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This article examines the role of indirectivity through -DI and -mlṣ/-lmṣ forms in creating hybrid constructions in Orhan Pamuk’s *The White Castle*. Following Johanson’s semantic notion of “indirectivity”, this study illustrates that marked indirectives -mlṣ/-lmṣ and their unmarked counterpart -DI adopt various pragmatic functions in the novelistic language. In line with Bakhtin’s (1984) categorization of double voiced discourse in fiction, we maintain that double voiced hybrids constructed with -mlṣ/-lmṣ create varidirectionality (parodic/ironic), whereas those constructed with -DI show unidirectionality (narrative/descriptive) in terms of intentionality in fictional discourse.
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1. Introduction

Some of the theoretical problems of the narratological approach to literary language arise out of a posited necessity to distinguish the voices of the narrator, the author (implied or real), and the characters unequivocally within a text. This sort of an approach depends on the implicit presupposition that the “self” in a narrative is or must be a unified, consistent, and determinable entity. Bakhtin, with his dialogic approach to polyphony within macro and micro levels of language in a novel, reminds us that reading a text becomes a more fulfilling activity when we displace the monologic one Expression / one Self conception\(^1\) and instead notice the communion, interaction, fusion, as well as a the strife and contradiction among different voices, styles, and languages within the complex structure that we conceive of as the fictional self.

This study breaks new ground by analyzing pragmatically determinable hybrid functions of marked indirectives -mlṣ/-lmṣ and their unmarked counterpart -DI in

\(^1\) Banfield (1982: 93) argues that for any expression in any one sentence there can be ‘at most one referent, called the ‘subject of consciousness’ or self to whom all expressive elements are attributed.’
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The novelistic hybrids in Orhan Pamuk’s *The White Castle*. We take the position that is essential to analyze a fictional text as a whole to fully account for the form-function correlation producing multi-voiced hybrid patterns in fictional discourse. A hybrid construction, according to Bakhtin (1981: 304-305), “is an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, it that actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two voices, two ‘languages’, two semantic and axiological belief systems.” Every type of direct word in a novel is a hybrid in the broadest sense. When the author’s intention to create irony through the indirect word in a novel, we see not only a merging of voices but also of clasping intentions (those belonging to the author, narrator, characters) within novelistic hybrids as we shall illustrate in our analysis below.

This paper is organized as follows: First we provide a brief description of Turkish directivity and non-indirectivity markers (section 2). Before we analyze different instances of these markers in novelistic discourse (section 4), we briefly introduce a theoretical background for double voiced discourse in Bakhtin’s theory (section 3).

Turkish indirectives and non-indirectives

The verbal grammatical suffixes -mıs and -DI can have more than one function in Turkish. They can signal tense, aspect, and/or modality simultaneously. In terms of directivity, -DI expresses the neutral standpoint of a speaker. It represents a speaker’s direct experience or access to the source of information in perceiving an event, whereas -mıs and -(y)ımıs show the speaker’s indirect access to the source of information. The narrator’s choice between -DI and -mıs in *The White Castle* creates hybridity in his point of view as the direct experiencer and the indirect transmitter of the events. Diverse functions of -(y)ımıs add to the complex nature of the narrator’s voice, and they pose problems related to translating the Turkish sense into a language lacking grammaticalized indirectivity. To illustrate this point we shall compare the counterparts of Turkish indirectives in *The White Castle*’s English translation, and we shall illustrate that “varidirectional” (parodic/ironic) novelistic hybrids in Turkish are rendered “unidirectional” (narrative, descriptive) in English. According to Johanson (2000: 61) “Indirectivity is the linguistic expression of E’s apparent to P... a narrated event E’ is not stated stated directly, but in an indirect way: by reference to its reception by a conscious subject P.” Languages have linguistic units to qualify utterances in terms of the reference to the source of information. While some languages have grammaticalized indirectives like Turkish, Bulgarian, and Persian others like English, and French do not have morphologically coded indirectivity markers in their verb systems.

Turkish grammaticalizes indirectivity by means of the verbal grammatical morpheme -mıs, and the copular suffix -(y)ımıs. In Turkish the basic contrast is between a marked indirective and a form that is unmarked. -mıs and -(y)ımıs are marked indirectives in terms of conveying reported, inferred or perceived knowledge, whereas -DI is the unmarked member of this opposition (Johanson 2000, 2003, Comrie 2000). Indirectivity in English, on the other hand, is rendered via lexical items like ‘apparently’, ‘evidently’, ‘reportedly’ or it is expressed by means of such expressions as ‘it seems’, ‘it appears’, ‘as I see’, ‘as I have heard’, and ‘it is said’. Indirectivity markers -mıs and -(y)ımıs signal the speaker’s becoming aware of facts through report, logical inference or perception. These share a common psychological feature involving the speaker’s psychological, cognitive as well as physical distance from the event (Yavaş 1980; Slobin & Aksu 1982; Johanson 2000). In other words, speakers employ -mıs and -(y)ımıs forms to distance themselves from the event, to distinguish themselves from the responsibility for it, or as a way of being vague about sources that they do not want to lay open to view (Johanson 2003: 283). Speakers’ psychological detachment from their own discourse is another element lost in most translations of hybrid structures involving indirectivity in Turkish.

2.1. Marked indirectives

The source of information for what is asserted indicates different meanings of indirectives. Information is either perceived (in)directly through the senses or it is obtained indirectly from report or inference. Finite verb forms in -mıs, and copular marker -(y)ımıs express reportive, inferential, and perceptive meanings. When an event is reported to a speaker, his/her knowledge about that particular event comes from a secondary source. The speaker makes this clear to the listener via -mıs (1) or -(y)ımıs (2). The reported event can also be

See Kantar & Aksan (2006) for an analysis of the roles -DI and -mıs play in the creation of different types of fictional hybrids defined by Bakhtin. Kantar & Aksan (2006) also includes an exploration of the distribution of the suffix -mıs throughout *The White Castle*. -DI and -mıs both denote anteriority. -mıs expresses postterminal viewpoint in Turkish. -(y)ımıs is a copular suffix which is affixed to nonverbal predicates or verbs inflected for tense, aspect, mood. It does not have any temporal or aspeutical content. It is the grammaticalized marker of indirectivity in Turkish. (Aksu-Koç 1995; and Csató 2000) for a detailed analysis of -(y)ımıs.

We should note that Johanson is against this straightforward relation between -DI and speaker’s direct experience of an event and -mıs and speaker’s indirect reception of an event. He gives the following counter-examples to illustrate his point:

(i) *Çok büyüt-dı.*

Much grow-DI

“You have become very big.” (Johanson 2003: 282)

(ii) *Çorba çok güzel ol-mıs.*

Soup very good be-mıs

“The soup is [as I perceive by tasting] very good.” (Johanson 2000: 82)

obtained in the form of third hand information, general truth, and oral history, as in (3). Again, -mt8 or -(y)mt8 is used when the hearer retells this information.

(1) Deniz ev-e gel-miş. (Eda söyle-di.)
Deniz house-DAT come-MIS (Eda tell-PST)
'(Eda told that) Deniz has come/came home.'

(2) Deniz hasta-ymış.
Deniz sick-MIS
'Reportedly, Deniz is sick.'

(3) Osmanlı İmparatorluğu-ğu 1299 yıl-m-da kar-ul-muş.
Ottoman Empire-ACC 1299 year-NL-LOC found-PASS-MIS
'Apparently, the Ottoman Empire was founded in 1299.'

When a speaker has access to knowledge about an event through inference s/he generally relies on retrospective inference (observable evidence) or inference from reasoning (logic, intuition). In (4) the speaker has not directly seen the event of Deniz’s coming home, but s/he infers it through observable evidence, and s/he uses -mt8 to indicate this inference to the listener. [Upon seeing Deniz’s car in front of her home, the speaker utters the following sentence:

(4) Deniz ev-e gel-miş.
Deniz house-DAT come-MIS
'Apparently, Deniz has come/came home.'

Perceptive use of indirective markers is observed when a speaker apprehends an event or its effect either directly through sensory perception or indirectly through results or traces of an event (Johanson 2000):

(5) Ayşe ıyt yemek yap-yor-muş.
Ayşe good meal make-PROG-MIS
'As I tasted as it appears/ as it turns out) cooks well.'

Besides the above mentioned semantic subdivisions of Turkish indirectives, -mt8/-(y)mt8 receive various interpretations in different contexts. As a result, they exhibit a wide variety of pragmatic extensions of their core meaning. The mirative (or admisive) category is one of them. Mirative refers to "linguistic marking of an utterance conveying information which is new or unexpected to the speaker" (DeLancy 2001: 170). Mirative use of -mt8/-(y)mt8 in Turkish indicates that the speaker’s present surprise is based on a new realization of an event as well as his past ignorance or misconception of it, as shown below. [Upon seeing a shelf full of books, the speaker utters the following sentence]

(6) Ne kaqar çok kitap-im var-miş.
How many a lot book-POS exist-MIS
'So many books I have/ I seem to have!

Pragmatic extensions of the indirectives also involve the ironic, scornful or doubtful attitude of a speaker. In languages with grammaticalized indirectivity markers, the speaker’s “non-committal” mood or “mediative” discourse in Gewecheva’s (1996) and Lazard’s (2001) terms, can have an ironic or doubtful tone. We should note that -mt8/-(y)mt8 themselves show neither dubitative nor ironic attitude. Contextual factors, world knowledge about the speaker, and the event described as well as some lexical items indicating presumption or irony in a sentence allow us to detect the ironic, sarcastic or dubious tone in a sentence.

In (7) -(y)mt8 conveys the speaker’s negative mind-set. s/he has not felt himself/herself mentally prepared for the consequences of the event, and this is reflected in his/her ironic or critical attitude towards the driver’s unprofessional driving style by using -(y)mt8. [After a disappointing test drive, the passenger speaks to the driver]:

(7) Sen ne ni arab-ı kullan-yor-muş-suz. 
You how good car drive-PROG-IMPER-2SG
'So, you can drive really well.'

2.2. Unmarked indirective

The marker -DI encodes both visual and non-visual direct evidence in Turkish. In sentence (8) the speaker has seen the occurrence of the event and his/her personal observation is conveyed to the hearer by -DI. On the other hand, in (9) the speaker becomes aware of the situation through sensory perception, and she describes unobservable inner state (physical or mental) she apprehends directly.

Deniz house-DAT come-DI I her-ACC see-DI-1SG
'Deniz came/ has come home. I saw her.'

(9) Karn-im ar-k-ı. stomach-POS get hungry-di
'I got hungry. I am hungry.'

6 In Turkish the lexical item meğer, for example, is the modal particle which chooses the semantically compatible mood marking to go with the main predicate. Meğer requires the predicate to be marked with -mt8 or -(y)mt8 which enhances the sense of ‘surprise’ conveyed by them.
6. Hybrid structures in narratorial double voiced discourse

Balasok (1984) categorizes double voiced discourse as follows: (1) Unidirectional double voiced discourse (2) Varidirectional double voiced discourse (3) Active type. In the unidirectional and varidirectional types of discourse the author’s intention (Ai hereafter) acts upon the characters’ intention (Ci hereafter) via the narrator. In the active type, on the other hand, somebody else’s discourse, which is not manifest in the text itself, shapes the author’s intention and enters into an implicit dialogue with the narrator’s or with one or more of the characters’ discourses in the novel.

The term “unidirectional” in the first type implies that the author uses a character’s style without changing its original intention, or “direction”. The character’s voice resonates within the narrator’s voice without changing its own stylistic makeup. Alternatively, the term “varidirectional” in the second type denotes that there are two conflicting voices (intentions, viewpoints, ideologies) within a single utterance. As opposed to the first type, here the author introduces a parodic or ironic component (semantic intention) within a narrator/character’s discourse. In the active type or “hidden polemic” another’s discourse “acts upon, influences, and in one way or another determines the author’s discourse, while itself remaining outside it” (Balkasok 1984: 195). In this last type, the whole utterance involves a “sideway glance” towards somebody else’s discourse. The following table is an adaptation of Balkasok’s categorization (1984: 199) of double voiced discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unidirectional double voiced discourse</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Stylization of another’s style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Unidentified discourse of a character who reflects the author/narrator’s intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Author’s intention: report, describe, narrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varidirectional double voiced discourse</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Stylization of another’s style with parodic (ironic) nuances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Discourse of a character whose intention is at conflict with the author/narrator’s intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Author’s intention: show irony, ridicule, scorn, disbelief, indignation within report/narration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The active type (reflected discourse of another)*

| a) Hidden internal polemic |  |
| b) Author’s discourse and his intention is shaped by a discourse outside the text |  |
| c) Author’s intention: refine or counter somebody else’s intention, point, ideology, etc. |  |

### Table 1. Types of double voiced discourse in fiction

---
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Double voiced point of view in *The White Castle* is created with the help of textual and extra textual elements. In Genette’s terms (1972), *The White Castle* can be considered “autodiagnostic” narrative: the first person narrator is personalized as a character within the fictional world. In a very general sense any novel written in the first person can be considered a report as a whole. Viewed from this perspective, each utterance in a novel written from the first person point of view is a hybrid, because it inherently involves two voices: the author/narrator’s reporting voice, and a character’s reported voice. The author’s own voice (as one of the characters in the story) is also a part of the reported voice in instances of self-quoting. Different hybrids constructed with -DI and -mly-/f)mly together create a dialogic tension, and a lively to-and-fro movement between the pseudo-objective authorial voice (reminding please) and the very same voice as a character physically and emotionally involved in the events he narrates (reminisced please) in *The White Castle*.

The main story in *The White Castle* consists of the memoirs of an Italian about the story of his captivity in the custody of an Ottoman courtier, Hoja. The narrator is a twenty-three-year-old renaissance man who has studied science and art in Florence and Venice. In the beginning, the common traits which join the main characters of the novel Hoja and his slave are their physical likeness, and their scorn for each other’s beliefs, and ways of life. As the story progresses, the narrator finds himself more and more involved in the eastern life style up to the point of crossing the identity lines between his capor and himself. In the final chapter of the novel we cannot really tell who is speaking, Hoja or his slave. This creates ambiguity on the reminding please in the overall structure. It eventually becomes impossible to decide who the writer actually is; the slave or the master. As an extra textual element enhancing this hybridity, Pamuk ironically mocks the reader’s illusionary expectation that the narrator have a unified self in the beginning and at the end of the story by saying that he himself does not know whether the Italian slave or the Ottoman master is the actual writer of the manuscript of *The White Castle*.

### 4. Aspects of indirectives and non-indirectives in the novelistic hybrids in *The White Castle*

Our claim is that varidirectionality (conflicting intentions belonging to the author and his narrator/characters) in the novelistic hybrids in Turkish is created with the introduction of an element of interruption within the flow of narration that can be traced in the following elements in narrative: (a) interruptions in the narrative constructed with -DI by the intervention of -mly-/f)mly (b) exclamatory interventions (c) interrogatory interventions.

Because of its multifunctional nature -mly-/f)mly can help create multiple intentions that can be traced in the intentional implications in a narrative text. This is better understood when Turkish indirectative structures in *The White Castle* are compared...

---

This remark appears in Orhan Pamuk’s postscript to the Turkish edition of the novel in 1992, which is not included in the English version.
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(10) Hoca, bir kezim bırakverdik ki kitabın beni heyeçanlandırdığını görece otkelendi. Yedi altın vermiş bu clide, kendimi becerimle biçmiş bir bayrak, sayfalarının çeviri bir gös aamam doğrdu olayını. Uşu bir öneme gibi, sabrına iyi birสุ לביתirik demistedim. (23-24)
When Hoja saw I was unimpressed and soon put the book aside, he was angry. He paid seven gold pieces for this volume, it was only right that I should put aside my conceit, turn the pages and take a look at it. Like an obedient student, I opened the book again and while patiently turning its pages came across a primitive diagram. (25-26)

In (10) free indirect speech constructed with -mLs and -(y)mLs implies the slave’s tone of sarcastic detachment from his own discourse. If the sentences in italics were constructed with -DI form or if they were produced as indirect speech embedded under a verb of report, then the utterance would be unidirectional as in the English translation of the passage. In the italicized sentences in Turkish we can read the slave’s scornful tone in a “hidden dialogue” addressing his captor or the reader: “Paying seven gold pieces for such a trashy book is ridiculous. It is foolish of him to tell me what to do with this ridiculous book.” In the English translation, the tone is uniform throughout the paragraph, and it does not display the sarcasm that is easily detectable in Turkish. The irony of the slave’s situation in the English version can only be deduced from the content of the passage.

In The White Castle some paragraphs are written predominantly with -DI form, and they only have -mLs/(y)mLs in their last sentences as in (11) below.

(11) Birden otkelendi, Hoca’nın kendine hiçbir yere varanayıcamı düşündüm. Bunu fark etmesini istiydım, bensiz hiçbir şey düş簋nmemeyeceği yuzine söylemek geldi içinden, ama cesaretim yoktu; uydun bir tavranı sinyaya bakmasının söyleydim. Hayır, cesaretim değil, halim yoktu. Otkelendi, kapıyi yavaş çikaran bağıştı. Benaptalım (57)
Suddenly I was angry. I felt Hoja would never be able to achieve anything on his own. I wanted him to realize this. I wanted to tell him to face that without me he would not think at all, but I didn’t dare; with an air of indifference I told him to go ahead and look in the mirror. No, it wasn’t courage I lacked, I just didn’t feel like it.

He flew into a rage and slammed the door, shouting as he left: You are a fool. (59)

These paragraphs create an open ground in anticipation of the reader’s participation at the end. This is in part due to the conversational nature of -mLs/(y)mLs which allows a “loophole” (Bakhtin 1984: 232-36), that creates a natural break or a dialogical opening with the narrator’s tone undercutting the reported information. The Turkish Ben aptalım ‘he told me that I was a fool’ implies the narrator’s rejection of the truth content of the statement he himself has just uttered. The narrator leaves it to the reader to decide whether he is a fool or not. English uses free direct speech to translate this originally indirect report, and the loophole the Turkish version has at the end of the paragraph disappears completely.

---

Barfield (1982), and Fludernik (1993) argue along the same lines that free indirect speech is not produced in a meaningful way by the narrator. Our analysis in this paper proves that subjectivity of the narrator does not shift entirely to the character represented in free indirect speech. See also Vette’s (1994), and Aczel (1998) for a criticism of Barfield’s and Fludernik’s approaches to speech representation in fiction.
In (12) repetitive uses of -mils/-yimlis describing the narrator’s own characteristic or habitual behavior is given as hearsay. This indirect form of reporting of one’s own personal traits implies that the speaker assumes the falsity of these propositions. The slave here dissociates himself from his own characterization by means of -mils and -yimlis. Here we see a clashing of intentions (those of the narrator and the people surrounding him) in the varidirectional hybrids created by -mils/-yimlis. In the English translation on the other hand, we have what seems to be an objective report of the habitual behavior of the narrator. The varidirectional discourse in Turkish has become unidirectional in English.

4.2. Exclamatory and interrogatory interventions

Exclamatory and interrogatory statements are subject-oriented features. Rhetorical questions and rhetorical exclamations “seem to be situated on the very boundary between authorial and reported speech (usually, internal speech), and often they slide directly into one or the other. Thus they may be interpreted as a question or exclamation on the part of the author or, equally, as a question or exclamation on the part of the hero, addressed to himself” (Vološinov 1973: 137). Insertion of exclamatory and interrogatory sentences into the narration leads to varidirectional double voiced discourse in The White Castle, because in such statements we hear the tone of the disgruntled slave within the tone of the narrator as a free man. Especially in the use of rhetorical questions it is the author/narrator who steps forward on behalf of his former self to portray him as the wronged party in this story.

In the examples below we will first focus on the exclamatory interventions, then the interrogatory interventions within the novelistic hybrids.

(13) ...Halîç üzerindeki sallar kiprûdûlar. Önce, muskava kuîeler ve hisarlar, burgeîarden fîşîler salarak geçerken yamp tutûşlar; bûlûr geçmiş yiîlîardaki safleri temîsil edîyorsunuz! (25)
...the caisques on the surface of the Golden Horn stirred. First the papîer mâché towers and fortresses, shooting rockets from their turrets as they sailed by, caught fire and went up in flames—these were supposed to symbolize victories of former years. (27)

In the English sentence above the exclamation mark is omitted, and the phrase “supposed to” only emphasizes that Turks “believe” or “imagine” that the act of burning papîer mâché objects can have a symbolic historical value. By contrast, -yimlis in the Turkish version displays the speaker’s second-hand knowledge about the event taking place, and conveys a distanced attitude of scorn, doubt, and surprise towards the message given. The ironic exclamation point following -yimlis in the Turkish sentence can imply a number of different intentions belonging to the speaker such as: “How can it be that burning papîer mâché objects represent past victories for Turks?”

The number of question forms constructed with -mils/-yimlis is almost equal to the number of question forms constructed with -DI in The White Castle. -mils or -yimlis is a marginal form for reporting someone else’s questions in Turkish. Such questions carry the author/narrator’s attitude tinged with sarcasm and contempt in The White Castle. In (14) the slave narrates his confrontation with Hoja about the approaching plague. English ‘Why was I afraid?’ is only a free indirect report of Hoja’s question, whereas Turkish Niye korkuyor musun? is a free indirect report including reflections of various pragmatic extensions of -yimlis. Here the slave implies that the plauge is something to be feared, and what is absurd is not his own fear, but Hoja’s question itself. (14) is a varidirectional double voiced hybrid.

(14) ...İstanbul’dan kaçmaya çalışmak faydaנışz man. Yazılımsız orada da gelir ölüm bizi bulunursun. Niye korkuyor musun? (70)
... [it was useless] trying to escape from Istanbul. If it was written, so it would come to pass, death would find us. Why was I afraid? (72)

As in (15) below, rhetorical questions reported in free indirect style with -DI are unidirectional forms of double voiced hybrids. The author/narrator uses Hoja’s words without changing their intended meaning. Here the author/narrator himself does not seem to dispute the fact that everybody around the sultan is stiff. If he wished to create a varidirectional novelistic hybrid and mock Hoja’s questions he could ask the same questions with -mils/-yimlis, which could be successfully translated into English without losing the original intentions contained in it.

(15) Bu ahmaklar gerekçelerin farkına ne zaman varacaklardı? Bu kadár alipin birbiriîn birbiri bulmas bir rastlımlı mıyd zarûrunuldu mu? Niye bu kadar âpptûkler! (105-106)
Was it mere coincidence that so many fools were collected together in one place or was it inevitable? Why were they so stupid? (106-107)
5. Conclusion

Turkish marked (-mlg/-ymls) and unmarked (-DI) forms of indirectivity adopt various pragmatic functions in the novelistic language. We can detect and analyze these functions when we regard the literary text as a communicative act which involves decoding of the speaker/author's intention by the listener/reader. In written communication the author's intention can be detected in the tone of his writing in a way similar to oral communication. The author's intention is not always an extra-textual element that could be reached through biographic or historical analysis. As we have seen in our analysis, the author's intention is insinuated in the tone of the text, which is detected not only between the lines but also within the lines of the text itself. Words, inextricably in the functions and pragmatic extensions of the indirectivity markers, the author's intention manipulates the reader's comprehension of the text.

Our analysis of the novelistic hybrids in The White Castle has illustrated different functions of -DI and -mlg/-ymls forms in fictional language. We have seen that double voiced hybrids constructed with -mlg/-ymls create varidirectional, whereas those constructed with -DI show unidirectionality in terms of intentionality in novelistic hybrids.

When Turkish novelistic hybrids are translated into English, they lose their pragmatic extensions especially in -mlg/-ymls constructed hybrids. The following points summarize the problems arising out of the translation of Turkish indirectives into English.

a) The Italian slave's dual point of view as the narrator of the story, distancing himself psychologically from the events (in -mlg/-ymls forms), and as the narrator of the story, physically and emotionally involved in what he narrates (in -DI), can not be rendered in English. Varidirectional ironic double voice enhanced by the pragmatic implications of -mlg/-ymls is lost.

b) The English translations of Turkish -mlg/-ymls usually focus on one of its many functions. The Turkish sentence loses its hybrid quality and multi-layered sense interpretations. When analyzed on the plot level in The White Castle, this loss changes the whole tone of the narrative, and it also diminishes the function the narrator has in the plot structure.

c) -mlg/-ymls, the preferred form in the folklore narration, introduces a conversational colouring in The White Castle. The logic, truth, and reliability expected of the novel as a western mode of writing (formal realism) is enriched by the elements of fantasy, dream, unreality, having arising out of different uses of -mlg/-ymls in the Turkish oral story telling tradition.

Sentences constructed with -mlg/-ymls create a similar form of natural narration to those observed in Russian skaz (an oral or conversational storytelling situation in which a speaker tells a story to a present audience) and narrative uses of Tassé Composé in French.
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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>POSS</th>
<th>PROG</th>
<th>PST</th>
<th>SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>noun compound</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>possessive</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>past tense</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>