl Yeşim says:

(17) “**Ama** yine de göremiyorum” (*But, I still can't see*)

Here, Yeşim tries to convey the message that “you opened the curtains for me to see in the dark. However, it doesn't work and I still can't see”. Hence, from the proposition “since the electricity is gone, let's open the curtains” the probable result “with this way, we can see” is rejected. Baştürk (1995) concludes that “ama” is used to deny the possible expectation that the preceding sentence conveys.

In another article, Canan (2001) asserts that “ama” is one of the commonly used discourse markers in Turkish and for its function generally an objective or accepted claim is given in the preceding sentence of “ama” and after “ama”, a subjective claim is conveyed. This can be illustrated in the following sentence:

(18) Evet, sigara sağlığa zararlı *ama* bırakamıyorum işte bir türlü.

*Yes, smoking is hazardous to health, but I can't quit.*

In this example, the truth that smoking is hazardous is accepted. However, for the conveyer of the message, smoking is an indispensable part of his life. Hence, the sentence following “ama” here includes a subjective claim of an idea.

As Doğan (1994), Baştürk (1995) and Altunay (2007) pinpoint studies in Turkish about the discourse or coherence relations of “ama” and “fakat” are very rare. To have a clear understanding of the functions and contributions of discourse markers to coherence relations, new studies are suggested to be conducted on “ama” and “fakat”. Emeksiz (2006) also highlighted that text type may be an important factor that could influence coherence. To date, no studies has been published (to the best of researcher's knowledge) focusing on the different relations these markers convey in different genres and positions in a sentence. Kerslake (1992) further pinpointed that discourse markers may convey different relations depending on their positions in a sentence. There is also a need to analyze “ama” and “fakat” from a Neo-Humean analysis perspective as there is no previous research focusing on this perspective of discourse markers. Such research would fill in the gap in the recent literature on Turkish discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” and their functions in discourse.

### 1.2. Research Questions

This study specifically focuses on analyzing how “ama” and “fakat” contribute to the coherence relations in the text. In this respect, “ama” and “fakat” are analyzed in different genres. Moreover, their positions (namely, sentence initial, middle and final positions) were further analyzed to shed light on whether their functions change according to their positions in a sentence. Hence, this study would have valuable insights into how “ama” and “fakat” are used in a certain discourse and how they attribute to coherence relations in discourse. Based on these aims, there emerged two research questions:

1. How do discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” contribute to coherence relations proposed by Kehler (2002) in different text genres?
2. How do discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” contribute to coherence relations proposed by Kehler (2002) when they are used in sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final positions?

## II. Methodology

### 2.1. Data

In order to reveal coherence relations discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” contribute to, a corpus analysis was conducted. The corpus used in the study is METU Turkish Corpus

which comprises 1.000.000 words (Say, Özge and Ofazer, 2003). Different genres were included in the corpus like novel, story, research, article, travel notes and interview. All these genres were taken to give a general outline of Turkish language between the years 1990 and 2000. This corpus is the first of its kind developed on Turkish language. It only includes written texts but no spoken data. For the analysis of Turkish discourse markers “ama” and “fakat”, METU Turkish Corpus appeared to provide appropriate grounds as it reflects use of Turkish in various text genres.

Among the text genres the corpus covers, three of them were selected for the purposes of the study. These are novel, news and travel notes. These three genres were chosen with the idea that they can give a general picture of how “ama” and “fakat” may function in different text types. Novel as a genre is mainly based on narration (Bakhtin, 2006), news as a genre generally aims at reporting and travel notes may include narration as well as reporting (Kich, 2007).

## 2.2. Data Collection Procedures

Three text types, namely novel, news and travel notes” has been analyzed as they were represented in the corpus for discourse markers “ama” and “fakat”. As one of the aims of the study is to find out how these markers function according to their positions in the sentence, “ama” and “fakat” in sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final positions in these genres were taken for analysis. Table 1 below shows the distributions of discourse markers according to genres and their positions extracted from the corpus.

Genre	Discourse Markers	Sentence Initial	Sentence Middle	Sentence Final	TOTAL
Novel	Ama	6	6	5	17
	Fakat	6	6	-	12
News	Ama	6	6	5	17
	Fakat	6	6	-	12
Travel Notes	Ama	6	6	5	17
	Fakat	6	6	-	12
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>87</b>

**Table 1.** Distribution of Discourse Markers according to Genres and Their Positions

As can be seen in Table 1 above, for each discourse marker six samples from sentence initial, six samples from sentence middle and five samples from sentence final position (for “ama”) were extracted. That is, a total of 87 instances of “ama” and “fakat” were analyzed. For sentence final position of “fakat”, no instances were found in the corpus. All of the discourse markers taken for analysis were analyzed within their own contexts in the sentences.

The functions of “ama” and “fakat” were analyzed according to what Kehler (2002) proposes as Neo-Humean analysis of coherence relations. In cases where the relevant

contexts in which “ama” and “fakat” appeared were not sufficient, preceding and following sentences were also taken into account. Although the data analyzed were quite limited to arrive at a generalization about the functions of “ama” and “fakat”, it is thought that the present study would provide a valuable basis as a first step of the analysis of these discourse markers from a Neo-Humean perspective. Moreover, this limited research would be helpful in exemplifying how “ama” and “fakat” function in different genres. To extract the sentences from the corpus, a work bench program developed by the corpus research team was used. Boolean analysis was selected and genres were identified.

### 2.3. Data Analysis Procedures

After extraction of the necessary data mentioned above from the corpus, each discourse marker is analyzed qualitatively to reveal how “ama” and “fakat” contributed to the discourse relations in a Neo-Humean sense. For the analysis, two separate analysts coded the data for the relevant coherence relations proposed by Kehler (2002). In order to test the reliability between two analysts, Kappa coefficient was measured and found as 93.7. Jenness and Wynne (2007) assert that the Kappa statistic is used to measure the agreement between predicted and observed categorizations of a dataset while correcting for agreement that occurs by chance. Hence, it appeared as an appropriate method to increase the reliability of the findings.

## II. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Analysis of “Ama”

Discourse marker “ama” was analyzed in three different genres and three different positions in sentence. When we analyze “ama” according to Kehler’s (2002) Neo-Humean coherence relations in different genres and different positions in sentence, it is found that “ama” expresses various coherence relations such as Contrast, Occasion, Exemplification, Denial of Preventer, Result, Violated Expectation and Exception.

#### 3.1.1. “Ama” in Novel

The first genre, “ama” analyzed is the novel. Novel as a genre includes narration and “ama” is found to contribute to different relations according to its different positions in a sentence. Corpus analysis identified various novels written by different writers in which “ama” is used as a discourse marker.

#### Sentence initial “ama”

Qualitative analysis of the corpus revealed that “ama” expresses Occasion (ii), Exemplification and two versions of Contrast, namely Contrast (i) and Contrast (ii) in sentence initial position. The following examples show how “ama” expresses different relations:

- (1) Denis Ahretlik ‘ i seviyor. Ahretlik öbür kadınlara benzemiyor.  
Dedikodu bilmez. Kimsenin arkasından konuşmaz. **Ama** kimi kimsesi

yok. Keşif ‘ in kimi kimsesi olmadığı gibi. (From *Amerika* Ömer Bayta, İletişim Yayınları, 1995).

In the example above, “ama” contributes to the expression of Occasion (ii) relation. Sentences preceding “ama” talks about a person (Ahretlik) and the sentence starting with “ama” contributes to some features the person has. At first sight sentence starting with “ama” may seem to have no relation with the preceding sentences. However, sentence starting with “ama” still talks about the person; hence it contributes to the same topic that is the person who is narrated. According to Kehler (2002), Occasion allows one to express a situation centered around a system of entities by using, intermediate states of affairs as points of connection between partial description of that situation. Hence, “ama” above denotes a point of connection about the person described. Occasion (ii) includes a change of state for a system of entities from S2, inferring the initial state from this system from S1. As a result, “ama” above expresses Occasion (ii) relation.

Another example of “ama” in sentence initial position expresses Contrast (i) relation. This contrastive relation is one of the mostly found relation “ama” contributes to.

(2) Ustaca işlenmiş bir cinayet. Ortada hiçbir ipucu yok. Çünkü öldürülen yok. **Ama** bir insanın rayı değiştiriliyor; başka bir yaşamın içine sokuluyor. (From *Örümceğin Kitabı*, Nazlı Eray, Can Yayınları, 1998).

In the example above, there is a contrastive relation between the sentence preceding “ama” and the sentence including “ama”. “Bir insanın rayı değiştiriliyor” is in contrast with “çünkü öldüren yok”. It is inferred that there is no clue or murderer found. However, a person is affected by this murder. Hence, this contradicts with the preceding sentences given about the murder. Contrast (i) includes contrasting the relation inferred. For the example above, since there is contrasting the relation (murder and the situation of the person), we can say “ama” here contributes to Contrast (i) relation.

### Sentence middle “ama”

When used in sentence middle position in novel genre, corpus analysis has put forward that “ama” may contribute to Contrast, Denial of Preventer, Result and Exemplification. Following examples taken from the corpus illustrates how “ama” expresses different relations.

(3) Koca bir duvar taşıyordun yüreğinde kimsenin aşamayacağı, aşmaya cesaret bile edemeyeceği. Dışa karşı güçlüydü, **ama** içe, kendi yüreğine yıkılmak üzereydi. Anılarla örülmüş , acılarla harçlanmış bu duvara tırmanmak onu aşabilmenin ilk şartıydı. (From *Nü Perde*, Hakan Akdoğan, Can Yayınları, 1998).

In this example, “ama” expresses **Contrast (i)** relation. According to Kehler (2002), Contrast (i) refers to contrasting the relation inferred. In this example, “dışa karşı güçlüydü”

is in contrast with “içe, kendi yüreğine yıkılmak üzereydi”. Relation is contrasted in this example. The person’s being tough outside is in contrast with the situation in his inside.

(4) Sanem bir arkadaş edininip aramızdan çekildi. Babam böyle beş yıldızlı bir fırsatı kaçırdığı için pişman olmuştu galiba. Çünkü bir şey söylemek istiyor **ama** bir türlü açılmıyordu. (From *Romantika*, Turgut Özakman, Bilgi Yayınları, 2000).

“Ama” in the example above, contributes to Denial of Preventer relation. The person wanted to say something, but he couldn’t. The relation which denotes this situation is Denial of Preventer.

#### **Sentence final “ama”**

In sentence final position in the novel genre, “ama” contributes to Contrast, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer relations. However, instances of “ama” in sentence final position are not as many as “ama” in initial and middle positions. Following examples show how “ama” is used to contribute to different relations in sentence final position in the novel genre.

(5) Eda sözünde durmuyor, yardımcı olmuyor bana, ne yapabilirim bilmiyorum , diyorum . Bugün onunla buluşacaktık, henüz aramadı **ama**. (From *Yeni Yalan Zamanlar*, İnci Aral, Can Yayınları, 1999).

Here, “ama” contributes to the relation of Violated Expectation. There is an expectation of the speaker to meet with Eda. However, this expectation is violated since Eda has not called yet. It means they couldn’t meet. Since expectation of meeting is not realized, violation of this expectation is present in this sentence.

(6) Uzun süredir şurada oturmuş, size bakıyordum. Ülkemin bir yazarı. Hemen tanıdım; çalışıyordunuz, fevkalâde kaptırmıştınız, bölmek istemedim, **ama** . . . (From *Romantik*, Adalet Ağaoğlu, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000).

In the sentence above, “ama” is in final position, but the sentence is not completed. This is common especially in daily speech where sentences can end with “ama” as illustrated in the example above. Here, “ama” contributes to Contrast (i) relation. Although verb following “ama” is not given, we still infer that it contrasts with the verb preceding “ama”, that is “bölmek istemedim”. Hence, we infer “bölmek istemedim ama böldüm”. The speaker already completed the action although he did not mention it in a full sentence. In the example above, “ama” contributes to contrasting the relation.

#### **3.1.2. “Ama” in Travel Notes**

The second genre “ama” analyzed is the travel notes. Travel notes as a genre may aim at either narration or report depending on the style it is written. Corpus analysis

has put forward different relations “ama” contributes to according to its positions in the sentence.

### Sentence initial “ama”

In sentence initial position, “ama” expresses the relations of Violated Expectation, and Contrast. Similar to novel genre, use of “ama” in sentence initial position in travel notes genre is common. Following examples illustrate two of the relations “ama” contributes to when used in the sentence initial position.

(7) Haritaya bakıyorum, evet böyle bir kent var. Küçük bir yerleşim merkezi. **Ama** işaret panolarında adı geçmiyor. Sabahtan beri yoldayız, hâlâ varamadık Big Sur ‘ a. (From *Pasifik Kıyısında*, Nedim Gürsel, Gezi İzlenimleri, Can Yayınları, 1991).

In the sentences above, “ama” contributes to Violated Expectation relation in Kehler’s (2002) terms. There is a fact that the city exists. Although it is a small city, it is expected to take part in the signs. However, this expectation is violated and the speaker cannot find the name of the city in road signs. Hence, we can talk about violation of an expectation in this example.

(8) Rüstem Palanın burada yaptırdığı bezistan, başvezirin İstanbul’ da Eminönü’ ndeki eski dükkânların arasına gizlenmiş caminin çinileri kadar albenili değildi belki. **Ama** içinde kimbilir ne gizler, ne güzellikler saklıyordu. (From *Balkanlara Dönüş*, Nedim Gürsel, Gezi İzlenimleri, Can Yayınları, 1995).

“Ama” in the example above expresses Contrast (ii) relation. Here, the set of properties of the structure are contrasted. On one hand, it is not that much attractive when compared to other structures, but on the other hand it has mystery and beauty. Hence, different properties of the structure narrated are contrasted.

### Sentence middle “ama”

For travel notes genre, “ama” in sentence middle position contributes to relations of Violated Expectation, Denial of Preventer and Contrast. In the corpus, there are many instances of “ama” in sentence middle position, but not many as “ama” in sentence initial position. Following examples shows how “ama” contributes to different relations in sentence middle position.

(9) Bakın, kitaplarımdan söz etmeyi pek sevmem. Başka şeylerden konuşalım isterseniz. Amerika’ dan, yakında başlayacak dünya kupasından, hemşehriniz Reagan’ dan **ama** edebiyattan konuşmayalım bu akşam. (From *Pasifik Kıyısında*, Nedim Gürsel, Gezi İzlenimleri, Can Yayınları, 1991).

In the example above, “ama” expresses Contrast (i) relation. This type of relation is achieved through contrasting the relation between two sentences. Here, the speaker wants to talk about different issues but he does not want to talk about literature. Hence, we see the contrasting of relation between various issues and literature.

(10) Eski renkliliği bulmak kolay değil **ama** Nusayri toplumunun düğünleri gene de başlı başına bir hazine. (From *Nusayriiler Bin Yemin*, Faik Bulut, Gezi Yazısı, Atlas, 2001).

In this example, “ama” contributes to the relation of Denial of Preventer. It is mentioned that the weddings are not as they were in the past, but this state is denied as these weddings are still precious.

#### **Sentence final “ama”**

Instances of “ama” in sentence final position are not as many as “ama” in sentence initial and sentence middle position. This is similar to use of “ama” in the novel genre. For travel notes, “ama” contributes to Denial of Preventer and Contrast. Following examples show how “ama” is used for the relations detected in the corpus analysis.

(11) Bizim kuşak Sait Faik’ in Son Kuşlar da yazdığı gibi toprak anamızın güzel saçlarına benzeyen otları, havada çığlık çığlığa dönüp duran kuşları da pek göremedi. Balinalarıysa hiç görmedi. Bol bol yağlarını içti **ama**. (From *Pasifik Kıyısında*, Nedim Gürsel, Gezi İzlenimleri, Can Yayınları, 1991).

In this example, “ama” expresses the relation of Denial of Preventer. Speaker talks about someone who never saw the whales. Even though this person never saw the whales, he drank whale oil. That is why; the coherence relation “ama” contributes to in sentence final position is Denial of Preventer.

(12) Luan haklı olarak korkuyor. Kosova’ da durum çok gergin çünkü. Sancak da öyle değil **ama**. Arnavutların da, Sırp, Hırvat ya da Slovenler gibi, tek bir devlet altında birleşmelerine sıcak bakmayanlar da var. (From *Balkanlara Dönüş*, Nedim Gürsel, Gezi İzlenimleri, Can Yayınları, 1995).

“Ama” here contributes to a Contrast (i) relation. That is, relation is contrasted in this example. The situations in Kosova and Sancak are contrasted.

#### **3.1.3. “Ama” in News**

The last genre “ama” analyzed is news genre. Generally, news aim at reporting events to readers. Various newspapers are taken for analysis and the findings indicated that “ama” contributed to relations like Contrast, Exception, Denial of Preventer and Violated Expectation.

### Sentence initial “ama”

In sentence initial position, “ama” contributes to Contrast and Exception relations. Following samples taken from the corpus shows how “ama” contributes to these relations.

(13) Öpücük hijyenik koşullarda keyif verici bir eylem. **Ama** sevgiliniz dış bakımına dikkat etmiyorsa yandınız. Bir öpücükle her türlü mikroba davetiye çıkartabilirsiniz. (From *Radikal* 1999).

In this example, the relation “ama” contributes to is Exception (i). In this type of relation, a general statement is followed by an example of it and negation is added. In the example, the first sentence is a general statement about kiss. This statement is followed by an example but this example includes negation. This negation contributes to an exception situation. Hence, the relation identified here is Exception (i) in Kehler’s (2002) terms.

(14) Yasaklı bir Türkiye ile bir yere varılmayacağını her zaman söylüyoruz. **Ama**, insanlar için kutsal bilinen bazı kavramları da siyasete alet etmemek lazım. Bir devleti sembolize eden bayrak da kutsaldır. (From *Milliyet* 2002).

“Ama” contributes to Contrast (i) relation. That is, the writer states that we cannot achieve our goals with restrictions. However, from the second sentence we infer that there should also be some restrictions in some occasions. Therefore, we can infer a contrasting situation between the first and the second sentences and the use of “ama” contributes to this relation.

### Sentence middle “ama”

In the news genre, “ama” expresses Contrast and Denial of Preventer according to Neo Humean analysis of coherence relations. Following examples illustrate these relations.

(15) İnsanların yaşam biçimleri neyse, düşündükleri şey neyse rahatlıkla türküde söylemiş. Kadın türküleri de öyledir **ama**, benim söylemem doğru olmayacağı için albüme koyamıyorum. (From *Cumhuriyet* 2002).

In the example above, “ama” contributes to Denial of Preventer relation. The writer makes a comment about folk lyrics. Even though any issue is mentioned in the women folk lyrics, the writer cannot include these in the album. Hence, we can talk about a denial of preventer relation in this case.

(16) İnanoğlu, bu konuda “ Evet, böyle şeyler söyledim **ama** artık işlerim yoluna girdi. Bu nedenle Güzide ‘ yi dizide oynattım “ yorumunu yaptı. (From *Milliyet* 2002).

The person in the example above accepts that he has told something, but we infer in the second half of the sentence that he doesn't tell these things anymore. Hence, there is a contrastive relation here. The relation "ama" contributes to is Contrast (i) in which a relation is contrasted.

### Sentence final "ama"

In sentence final position, "ama" expresses Contrast and Violated Expectation in the news genre. Following examples may help to illustrate how "ama" contributes to these relations.

(17) AB'nin oyalama taktiği artık açık açık su yüzüne çıktı. Bizim de hayallerimiz suyun dibini boylamaya başladı. Hava güzel, su güzel, insanlar güzel, imajımız kötü **ama**. (From *Milliyet* 2002).

The relation identified in this example is Violated Expectation. Although at first sight the relation seems to be a contrastive one, the sentence starts with the beauty of air and people. Thus, there is a positive expectation about the image. However, this expectation about the image of the country is violated as the image is not as the ones depicted beautiful in the preceding sentence. That is why, the relation "ama" contributes here is Violated Expectation.

(18) Hayatı ile ilgili çarpıcı açıklamalarda bulunan Nihat Doğan içini dün akşam katıldığı bir program sonrası gazetecilere döktü. "Tüm yaşadıklarına rağmen hayatımı değiştirdiğimi sanıyordum, kaderimiz çok önceden çizilmiş **ama**" diyen Doğan bundan sonra geriye bakmayacağını söyledi. (From *Milliyet* 2000).

In this example, the relation "ama" contributes to is Violated Expectation relation. That is, the speaker thought he changed his life, but we infer that he couldn't. Thus, his expectations are not fulfilled but even violated. It is quite important to note that sentence final "ama" is generally preferred in instances of daily speech as reflected in the news.

### 3.2. Analysis of "Fakat"

Like "ama", "fakat" is analyzed in the same three genres and in three different positions in sentence. In each position, "fakat" contributes to different relations such as Occasion, Contrast, Result, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer. The corpus analysis revealed that "fakat" is preferred less when compared to "ama". In instances where two discourse markers can be used, generally "ama" is preferred more. Especially for sentence final position, no instances of "fakat" was detected.

#### 3.2.1. "Fakat" in Novel

In novel genre, "fakat" is analyzed in sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final positions. In a genre based on narration, results related to "fakat" revealed that this

discourse marker is used for coherence relations such as Contrast, Occasion and Violated Expectation in different positions in a sentence.

### Sentence initial “fakat”

In sentence initial position, “fakat” expresses coherence relations like Occasion, Contrast and Result. Compared to “ama”, “fakat” seems to contribute to different relations. Some of these relations are exemplified in the following.

(19) Ortalıkta hoş bir serinlik var. Anita, Wiltschko ‘ ların bahçe lambalarını henüz yakmamış. **Fakat**, annelerle babalar çocuklarını alıp gitmiş. Bahçede artık yalnızca okurumla benim mırıltılarım. . . (From *Romantik*, Adalet Ağaoğlu, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000).

In this sentence, “fakat” expresses Occasion (i) relation. According to Kehler (2002), first version of Occasion relation requires a situation centered round a system of entities. In this type of relation, we infer a change of state for a system of entities from S1 inferring the initial state for this system from S2. Although the sentence beginning with “fakat” seems to have no relation with the preceding sentence; in fact two sentences center on the same situation. In this sense, the writer narrates us the atmosphere.

(20) Son tahtayı yerinden oynattığında doğrulabildi ve dökülmeye başlayan toprağın bacaklarını örtmemesine dikkat ederek yukarıya uzanmaya çalıştı. **Fakat** bir anda önce dizlerine, sonra da yarı beline kadar gömüldü. (From *Puslu Kitalar Atlası*, İhsan Oktay Anar, İletişim Yayınları, 1995).

Here, “fakat” contributes to Contrast (i) relation. That is, we see contrasting the relation here between the sentences preceding “fakat” and the one including “fakat”. The person tries to reach upwards, but we understand that he can’t achieve it. Hence, there is a contrast between what the speaker tries to achieve and his situation described at the end of the sentence.

### Sentence middle “fakat”

“Fakat” in sentence middle position, contributes to Contrast and Violated Expectation for the novel genre. Corpus analysis revealed that “fakat” appears in the sentence initial position more than it appears in the sentence middle position. Following examples illustrate how “fakat” contributes to Contrast and Violated Expectation.

(21) Sözelimi biri hiç etek giymezdi. Şortluyken bakmıştım; bacakları fena değildi oysa. Başka biri Galatasaray kulübüne üyeydi, hiçbir maçı kaçırmıyordu, **fakat** futbol muhabbeti edecek şoförden başka insan bulamıyordu çevresinde; bunalıma giriyordu. (From *Kişilikler*, Kaan Aslanoğlu, Adam Yayınları, 1997).

In this example, “fakat” contributes to Contrast (ii) relation. That is, a person is narrated and this person’s contrasting features are given. Although this person is member of a sports club, he can not find one to talk. Thus, this example shows us how “fakat” contributes to a contrasting relation.

(22) O güzeller güzeli şehzade de kendi bedenini terketmiş, tıpkı onun gibi uçuyordu. Pencereden çıkıp göğe yükselmeye başladı. Bünyamin ona yetişmek istedi **fakat** şehzade kısa sürede gökteki yıldızların arasında kayboldu. (From *Puslu Kıtalar Atlası*, İhsan Oktay Anar, İletişim Yayınları, 1995).

“Fakat” contributes to Violated Expectation relation in this example. That is, Bünyamin wanted to reach to the prince, but this expectation is not realized. The prince disappeared among the stars, so Bünyamin’s expectations are violated.

#### **Sentence final “fakat”**

In novel genre, no instances of “fakat” in sentence final position are detected. In daily speech, “fakat” may appear in sentence final position, but in the written corpus, it was not found. For “ama” limited instances of final position were detected, but it is revealed that “fakat” is not preferred in the sentence final position.

#### **3.2.2. “Fakat” in Travel Notes**

Sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final analyses of “fakat” in travel notes genre have put forward that “fakat” contributes to Contrast, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer among Kehler’s (2002) Neo-Humean coherence relations in sentence initial and middle positions.

#### **Sentence initial “fakat”**

(23) Sao Paulo’ya vardığımızda günlük güneşlik bir hava bizi karşıladı. Neredeyse tek bir bulut bile yoktu gökyüzünde. Bütün o güzellikleri tek tek yaşamak vardı şimdi. **Fakat** tadını çıkaramayacak kadar halsizdik. (From *Bakır Tuval*, Hakan Şenocak, Gezi Yazısı, Atlas 2000).

In this example, “fakat” contributes to Violated Expectation relation. That is, the narrator talks about a sunny day. However, we infer that he cannot do what he wants to do due to fatigue. Hence, his expectations are violated and he could not do what he wanted to do.

(24) Giderken türlü türlü düşünceler aklımızdan geçiyordu. Örneğin ne yiyecektik? Midemizi bozma korkusu şimdiden bizi sarmıştı. **Fakat** yeni tatlar denemekten de çekinmeyecek gibi görünüyorduk. (From *Kılıç Avı*, Halim Diker, Gezi Yazısı, Atlas 2001).

Here, “fakat” expresses Denial of Preventer relation in Kehler’s (2002) terms. People described in the example are afraid of stomach problems, but they will probably taste different types of food. Hence, a preventer is denied and they will try different food even though they are afraid.

#### **Sentence middle “fakat”**

In sentence middle position, “fakat” contributes to Contrast, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer. In this respect, analyses revealed similar results for the contribution of “fakat” both in sentence initial and sentence middle positions. Following examples illustrate the use of “fakat” in sentence middle position.

(25) Bize rehberlik eden yerli, gün boyunca birçok turist grubunu dağın tepesindeki kutsal mağaralara götürmüştü. Halsizdi **fakat** gözlerinde içtenliğin ve mutluluğun ışıkları parlıyordu. (From *Kılıç Avı*, Halim Diker, Gezi Yazısı, Atlas 2001).

“Fakat” contributes to Contrast (ii) relation. In this type of relation, a set of properties are contrasted. As for the example, a person’s features are contrasted. His exhaustion is in contrast with his sincerity and happiness.

(26) Üstün bir umut ve coşku içinde hazırladığı Chatterton adlı operasını bir türlü oynatmak olanağı bulamamasının düş kırıklığı sonucu, ekmek parası kazanmaya öncelik vermiş, **fakat** sanatına saygısını sürekli korumuştur. (From *Kılıç Avı*, Halim Diker, Gezi Yazısı, Atlas 2001).

In this example, “fakat” expresses Violated Expectation relation. The person narrated in the lines above has priority for survival since he couldn’t find appropriate grounds for his opera play, but at the same time he kept his respect for his art. While dealing with survival, he is not expected to keep respect for his art. However, this situation is violated.

#### **Sentence final “fakat”**

Similar to sentence final “fakat” in the novel genre, no instances of “fakat” is found that appears in the sentence final position in the travel notes genre.

#### **3.2.3. “Fakat” in News**

The last genre “fakat” analyzed is the news genre. As for the relations “fakat” contributes to, the relations identified are Violated Expectation, Contrast and Denial of Preventer. Similar to novel, “fakat” does not appear in sentence final position.

#### **Sentence initial “fakat”**

In sentence initial position, “fakat” contributes to Violated Expectation and Contrast relation. Examples extracted from the data set illustrate how “ama” expresses these relations.

(27) Düzce’de askere alınmamayı kabullenemeyen Tahsin Esra Gezgin, benzin bidonuyla F. Çakmak Mahallesi ‘ndeki bir inşaatın 5. katına çıktı. Gezgin, olay yerine gelen Jandarma Yarbay Şenol Boyu ‘ya “Beni çürüğe ayırdınız **Fakat** asker kaçağı gibi devamlı tutuklanıyorum. Askerlik yapmak istiyorum” dedi. (From *Milliyet* 2003).

In this example, the relation “fakat” contributes to is Violated Expectation. The speaker in those lines is not eligible for military service. Since this is the case, he is expected not to go for his military service. However, this expectation is violated and he is arrested for not doing his military service.

(28) Gül, gazetecilerin AKP genel merkezi ve hükümet üyeleri arasındaki çelişkili açıklamaları anımsatması üzerine, bu yorumların doğruluk payı taşıdığını söyledi. Gül , “Yapılan farklı açıklamalar kamuoyunda temel politikalarından sapıldığı izlenimi yaratıyor. **Fakat** bu doğru değil. Temel politikalarından sapmıyoruz” dedi. (From *Milliyet* 2003).

We see a contrasting relation in this example to which “fakat” contributes. That is, the sentence preceding “fakat” and the sentence including “fakat” contrasts with each other. Since the relation is contrasted, the relation is Contrast (i).

#### **Sentence middle “fakat”**

In sentence middle position, “fakat” expresses Contrast, Denial of Preventer and Violated Expectation relations. Examples extracted from the corpus can give ideas about how “fakat” contributes to these relations.

(29) Garantili fonlar, yatırımcısına minimum bir getiri oranını taahhüt eder. Genelde, piyasaların yükselme potansiyelinden yararlanmak isteyen **fakat** piyasa düşüşlerinde anaparalarını korumak isteyen yatırımcılar için oluşturulmuş. Yatırımcılar belli bir süre bu fonlardan çıkmamayı taahhüt ediyor. (From *Radikal* 2002)

In this example, we can talk about a contrasting relation. The people in the example have ambitions which contradict with each other. Thus, we can infer Contrast (i) in which relation between two sentences is contrasted.

(30) Hakikaten nasıl oluyorsa oluyor, dünyanın en iyi pilotları bizde; **fakat** en çok pilotaj hatasına bu memleketin çocukları kurban gidiyor. (From *Radikal* 2002)

The relation “fakat” contributes to in this example is Violated Expectation. Since world’s best pilots are in this country, we do not expect to find mistakes related to piloting. However, this expectation is violated.

### **Sentence final “fakat”**

Corpus analysis has put forward that there is no instance in the news genre in which “fakat” is used in the sentence final position. This finding is in collaboration with the findings about “fakat” for novel and travel notes. In all these genres, “fakat” does not appear in the sentence final position.

### **3.3. Discussion**

The results of this study have indicated that Turkish discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” contributes to various coherence relations when used in sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final positions. Although the data is quite limited to make any generalization, how “ama” and “fakat” contribute to coherence relations differ according to different genres in the data set.

Results have put forward that both “ama” and “fakat” contribute to more relations when they are used in sentence middle position then sentence initial and sentence final positions. In general, these discourse markers contribute to Contrast, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer relations more than the other relations. All these relations are under the general title of Cause and Effect relations in Kehler’s (2002) terms. That is, limited corpus analysis in this study has indicated that “ama” and “fakat” generally contribute to Cause and Effect relations between sentences. There are also other types of relations identified; however they are not many in number when compared to Cause and Effect relations. In each genre, relations “ama” and “fakat” contribute to differ, but still Cause and Effect relations are the most common relations these markers express. This finding is in consistency with Üstünova’s (2006) findings who revealed that “ama” functions for Contrast, Conflict, Comparison and Cause and Effect relations. Likewise, on her study on Turkish discourse connectives, Kerslake (1992) asserts that “ama” and “fakat” have adversative functions. Her study is mainly based on Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) coherence relations, but compared to the findings in this study, Kerslake’s (1992) study would have valuable insights into the coherence relations “ama” and “fakat” contribute to. In this sense, what she calls as adversative relations may be compared to contrastive relations identified in this study. Hence, we can assume that one of the main functions of “ama” and “fakat” in written discourse is that of contrastive or in Kerslake’s terms adversative ones. In another study, Doğan (1994) asserts that “ama” may contribute to Contrast and Violated Expectation relation. The results of this study are also in collaboration with Doğan’s (1994) findings and it is revealed that “ama” and “fakat” may contribute to relations like Violated Expectation and Contrast. Actually, these are the most common relations identified in the corpus analysis. Baştürk’s (1994) article also supports these findings. According to Baştürk (1994) one of the main functions of “ama” is to denote contrastive relations between sentences.

This study yields that “ama” and “fakat” may have genre specific contributions to coherence relations. Results revealed that although these markers commonly contribute

to contrastive relations, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer are among the relations that these markers contribute to. In news genre, “ama” and “fakat” mostly express Contrast, but in travel notes along with Contrast, Denial of Preventer is a common relation these markers contribute to. Hempbel and Degand (2007) found that functions of sequencers as discourse connectives may function in different roles for academic writing, journalese and fiction. Similarly, limited number of data in this study has shown that discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” contribute to different relations in novel, travel notes and news. However, further studies are required to reveal the actual functions of these discourse markers in different genres.

Another aim of the study is to analyze discourse functions of “ama” and “fakat” according to their position in a sentence. For this purpose, each marker is analyzed in sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final positions. Results indicated that “ama” and “fakat” contributed to various relations depending on their positions. Although these markers are considered to have similar functions and used interchangeably, results have showed that “ama” is preferred more than “fakat” when contributing to contrastive relations. There are less instances of “fakat” identified in the corpus. What is interesting is although “ama” is used in sentence final position, there are no instances of “fakat” in sentence final position. When “fakat” is required in sentence final position, generally “ama” is preferred. In spoken Turkish, “fakat” may appear in the sentence final position, but it does not appear in this position in the written language. This finding is in consistency with Ceylan’s (2005) study. In her study, no instances of “fakat” were identified in sentence final position. Similar to the findings of this study, “fakat” is found to be used most commonly in sentence initial position. As for “ama”, it is also preferred more commonly in sentence initial position like “fakat”.

Results in this study pinpoint that when used in sentence initial position, both “ama” and “fakat” contribute to Cause and Effect relations like Contrast, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer. Ceylan’s (2005) findings indicate that “ama” contributes to Contrast, Emphasis, Conflict and Explanation when used in sentence initial position. In sentence middle position, “ama” denotes similar relations and in sentence final position “ama” is used for Emphasis. However, in this study “ama” in sentence final position also contributes to Contrast, Denial of Preventer and Violated Expectation. For “fakat”, Ceylan (2005) identified similar relations she identified for “ama” in sentence initial and sentence middle positions. Results of this study indicate slight differences for the contributions of “ama” and “fakat” to coherence relations. That is, these markers appear to express Cause and Effect relations more often in contrast to Ceylan’s (2005) findings. However, to claim exactly how these markers contribute to coherence relations, more studies are needed.

All in all, this study has put forward that “ama” and “fakat”, two commonly used but mostly ignored markers, may contribute to various relations when used in sentence initial, sentence middle and sentence final positions in three different genres. In general, it is obvious from corpus analysis that these markers along with other relations often contribute

to Cause and Effect relations like Contrast, Violated Expectation and Denial of Preventer in Kehler’s (2002) terms. However, it is not known what other contributions these markers may have when analyzed according to other categories of coherence relations proposed by other researchers. This study analyzed contributions of these markers according to Kehler’s (2002) Neo-Humean coherence relations and the results pinpointed how these markers express different relations in different genres and positions in a sentence.

### **Conclusion**

Contributions of discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” to coherence relations are not much investigated in the literature (Kerlake, 1992; Doğan, 1994; Üstünova, 2006). To date, there are a few studies concerned with the discourse functions of these markers. Based on the need for the analysis of “ama” and “fakat”, this study tried to fill the gap in the literature. In its basic terms, discourse markers are defined to connect two sentences and they lack meaning on their own. However, findings of the study put forward that discourse markers like “ama” and “fakat” function more than they are defined to connect sentences. In fact, they contribute to various relations in discourse as identified in this study.

Coherence relations Kehler (2002) proposed are appeared as plausible ones for the analysis of Turkish discourse markers “ama” and “fakat” and their contributions to coherence. Results in general indicated that these markers contribute to Cause and Effect relations more often depending on their position in a sentence. This study has an original attempt to investigate “ama” and “fakat” in three different genres and three different positions in a sentence. In this respect, results provide valuable insights into understanding what kind of coherence relations these markers contribute to in written discourse. However, still not much is known about the discourse functions of these markers. Hence, more studies would shed further light on how these markers function in both written and spoken discourse.

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ümit Deniz Turan for her valuable comments throughout this study. She deserves special appreciation for giving feedback with a critical eye. I also owe special thanks to colleagues working for METU Turkish Corpus for giving me permission to use the data in the corpus.

### **References**

- Altunay, D. (2007). Neden-etki İlişkisi Bağlaçları ve Metinde Bağdaşıklık. XXI. Ulusal Dilbilim Kurultayı Bildirileri, (in press). 10-11 Mayıs 2007, Mersin.
- Ariel, M. (1994). “Pragmatic Operators”. The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 3250-3253.

- Bakhtin, M.M. (2006). "Discourse in the Novel". In *The Novel: Anthology of Criticism and Theory*. Ed. Dale, H.J. Blackwell Publishing: New York.
- Baştürk, M. (1995). "'ama' Bağlacına İletişimsel Sözcelem Açısından Bir Bakış". *Dil Dergisi*, 34. 22-25.
- Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic Constraints and Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bolulu, O. (1991). "Yine İlgeç ve Bağlaçlar". *Türk Dil Dergisi*, 24. 48-53.
- Canan, S. 2001. "'ama' bağlacı". Retrieved on November, 2009 from [www.sinancanan.net/dusunce/ama/htm].
- Ceylan, N. (2005). *Haldun Taner'in Öykülerinde Cümle Bağlayan Bağlaçlar*. Unpublished (MA. Dissertation). Çukurova University.
- Çelik, M. (1999). "'da'nın İşlevleri". *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 25-32.
- Doğan, G. (1994). "'ama' Bağlacına Edimbilimsel Bir Bakış". In *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, (eds.) İmer, K., Kocaman, A., Özsoy, S. Ankara: Hitit Yayınları.
- Erk-Emeksiz, Z. (2006). *Discourse functions of negative markers in Turkish*. Retrieved on December, 2009 from [www.conference.slu.se/turkling/program/programme060801.pdf]
- Fraser, B. (1990). *An Approach to Discourse Markers*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: 383-395.
- Fraser, B. (1999). *What are Discourse Markers?* *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31. 931-952.
- Gencan, T. N. (2001). *Dilbilgisi*. Ankara: Ayraç Yayınları.
- Hacıeminoglu, N. (1992). *Türk Dilinde Edatlar*. İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, Öğretmen Kitapları Dizisi: 193.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. New York: Longman Press.
- Hempbel, S. and Degand, L. (2007). *Sequencers in Different text Genres: Academic Writing, Journalese and Fiction*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (in press), 1-18.
- Hengirmen, (1999). *Dilbilgisi ve Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Engin Yayınevi.
- Hutchinson, B. (2004). *Acquiring the Meaning of Discourse Markers*. Retrieved on January, 2008 from [http://acl.ldc.upenn.edu/P/P04/P04-1087.pdf]
- Izutsu, M. N. (2007). *Contrast, concessive, and corrective: Toward a Comprehensive Study of Opposition Relations*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, (in press). 1-30.

Jenness, J and Wynne, J. J. (2007). Cohen's Kappa and Classification Table Metrics 2.1a: An ArcView 3x Extension for Accuracy Assessment of Spatially-Explicit Models. Retrieved on January, 2009 fr. [[http://www.jennessent.com/arcview/kappa\\_stats.htm](http://www.jennessent.com/arcview/kappa_stats.htm)]

Kehler, A. (2002). *Coherence, Reference and the Theory of Grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kerslake, C. (1992). The role of Connectives in Discourse Construction in Turkish. In *Modern Studies in Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, (ed.) Konrot, A. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları. 77-104.

Kich, M. (2007). Some notes on the travel narrative, with special emphasis on Tony Horwitz's *One for the Road: Hitchhiking through the Australian Outback*. [Retrieved on December 20, 2007 from <http://www.wright.edu/~martin.kich/BookBox/Travel.htm>]

Knott, A. and Sanders, T. (1998). The Classification of Coherence Relations and their Linguistic Markers: an Exploration of two Languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30. 135-175.

Korkmaz, Z. (2004). "Bağlaçlar ve Türkiye Türkçe'sindeki Oluşumları". *Türk Dili Dergisi*, 638. 118-125.

Lenk, U. (1998). "Discourse Markers and Global Coherence in Conversation". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30. 245-257.

Maat, H. P. (1998). "Classifying Negative Coherence Relations on the Basis of Linguistic Evidence". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30. 177-204.

Maat, H. P. and Sanders, T. (2006). "Connectives in Text". In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, Vol. 3. (Ed.) Brown, K. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing. 33-41.

Polanyi, L. and Scha, R. (1983). The syntax of Discourse. *Text*, 3. 261-270.

Redeker, G. (1990). Ideational and Pragmatic Markers of Discourse Structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(3). 367-381.

Risselada, R. and Spooren, W. (1998). "Introduction: Discourse markers and coherence relations". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30. 131-133.

Rüstemova, C.R. (2007). "Türk Dilinin Öğretiminde Terim Sorunları". [Retrieved on December 7, 2007 from <http://www.study-turkce.com/M/term.htm>].

Say, B., Özge, U. and Oflazer, K. (2003). "Bilgisayar Ortamında Bir Derlem Geliştirme Çalışması". *Akademik Bilişim Konferansı*. Konya, February, 2002.

- Schffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taboada, M. (2006). "Discourse Markers as Signals (or not) of Rhetorical Relations". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38. 567-592.
- Üstünova, K. (2006). "Ama'nın İşlevleri". *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10 (1). 79-92.
- Vivanco, V. (2005). "The Absence of Connectives and the Maintenance of Coherence In Publicity Texts". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37. 1233-1249.
- Yılmaz, E. (2004). *A pragmatic Analysis of Turkish Discourse Particles: "yani", "işte" and "şey"* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Middle East Technical University.