Semi-grammaticalized and Pragmatic Means of Common Ground Management in Turkish

Türkçede Yarı Dilbilgiselleşmiş ve Kullanımbilimsel Yollarla Ortak Alan Yönetimi

Kadri Kuram

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Bartın Üniversitesi
Edebiyat Fakültesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü, Bartın/Türkiye
e-posta   kadrikuram@gmail.com
orcid   0000-0001-8829-5680
doi   10.54316/dilarastirmalari.1342780

ÖZ

Bu çalışma yarı dilbilgiselleşmiş ve söylemsel araçlarla Türkçede Ortak Alan (OA) yönetiminin nasıl yapıldığını derlem verilerini kullanarak örneklemektedir. Bu araçlar yedi söylem belirleyicisi (*hani, işte, ha, hah, ee, evet, hıı*) ve bir eylemcil klitiktir *(=ya)*. OA yönetiminin iki alt türü bulunmaktadır: bilgisel yönetim ve yapısal yönetim (Grzech, 2020a,b). Bilgisel yönetim bilgi haklarının konuşmacılar arasında nasıl dağıldığını belirlerken yapısal yönetim konuşmanın hangi yönde ilerleyeceğinin belirlenmesidir. Çalışmanın verileri *hani, işte* ve *=ya*'nın paylaşılan bilgi yoluyla bilgisel yönetim gerçekleştirdiğini, *işte, ha, hah, ee, evet* ve *hıı*'nın ise konuşmayı belli bir yönde ilerletmek için sözcelendiğini göstermektedir. Söylem belirleyicilerinin ikisinin çok anlamlı olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bu belirleyiciler OA'ı birden fazla şekilde yönetebilmektedir. *İşte* hem bilgisel hem yapısal yönetim için kullanılabilirken *hıı* yapısal yönetimin üç alt türünü gerçekleştirebilmektedir: hatırlama, onaylama, onaylama ve dinleyiciyi konuyu devam ettirmeye davet etme. Çalışmanın verileri Ulusal Türkçe Derlem'den (TNCv3.0) sağlanmıştır.
Anahtar Kelimeler: Söylem belirleyicileri, Ortak Alan yönetimi, paylaşılan bilgi, *hani, işte, ha, hah, ee, evet, hıı, =ya*

ABSTRACT

This paper uses corpus data to exemplify Common Ground (CG) management via semi-grammaticalized and pragmatic means in Turkish. These means are seven discourse markers (*hani, işte, ha, hah, ee, evet, hıı*) and a verbal enclitic (*=ya*). CG management has two subtypes: epistemic and structural management (Grzech,

2020a,b). Epistemic management concerns how epistemic rights are distributed among interlocutors while structural management concerns how the conversation will develop in the immediate future. Data show that *hani, işte* and *=ya* manage the epistemics of CG by way of shared information while *işte, ha, hah, ee, evet* and *hıı* are uttered to lead the conversation in a specific direction. Two of the discourse markers are shown to be polysemic, i.e. they serve to manage CG in multiple ways. *İşte* may be uttered for epistemic CG management as well as structural management. *Hıı*, on the other hand, serves three subtypes of structural CG management: remembering, approving, and approving and inviting the addressee to develop the topic. The data are drawn from Turkish National Corpus (TNCv3.0).

Keywords: Discourse markers, Common Ground management, shared information, *hani, işte, ha, hah, ee, evet, hıı, =ya*

0. Introduction

In Kuram (2023), I show, using corpus data, how Turkish past evidential markers (*-DI* and *-mIş*) are used for epistemic Common Ground (CG) management, i.e., how the speaker and addressee are epistemically related to the utterance content that the speaker offers to be accepted as a fact in the conversation. Tense markers of Turkish are grammaticalized lexical items: They form dependency relations with other lexical items, such as temporal adverbs. They are also strictly fixed in their syntactico-morphological position. However, being a pragmatic phenomenon, CG is usually managed by pragmatic means, such as particles (Grzech, 2020a,b), question-answer pairs (Krifka 2007) and primacy-imposing utterances (Pomerantz 1984). Drawing data form Turkish National Corpus TNCv3.0, this paper attempts to describe how seven discourse markers and a verbal enclitic are used by Turkish speakers to manage the two facets of CG: epistemics and structure. It is organized as follows. §1 is the theoretical framework where the notions Common Ground and Common Ground Management are summarized. Two types of CG management are also differentiated in §1: epistemic and structural CG management. In §2.1, I show how the discourse markers *hani*, *işte* and the enclitic *=ya* manage the epistemics of CG by marking information shared between the speaker and addressee. §2.2 is devoted to the markers used for structural CG management. These are *ha, hah, ee, evet, hıı* (and its variant *ha*) and *işte*. Two of the discourse markers described in this paper (*işte* and *hıı*) are polysemic. They appear in the data with multiple functions. *Hıı* has three functions that can be subsumed under CG alignment (structural CG management) while *işte* may mark shared information (epistemic CG management) and resumption (structural CG management). Each function is differentiated via numbers in superscripts, e.g. *işte*[1] and *işte*[2].

1. Common Ground (Management)

As interlocutors converse, they build the exchanged information on a set of presupposed facts or referents that they mutually agree to hold true. This is known as Common Ground (CG): "[…] the mutually recognized shared information in a situation in which an act of trying to communicate takes place […]" (Stalnaker 2002: 704). Once all interlocutors recognize a referent or acknowledge a fact and become aware that the other interlocutors share their mental state, the referent or fact is in CG among them. Presupposed facts and referents in CG can be made explicit by linguistic means. For instance, the past marker *-mIştI* is used for past events jointly experienced by the speaker and the addressee (Erguvanlı-Taylan 2000, Kuram 2023). In (1), A refers to an event that is common ground between A and B as they went to that restaurant together. B remembers and replies with another *-mIştI* sentence.

(1) A: Seninle Beşiktaş'ta bir restoranta git-mişti-k
    With you Beşiktaş   a restaurant   go-CG-1PL
    'You and I went to a restaurant in Beşiktaş.'

   B: Evet. Hatırlıyorum. Istakoz ye-mişti-k
    Yes. I remember.   Lobster eat-CG-1PL
    'Yes. I remember. We ate lobster.'

Alternatively, a referent may be situationally available to the interlocutors. A porcupine (a referent) in a room two people walk in and immediately notice is naturally part of the CG between them. This also makes the information that there is a porcupine in the room part of the CG.

New items can be added to CG as long as all interlocutors agree on the update, which requires the interlocutor wishing to add an item to use the right linguistic forms and communicational strategies. Krifka (2007) makes a distinction between what is readily available in CG and how CG is updated. He calls the former CG content and the latter CG management. According to Krifka (2007), interlocutors use information structure-related forms and strategies as they introduce an item to CG, marking, for instance, its importance (focus) or how it relates to CG content (new or continued topic). Grzech (2016, 2020a, b), on the other hand, adds a distinction to CG management. She argues that in addition to how a proposed item is related to CG content (viz. new topic, elaboration or important topic as proposed by Krifka 2007) it should also be marked for how the interlocutors are epistemically related to the proposed item. Grzech (2016, 2020a, b) refers to Krifka's (2007) notion as structural CG management since it concerns how CG will develop, while referring to her new notion as epistemic CG management since it concerns how interlocutors are epistemically related to the proposed item. Structural and epistemic CG management are detailed below.

The notion of CG requires that all interlocutors in a speech environment agree on a set of facts they build the conversation on and referents they refer to. Therefore, every time an interlocutor wishes to introduce an item to CG, this needs to be approved by all interlocutors without anyone challenging the truth of a proposed

DiL
araştırmaları

fact or existence of a referent. To this end, the interlocutor may impose their epistemic primacy regarding the item or they may indicate that the item is already known to everyone in the conversation (shared information) (Clark and Brennan 1991, Grzech 2020a,b). Epistemic primacy refers to a situation where the speaker has a better understanding or deeper knowledge of the information in the sentence than the addressee. It roughly translates to "I know and you don't" while shared information translates to "Both you and I know this". Therefore, while primacy marking imposes a fact, shared information seeks approval or challenge of the group. For example, by referring to a past event the speaker and addressee jointly experienced, the speaker seeks the addressee's approval that they recall the event and that it is now part of the CG (cf. (1)). Once the addressee approves, the speaker can build on the new version of the CG. Alternatively, the speaker may introduce an item that is contextually, culturally or linguistically salient to both speaker and addressee. This could be a referent in the speech environment (the porcupine in the room) or a culturally shared fact (traditions, social codes etc.). In either case, by marking an item as shared information, the speaker seeks the addressee's approval that the item is in CG.

Structural CG management, on the other hand, concerns the information structural relevance of an item an interlocutor offers to write in CG. By marking the item's relevance, the interlocutor shows how they intend to develop the conversation. This allows the interlocutor to manage the structure of CG. I will mention two pragmatic moves performed by interlocutors for structural CG management: question formation and (pragmatic) focus which can be used for correcting, confirming and presenting new and newsworthy information (Lambrecht, 1994), or in Krifka's (2007) terms the chosen one among a set of alternatives. Questions do not add factual information but indicate how the speaker wishes to develop CG in the immediate future (Krifka, 2007). By asking a question, the interrogator limits the possible updates of CG to the specific proposition or referent in the question. (2) is Krifka's question-answer pair that shows two structural CG management moves.

(2) A: Who stole the cookie?

　　B: [PEter]$_F$ stole the cookie.

　　　Ordinary meaning of the answer: {STOLE(COOKIE)(PETER)}

　　　Focus-induced alternatives: {STOLE(COOKIE)(x) | x $\in$ ENTITY}

(Krifka 2007: 22)

By seeking information about the identity of cookie-stealer, A restricts B's conversational move to an answer. B complies and focuses *Peter* for the pragmatic meaning that Peter is the new information, or the information sought in CG among possible alternatives. B's focus on Peter marks how the utterance is linked to CG: providing the missing piece of information and offering a possible path of development. In short, epistemic CG management is the linguistic exposition of who has the rights to write which piece of information in CG while structural CG management concerns how CG should develop.

2. CG Management Through Non-grammaticalized Markers

Like all languages, Turkish has dozens of discourse markers serving various communicative goals. Özbek (1998) reports she has encountered as many as 65 discourse markers in her database. Naturally, it is not possible to illustrate how each marker is related to CG management or whether they are involved in CG management. Therefore, I will only discuss seven of them and the verbal enclitic *=ya*.

2.1. Epistemic CG Management

In this section, I will describe three markers that manage the epistemics of CG in Turkish by way of shared information: *hani*, *=ya* and *işte*[1].

2.1.1. *Hani*

As a matter of fact, *hani* has already been described by Erguvanlı-Taylan (2000), who argues that it marks shared information where the speaker confronts the addressee about a previous statement. Erguvanlı-Taylan (2000) argues that *hani* is dependent on the past marker *-IDI* on the verb and should, therefore, be classified as a semi-grammatical marker. The grammaticality contrast in (3) shows Erguvanlı-Taylan's (2000) point.

    (3) a.   *Hani sen Galatasaraylı-sın

          you a supporter of Galatasaray-2SG

       b. Hani sen Galatasaraylı-ydı-n

          you a supporter of Galatasaray-PST-2SG

          'I thought you were a supporter of Galatasaray.'

<div align="right">(Erguvanlı-Taylan 2000: 135-136)</div>

However, Göksel, Kelepir and Üntak-Tarhan (2009) and Akar and Öztürk (2019) show that marking shared information and confronting the addressee are two different components of the pragmatics of *hani* and that there are cases where it marks shared information without confrontation. It stops interacting with any other marker when it is used for the sole purpose shared information. In this function, it is a discourse marker uttered for CG management (Akar and Öztürk, 2019). I will show in this section the empirical evidence of this observation made by Akar and Öztürk (2019) and add that *hani* falls into epistemic CG management in the distinction made in §1. *Hani* appears several times in (4) so that the speaker updates CG. Each time, she intends to write a state of affairs in CG as a fact. To this end, she marks it as shared information between the addressee and herself, seeking approval or challenge. It first appears in line [2] where B mentions a commonplace fact: that one sees things better as one matures mentally. She prefaces *hani* to highlight her assumption that her addressee shares this observation, so that it should be written in CG and she can build her following utterances on it. It appears again in [10] where she says professors give students information, another fact that should be shared by the addressee. It appears two more times where the speaker mentions the difference between theory and

practice and the well-known saying in Turkish about the difference between them in [15] and [16].

(4) [1] A: Anladım, haklısın aslında şöyle bi düşününce

'I understand, when you think about it you are right, actually.'

[2] B: Artı düşünüyorum şimdi, **hani** insan bi şeyleri olgunlaştıkça beyin olarak

'Plus I am thinking about it now, when one's mind matures […]'

[3] Daha iyi anlıyo, açık konuşmak gerekirse, mesela bakıyosun sınıfımda mesela

'One understands better, to be honest, for example when you look at my class'

[4] Bildiğin öküz dersin ya, öküz cinsi

'Idiots, they are complete idiots.'

[5] A: <laughter> Ayy!

[6] B: Bu insanlarla aynı eğitimi görüyosun, tamam mı? Aynı eğitimi görüyosun.

'You are getting the same education as these people, OK? Same education.'

[7] Belki başarı olarak, akademik başarı olarak onlardan çok daha iyi olabilirsin; fakat

'You may be academically much better than them; but'

[8] Okul, emin ol akademik başarıyla işteki başarının birbiriyle hiç alakası yok.

'School, trust me, academic success has nothing to do with success in business.'

[9] Ben şunu da iddia etmiyorum, yine söylüyorum: Şu an, mesela okuldaki hocalarım,

'I don't claim this, either, I am saying again: my professors in the university'

[10] **Hani** bilgi veriyorlar, **işte**[1] işletme bilgisidir. Ama şunu söyliyim,

'You know, they are giving information, business information. But let me tell you this.'

[11] bu hocalar gitsinler turizm sektörüne, emin ol hiç başarılı olamazlar.

'If these professors actually work in tourism, trust me, they will fail.'

[12] A: Neden?

'Why?'

[13] B: Çünkü teoriyle pratik çok farklı şeyler.

'Because theory and practice are two different things.'

[14] Bir şeyi bilmekle bir şeyi yapmak birbirinden çok ayrı kavramlar

'Knowing something and doing that thing are very different concepts.'

[15] **Hani** bir şeyi çok iyi bilebilirsin ama çok iyi yapabilirsin demek değil bu

'You may know something very well, but it doesn't mean you can do it well.'

[16] **Hani** bi laf vardır, çok okuyan mı bilir çok gezen mi bilir?

'There is a saying. Who knows better? The one that reads a lot or the one that travels a lot?'

(TNCv3.0, S-BEABXO-0358-2126)

2.1.2. =Ya

=Ya has also been described as a shared information marker in Turkish (Özbek 1998, Adıgüzel 2023). Abundant examples are also found in TNC. In (5), A is trying to add a referent (anchor) to CG that is situationally available both to the speaker and the addressee. Therefore, she tags two utterances with *=ya* to establish its existence. As B indicates that she is not fixed on the anchor yet – that update by way of shared information is not accepted – A utters two more utterances tagged with *=ya*. *=Ya* also occurs in (6) below in combination with *hani* and the grammaticalized shared information marker for past reference *-mIştI* (Erguvanlı-Taylan 2000), reinforcing the fact that it is shared information between the speaker and addressee (line [5] of (6)).

(5) [1] A: Bak şu şey   var=**ya**. Çapa var=**ya**.   Onu aşağı bırak-ıyor-lar.
          'Look! There is that thing. There is an anchor. They drop it down.'

   [2] B: Ne? Anlamadım.
          'What? I don't understand.'

   [3] A: Çapa   var=**ya**. Kayığın üzerinde var=**ya**
          'There is an anchor. There is (an anchor) on the boat.'

   [4] B: **Ee?**
          And?

   [5] A: Onu denize atıyolar. Hiç bir yere gemi gidemiyor.
          'They drop it in the sea. The ship then stays still.'

(TNCv3.0, S-BEABXr-0078-1)

2.1.3. İşte[1]

İşte is another discourse marker described for various functions (Özbek, 1998, 2000; Yılmaz 2004). Here, I will mention two functions of *işte* serving epistemic and structural CG management. In (6), A mentions an engagement ceremony and B asks whose engagement ceremony A is referring to, lines [1] and [2]. A now is in a position to introduce a referent to CG. She marks the referent (Esra) with *işte* assuming that B knows the referent. That A is referring to a referent known by the addressee is evident in [5]. As B makes it clear that she cannot recall Esra with question intonation [4], A uses three more shared information markers in her following utterance: *hani, -mIştı, =ya*.

(6) [1] A: Pazar günü nişan var **ha**. Gelirsin.

     'There is an engagement ceremony on Sunday. You should be there.'

  [2] B: Kimin?

     'Whose [engagement ceremony]?'

  [3] A: Esra'nın **işte**[1]

     Esra's

  [4] B: Esra?

  [5] A: Şu şey.   **Hani** bir kere buraya gel**mişlerdi=ya**. Cetvelden benim arkadaşlar dedim.

     'This thing. They came here once. I told you they are my friends from Cetvel.'

[6] B: **Haa**!   Ben durmadım ki orda.

     'I didn't stay there.'

                         (TNCv3.0, S-BEABXO-0071-701)

2.2. Structural CG Management

2.2.1. *Ha* (focus)

Ha is a focus particle that signals the importance of the utterance content (Akar 1998). Speakers use *ha* when they wish to lead the conversation in the way they see relevant. We see it in (6) where A introduces the engagement ceremony and marks it as newsworthy information. This indicates A's aim to establish between A and B the fact that there is a ceremony on Sunday and to develop the conversation on this topic. (7) presents another conversational situation where the speaker introduces a new topic of discussion tagged with *ha* indicating her desire to update CG so that it includes the topic. In the extended context, two women are talking about how a woman is beating her children. A sees a jumpsuit and introduces the fact that the specific type is a trending one with an utterance tagged with *ha* [3]. B complies with A's attempt to redirect the conversation and replies with a comment on the jumpsuit [4].

(7) [1] A: Eveet. Bak bak bak şimdi nasıl dövecek. Onları ordan nasıl geçircek şimdi?

     'Yes. Look look look how she will beat them. How will she make them pass through it now?'

  [2] B: 3 tane çocuk.

     'Three children.'

  [3] A: Bak şu tulumlar da moda **ha**.

     'Look those jumpsuits are in trend.'

  [4] B: **Hıı**[2] herkeste aynısından var ya herkeste

     'Everybody has one of these, everybody.'

  [5] A: Dimi bu güzel ama bu güzel yakışmış.

     'Right. But this one is nice. This one looks good.'

[6] B: Rengi güzel.

'The colour is nice.'

2.2.2. *hah* (alignment), *işte²* (resumption), *ee*? and *evet*? (approve and invite)

The remaining markers to be described here can be subsumed under *alignment*. These markers indicate that the speaker remembers an item (referent or fact) or accepts the update offered. I will exemplify four of them in one conversation: ee?, evet?, *hah* and *işte²*. In (8), A starts a new topic with inadequate details: Dilek's boyfriend called me. B agrees to continue the conversation with this. She approves that the call is now in CG and invites A to develop the topic with *ee?* with question intonation [2]¹. A complies and develops the topic by saying that Dilek is apparently in Antep and A did not know this until her boyfriend called. B feels she needs to provide the background of the event and says Dilek went there for a wedding. This utterance is marked with the shared information marker *=ya* (§2.1.2). Since this has introduced another fact to CG, it needs to be approved. A approves that the fact that she went there for a wedding is now in CG by uttering *evet?* (yes?) [5]. Again, the question intonation is an invitation to develop the topic further (Özcan 2015 Özcan and Aksan 2017). B utters in [6] *hah* and *işte²*. *Hah* signals that B sees that CG is finally aligned while *işte* signals how the following utterance is related to CG: It is a follow-up to what happened after Dilek went to Antep, i.e. after the point in narration A and B are now aligned.²

(8) [1] A: Dilek'in sevgilisi aradı, Onur.

'Dilek's boyfriend called (me), Onur.'

[2] B: **ee?**

And?

[3] A: Dedi işte Dilek kaç gündür Antep'teydi. Kaç gündür Antep'teymiş haberim yok.

'He said Dilek has been in Antep for days. Apparently, she has been in Antep for several days and I know nothing about it.'

[4] B: Düğün için gitti **ya**

'She went (there) for a wedding.'

[5] A: **Evet?**

Yes?

[6] B: **Hah! İşte²** çok hastalanmış son gün.

'She got very sick on the last day (of her visit)'

(TNCv3.0, S-BEABXO-0345-1)

---

¹ We also see *ee?* in line [4] of (5). After A repeatedly refers to an anchor visible to both A and B using the shared information marker *=ya*, B approves the CG update and invites A to develop the topic with *ee?*.

² *İşte* has already been described for resumption by Özbek (1998, 2000) and Yılmaz (2004). Also, *işte* is uttered in [3] of (8) to introduce reported speech, a function also described by Özbek (1998, 2000) and Yılmaz (2004).

2.2.3 *hıı*[1] and *haa* (remember) *hıı*[2] (approve)

Next is another alignment marker *hıı* and its variant *haa*. They are used to signal remembering an item marked as shared information, approving an update (Çakır Sarı, 2020), and approving and inviting to develop the topic further.[3] In (9), the topic starts with a confusion about which Sinem is being talked about. As A repeats the subject's full name [3], B replies with *hıı*[1] signalling the alignment regarding the referent [4]. Now both A and B have Sinem Kılıç in CG. A then says Sinem feels bad about something and asks why. B says she does not know why [6] - [7]. A remembers the reason indicated by her uttering *hıı*[1]. She then explains why she feels bad: She failed in German. B repeats the utterance in question form, seeking confirmation that she understood correctly, and CG is aligned [9]. A utters another *hıı*[2], this time approving B's inquiry about alignment [10]. She elaborates on it in [11]. *Hıı*[2] for simple approval without invitation also appears in [4] of (7) where B approves A's move to update the CG using the focus marker *ha*.

(9) [1] A: Sinem Burda mı? Sinem Kılıç.

       'Is Sinem here?   Sinem Kılıç.'

  [2] B: Yok burda değil. Tarsus'ta.

       'No, she's not here. She's in Tarsus.'

  [3] A: Sinem Kılıç.

  [4] B: **Hıı**[1] Sinem Kılıç burda.

       'Sinem Kılıç is here.'

  [5] A: Gitmedi mi? Dur ben ona mesaj mı atsam napsam?

       'Hasn't she left? Should I text her or what?'

  [6] A: Onun sınavla ilgili bir sorun çıkmış. Çok kötüydü. Niye?

       'Apparently, a problem occurred about one of her exams. She was feeling terrible. Why was that?'

  [7] B: Bilmiyorum. Sinem söyledi telefonda.

       'I don't know. Sinem said so on the phone.'

  [8] A: **Hıı**[1] Almanca'dan kaldı.

       'She failed in German.'

  [9] B: Almanca'dan mı kalmış?

       'She failed in German?'

  [10] A: **Hıı**[2] face'te söyledi.

       'She said so on Facebook.'

                       (TNCv3.0, S-BEABXB-0003-1606)

The *haa* variant of *hıı*[1] for remembering appears in (6) repeated as (10) below, which also exemplifies various other CG management markers. To repeat, A introduces the topic to CG with a focus marker indicating its importance relative

---

[3] Also see Özcan (2015) for approval and invitation functions of *hı-hı, mm* and *hmm*.

to the current CG content: There is an engagement ceremony. After A sees B cannot recall who Esra the bride is. She mentions people visiting her from Cetvel marking the utterance with the shared information markers *hani,* and *=ya*. To this, B utters *haa* [7] showing her recollection of the day. By uttering *haa*, B signals the CG is aligned. She then says she did not stay to meet Esra that day.

(10) [1] A: Pazar günü nişan var **ha**. Gelirsin.

‘There is an engagement ceremony on Sunday. You should be there.’

[2] B: Kimin?

‘Whose [engagement ceremony]?’

[3] A: Esra’nın **işte¹**

Esra’s

[4] B: Esra?

[5] A: Şu şey. **Hani** bir kere buraya gelmişlerdi=**ya.** Cetvelden benim arkadaşlar dedim.

‘This thing. They came here once. I told you they are my friends from Cetvel.’

[7] B: **Haa**! Ben durmadım ki orda.

‘I didn’t stay there.’

(TNCv3.0, S-BEABXO-0071-701)

2.2.4 *hıı³* (approve and invite)

Finally, *hıı* is used with question intonation in (11) as in *ee* and *yes* in (5) and (8). In the extended context, A and B are talking about how Gizem and her boyfriend bonded. A starts with an utterance saying she (Gizem) once went to Ankara for visa application. She marks this utterance with *=ya*, indicating that this is shared information between A and B and seeking B’s approval of CG alignment [1]. B’s uttering *hıı* with question intonation indicates her approval and invitation to develop the topic [2]. Then A elaborates on what happened in Ankara.

(11) [1] A: Bu vize için Ankara’ya gitmişti=**ya**

‘She went to Ankara for visa.’

[2] B: **hıı?**

And?

[3] A: Çocuk da gitmiş o sırada. Dönüşte Adana’ya gelmişler. Baya gezmişler.

‘The guy went there at the same time. They came to Adana on their way back. They traveled a lot.’

3. Conclusion

This paper described with corpus examples how seven discourse markers and a verbal enclitic are used for epistemic and structural Common Ground management in Turkish. There are two epistemic configurations that can occur between the speaker and addressee for epistemic CG management: epistemic primacy (of the speaker) and shared information (Grzech 2020a, b): The speaker may have epistemic primacy over the addressee or the speaker and the addressee may share the information in an utterance. Both of these epistemic configurations are marked by the speaker so that their offer to update CG with a specific content is agreed upon. The markers here (*hani, işte, =ya*) *only* manage CG with shared information. Structure of CG, on the other hand, is managed in two ways: Focusing an item so that the addressee knows that the item is important allows the speaker to develop the conversation in a specific way (*ha*) and marking the alignment of the interlocutors so that the conversation may continue with the new version of CG. The latter has subtypes where the speaker may (i) simply approve CG alignment (*hah, hı*[1] and *hı*[2]) (ii) approve CG alignment and invite the addressee to develop the topic (*hı*[3], *ee* and *evet*) and (iii) mark the following CG update as a follow-up to the latest approved update (*işte*[2]). Figure 1 is the summary of the findings in this paper.

Marker	Type	Function	Meaning
Hani	ECGM	Shared information	You and I know this
Ya	ECGM	Shared information	You and I know this
İşte[1]	ECGM	Shared information	You and I know this
İşte[2]	SCGM	Alignment	I will resume the topic
Hah	SCGM	Alignment	I see we are on the same page
Ha	SCGM	Focus	This is important
Hı[1]	SCGM	Alignment	I remember
Hı[2]	SCGM	Alignment	I approve
Hı[3]	SCGM	Alignment	I approve and invite you to develop further
Ee	SCGM	Alignment	I approve and invite you to develop further
Evet	SCGM	Alignment	I approve and invite you to develop further

Figure 1. (Some of the) Common Ground managing discourse markers in Turkish.

4. References

ADIGÜZEL, Fatih M. (2023). "The Functional Spectrum of the Turkish Pragmatic Marker *Ya"*. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 212/2023: 58-71.

AKAR, Didar (1988). "Interjections in Turkish". *Proceedings of the IV. International Conference on Turkish Linguistics* (Eds. Sabri Koç). Middle East Technical University, 265-274.

AKAR, Didar; ÖZTÜRK, Balkız (2020). "The discourse marker hani in Turkish. In Pierre-Yves Modicom and Olivier Duplâtre". *Information-Structural Perspectives on Discourse Particles*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 213-251.

ÇAKIR SARI, Hamide (2020). Türkçe Öğretmenlerinin Söylem Belirleyicisi Kullanımı. *Dil Dergisi*, 171/1, 75-90.

CLARK, Herbert. H.; BRENNAN, Susan. E. (1991). "Grounding in communication". *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (Eds. L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley). American Psychological Association, 127–149.

ERGUVANLI-TAYLAN, Eser (2000). "Semi-grammaticalized modality in Turkish". *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages* (Eds. Aslı Göksel-Celia Kerslake). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 113–143.

GÖKSEL, Aslı; KELEPIR, Meltem; ÜNTAK-TARHAN, Aslı (2009). "Decomposition of question intonation: The structure of response seeking utterances". *Phonological domains: Universals and deviations* (Eds. Janet Grijzenhout-Barış Kabak). Mouton De Gruyter, 249-286.

GRZECH, Karolina (2016). *Discourse enclitics in Tena Kichwa: A corpus-based account of information structure and epistemic meaning*. Doctoral dissertation, SOAS: University of London.

GRZECH, Karolina (2020a). "Managing Common Ground with epistemic marking: 'Evidential' markers in upper Napo kichwa and their functions in interaction". *Journal of Pragmatics, 168*/2020: 81-97.

GRZECH, Karolina (2020b). "Epistemic primacy, Common Ground management, and epistemic perspective". *Evidentiality, egophoricity, and engagement* (Eds. Berqgvist-Seppo Kittilä) Berlin: Language Science Press, 23-60.

KRIFKA, Manfred (2007). Basic notions of information structure. *Interdisciplinary studies on information structure ISIS* (Eds. Caroline Féry-Gisbert Fanselow-Manfred Krifka). Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam, 13-56.

KURAM, Kadri (2023). "Common Ground Management via Evidential Markers in Turkish". *Pragmatics and Society.* https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.21058.kur

LAMBRECHT, Knud (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents* (Vol. 71). Cambridge University Press.

ÖZBEK, Nurdan (1998). "Türkçede söylem belirleyicileri". *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9, 37-47.

ÖZBEK, Nurdan (2000). "Yani, işte, şey, ya: Interactional markers of Turkish". *In Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, 393-401.

ÖZCAN, Güner (2015). *A corpus-driven analysis of evet 'yes' and hı-hı in Turkish: Evidence from the spoken Turkish corpus*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Mersin University.

ÖZCAN, Güner; AKSAN, Yeşim (2017). "Sözlü Türkçede Evet'in Görünümleri: Sözlü Türkçe Derlemi'nden Bulgular". *Mersin University Journal of Linguistics & Literature*, 14/2: 15-35.

POMERANTZ, Andrew. M. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn Shapes. *Structures of social action* (Eds. J. M. Atkinson-J. Heritage). Cambridge University Press, 57-101.

STALNAKER, Robert. (2002). Common Ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25: 701-721.

YILMAZ, Erkan. (2004). *A pragmatic analysis of Turkish discourse particles: Yani, işte and şey.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Middle East Technical University.