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1. Introduction

Linguistic analyses of literary language rarely consider the relationship between form and content in fiction. They associate style with mere quantification of linguistic form. Our study explores the relationships between the linguistic units and overall content in the polyphonic layers of a fictional text. It centers on how language specific grammatical categories with opposing semantic and pragmatic interpretations constitute cognitive barriers in processing fictional language. We focus on epistemic modality encoded by verbal grammatical morphemes within fictional hybrids in novelistic discourse in light of Bakhtin’s (1981) theory on novelistic heteroglossia.

Verbal grammatical morphemes in Turkish may express tense, aspect and/or modality simultaneously. Thus, a single morpheme can carry functions of different semantic categories. Among these, we have analyzed different functions of epistemic modality markers -DI and -mIş in a Turkish novel, Orhan Pamuk’s¹ The white castle (1985, 1998). To discuss language specific aspects of these markers as cognitive barriers in processing fictional language, we have also considered their counterparts in the English translation of The white castle.

In Turkish multifunctional markers -DI and -mIş are subsumed under evidentiality (Slobin – Aksu 1982, Willett 1988, Palmer 2001), which refers to direct and indirect sources of information that a speaker experiences. While -DI is employed to convey direct experience of a speaker, -mIş is mainly used to express indirect experience. However, it also marks statements based on direct experience depending on the context. The marker -mIş in Turkish constitutes a cognitive barrier for language users because it may denote the following concepts of evidential modality: inference (conclusion, deduction), hearsay, report, and admirativity. It also has pragmatic extensions of irony, doubt, and scorn depending on how the speaker evaluates the content of a communicative act. When such markers as -mIş are approached as discrete forms of decontextualized linguistic data, it is impossible to determine the problems arising out of their multiple linguistic functions. To surmount this methodical difficulty, we have adopted an interdisciplinary approach, and utilized the methods of literary and linguistic analyses. Based on Bakhtin’s theory on novelistic discourse, we have established the relationship

¹ Orhan Pamuk is the author of six novels, and the recipient of major Turkish and international literary awards. He is one of Europe’s most prominent novelists, and his work has been translated into more than twenty languages.
between the micro level Turkish modality markers, and their reflections beyond sentence level manifestations in the macro level literary structure of a fictional text. A study of semantic/pragmatic functions of modality and its interaction with macro level literary interpretation provides a valuable lens for understanding and decoding cognitive barriers in novelistic discourse.

Modality is a subjective category, which involves different elements regarding a speaker’s assessment of the propositional content of an utterance. The two types of modality that have been identified are epistemic and deontic modality. Epistemic modality is a very broad concept which concerns subjective perspectives of the speaker towards an utterance in terms of truth, certainty, evidence, hearsay, inference, report, and quotation. Deontic modality, on the other hand, describes the way through which the speaker qualifies an utterance in terms of desirability, ability, obligation, and permission (Lyons 1977, Givón 1995, Palmer 2001, among many others). Epistemic modality connects the speaker to a proposition in a very general sense, but in a fictional context, both the speaker and the proposition are multi-layered constructions. Each layer of meaning in a persona and in her/his fictional proposition offers a new possibility with a new truth value, which necessitates an explanation based on modality. “Language treats possibility and truth as a conceptual/semantic system: not as a system that relates language to the world, but as one that connects language to its users” (Frawley 1992: 408). Adopting this viewpoint, we account for evidential markers in novelistic discourse as one of the communicative components of language involving writer/narrator oriented meaning, and the processing of this meaning in socially negotiated reader/interpreter interaction.

In our analysis, we have explored how the markers -DI and -mluş behave in novelistic hybrids in relation to plot advancement. Hybrid construction in the sense defined by Bakhtin (1981: 304) is “an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but actually contains mixed within it two utterances, two speech manners, two styles, two ‘languages’, two semantic and axiological belief systems.” In *The white castle* the novelistic hybrids within the speech patterns of the narrator reveal his double consciousness as a Venetian slave, and as Ottoman Hoja, his captor. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator is critical of his life in captivity, and he puts a psychological and mental distance between himself and everything Eastern. This attitude starts to change as he adapts himself to the Eastern lifestyle. We have illustrated how the markers -DI and -mluş are manipulated by the consciousness level of the narrator as the direct involved experiencer and indirect disassociated perceiver of the life he narrates.

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the grammatical functions of -DI and -mluş in detail. It elucidates temporal, aspectual, and modal functions of these markers in comparison to their English renditions. Section 3 discusses novelistic hybrids. It identifies different types of hybrid structures involving -DI and -mluş, and focuses on their English translations in relation to the different aspects the narrative voice in *The white castle*. Section 4 discusses the distribution of the morpheme -mluş in the whole novel with reference to the changes in narrating consciousness.

1. Grammatical functions of -DI and -mluş

In Turkish different semantic categories are encoded on the same verbal grammatical marker. Verbal grammatical morphemes -DI and -mluş, in this respect, express temporal, aspectual, and/or modal relations simultaneously (Aksu-Koç 1995, Erguvanlı-Taylan 1996, Johanson 2000).

In its temporal sense, -DI shows that the event took place before the moment of speech, so it encodes past tense. When a speaker uses -DI, s/he views the situation as a completed event. -DI signals the perfective aspect, which presents all parts of the situation as a single whole. As an epistemic modality marker, -DI conveys the speaker’s direct experience or involvement with the event. It shapes the epistemic status of the information asserted by the speaker as follows: the proposition constructed by -DI is true, factual, and reliable, because it involves the speaker’s first-hand information about the event. In (1) below, the verb ye- ‘eat’ is inflected by -DI, and the sentence carries the above-mentioned temporal, aspectual, and/or modal meanings all at once.

1. Deniz elma-ye-di.

Deniz apple-ACC eat-DI2

‘Deniz ate the apple.’

-DI expresses past and present perfect tenses. Temporally, it mainly shows the present perfect tense, which denotes through the results of the action that the event in question takes place prior to the moment of speech. It also signals perfect aspect because the event is represented by its result. Being an opposite member of the epistemic modality, -mluş illustrates that a speaker has not seen the event described. The source of information the speaker employed is an indirect one, and this affects the epistemic nature of the proposition. Contrary to the necessary truth, factuality, and reliability encoded by -DI to a proposition, a proposition construed by -mluş displays a hybrid nature. It can or cannot be necessarily true, factual, and reliable. A statement like (2) encodes all of the relevant temporal, aspectual and modal meanings of -mluş at the same time.

2. Deniz elma-ye-mluş.

Deniz apple-ACC eat-mluş

‘Reportedly/Apparently Deniz has eaten the apple.’

The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: ACC – accusative, DAT – dative, POSS – possessive, PRES – present tense, SG – singular.
We should note that since different semantic categories can be subsumed under a single morpheme in Turkish, pragmatic factors disambiguate the tense, aspect or modality interpretations of the relevant morpheme.

2.1. Evidential modality in Turkish: direct vs. indirect evidence

Turkish -DI and -mļş mark direct and indirect experiences of a speaker respectively. These morphemes differentiate epistemic notions that can be categorized under evidential modality. In its broad sense, evidential modality refers both to the source and to the reliability of a speaker’s knowledge. The source of the evidence or knowledge for what is asserted indicates different semantic domains of evidentials. In view of Willett (1988: 96) and Plungian (2001: 354), we can identify the following subdivisions as the semantic values of Turkish evidential markers:

I. Direct evidence: Speaker has observed or perceived the situation (S hereafter) described.
   - Visual evidence: ‘S, and I saw S.’
   - Non-visual evidence: Speaker has perceived or experienced the situation directly:
     - Sensoric: ‘S, and I perceived S’ [S may be heard, smelled, tasted, etc.]
     - Endophoric: ‘S, and I felt S’ [S is the speaker’s inner state.]

II. Indirect evidence: ‘Speaker has not had a direct access to S.’
   - Reported: Speaker has received the information from an external source: ‘S because I was told that.’ ‘S because I heard/read about that.’
   - Inferring: Speaker has accessed some evidence related to S, which the speaker has not witnessed.
     - Retrospective inference: ‘S, because I can observe some traces of S.’
     - Reasoning: ‘S, because I know Q involves S, and I know that Q entails P.’

The marker -DI encodes both the visual and non-visual direct evidence in Turkish. In sentence (3) the speaker has seen the occurrence of the event, and his personal observation is conveyed to the hearer by -DI. Sentences (4) and (5) illustrate that the speaker has become aware of the situation not visually, but through the sensoric and endophoric perceptions respectively. The speaker has perceived the nice smell of the food directly, using his sense of smelling in (4). (5), on the other hand, describes the speaker’s inner state — physical state — which cannot be observed visually, yet experienced by her/him. The speaker’s unobservable physical or mental state, her/his desires or intentions are all sensed by her/himself directly and expressed by -DI in Turkish.

   ‘Deniz came has come home.’ I saw her.’

(4) Yemek güzel kok-tu.  Food nice smell-DI
   ‘The food (has) smelled nice.’

(5) Kavum aç-tı.  Stomach-POSS get hungry-DI
   ‘I got hungry.’ ‘I am hungry.’

Turkish has two indirect evidence markers, i.e. -mļş and postelicitic -Imlş. These markers cover both reported and inferring evidence. When an event is reported to a speaker, her/his knowledge about that particular event comes from a secondary source. The speaker makes this clear to her/his listener via -mļş (6) or -Imlş (7). In (6), for instance, the speaker has not actually seen Deniz’s coming home but s/he has heard of the event from someone who was a direct witness, i.e. a person named Eda. The speaker can access an event through third hand evidence, for instance, from a news bulletin, and again -mļş is used when s/he retells this event, as shown

3 -mļş is a bound morpheme affixed to the invariant verb root, and it carries relevant tense, aspect, and modality properties. -Imlş is a postelicitic affixed to nonverbal predicates (1) or verbs inflected for tense-aspect-mood (2). It does not have any temporal or aspectual value, but is a grammaticalized marker of evidentiality in Turkish (see Aksu-Koç 1995 and Caşo 2000 for a more detailed discussion).

(1) Deniz hasta-yıms.  Deniz sick-Imlş
   ‘Reportedly, Deniz is sick.’

(2) Deniz çalış-yor-muş.  Deniz work-PRES-Imlş
   ‘Reportedly, Deniz is studying.’

4 Note that reportive utterances with -mļş are not synonymous with their corresponding indirect speech utterances. In terms of the truth of the proposition, as Yavaş (1980) mentions, the speaker believes in the truth of the proposition in utterances with -mļş. The following utterance is unacceptable in Turkish.

(3) ?? Deniz ev-e gelmiş anı ben inanmıyorum.
   ‘Reportedly Deniz has come home, but I don’t believe it.’

On the other hand, in indirect speech utterances, the speaker does not necessarily believe in the truth of the proposition. So s/he can overtly deny it without causing any contradiction, as in (4):

(4) Eda Deniz’ın ev-e girdiği söyledi anı ben inanmıyorum.
   ‘Eda told me that Deniz has come home, but I don’t believe it.’
in (8). Subcategories of reported evidence, such as second- and third-hand evidence, or evidence from general truth or oral history (as exemplified in 9), are all denoted by the above-mentioned evidential markers. There is no other marker to distinguish such subtypes in Turkish.

(6) (Eda söyle-di.) Deniz ev-e gel-miş.
(Eda tells-D1) Deniz home-DAT come-miş
‘Eda told me that Deniz has come/came home.’

(7) Deniz hasta-ymış.
Deniz sick-Imlş
‘Reportedly, Deniz is sick.’

(8) (Haberlerde duyдум.) Cumhurbaşkanı Varşova’ya gitmiş.
‘I heard it in the news.) The president has gone/went to Warsaw.’

(9) Türklere Anadolu’ya Orta Asya’dan gelenler.
‘Apparently, Turks came to Anatolia from central Asia.’

Inferencing evidence is another way of expressing indirect evidence by -mış or -Imlş. When a speaker accesses knowledge about an event through inference, s/he generally relies on either retrospective inference or inference from reasoning. Retrospective inference is achieved only through observable or physical evidence, which constitutes the trace of an event. In (10) the speaker has not directly seen the event of Deniz’s coming home but s/he infers it through observable evidence, i.e. after seeing Deniz’s car in front of her home. The speaker uses -mış to show her/his inference to the listener. On the other hand, inference from reasoning is carried out on the basis of logic, intuition, previous experience or some other mental construct (Willett 1988: 96). In (11) the speaker infers that s/he has eaten a lot without being aware of this fact consciously, and now s/he feels sleepy. S/he uses the steps of logical reasoning as such to reach this inference: ‘I have eaten a lot, I know that, because whenever I eat a lot, I feel sleepy. Thus eating a lot entails being sleepy.’

(10) [Upon seeing Deniz’s car in front of her home, the speaker utters the following sentence.]
Deniz eve gelmiş.
‘Apparantly, Deniz has come/came home.’

(11) Çok yemişim. (Üstüme bir ağrılık çöktü.)
‘Apparently, I have eaten a lot (I feel sleepy).’

So far, we have shown that the evidential markers -mış and -Imlş indicate indirect evidence based on report and inference. Utterances with these markers in Turkish denote that the speaker has not witnessed the event, and they say nothing about how the speaker has come to receive this information.

Besides the above-mentioned semantic subdivisions of Turkish evidentials, -mış and -Imlş are also the markers of admirative (or mirative) category, which is widely considered as a subclass of evidentiality. Admirative refers to “linguistic marking of an utterance conveying information which is new or unexpected to the speaker” (DeLancey 2001: 370). Sudden realization or perception of an event that a speaker was not aware of before or was not expecting carries a tone of ‘surprise’. This tone is expressed by -Imlş and -mış respectively in the following sentences:

(12) [Upon seeing a shelf full of books, the speaker utters the following sentence.]
Nu kadar çok kitab-im var-(f)mış.
What also a lot book-poss exist-Imlş
‘How many books I have/I seem to have!’

(13) [The speaker opens the door and sees Deniz – an unexpected visitor.]
Aaa, Deniz gel-miş.
Deniz come-miş
‘Deniz has come/came!’

Note that in admirative use of -mış and -Imlş, the speaker’s source of knowledge is direct perception of the event described. Contrary to their report and inference meanings, -mış and -Imlş mark statements based on direct experience and the perception of an event or its effects which become obvious and visible to the speaker through her/his consciousness or senses.6

The pragmatic extensions of the evidential markers which refer to the ironic, scornful or doubtful attitude of a speaker should be mentioned to get a complete picture of the uses of -mış and -Imlş. Irony and scorn stem from the admirative function, and they reflect the sense of surprise at an unanticipated situation. Ironic tone implied by -Imlş in (14) conveys a negative mind set of the speaker. The speaker has not felt mentally prepared for the consequences of the event, so he expresses his ironic attitude towards the driver’s unprofessional driving style through -Imlş.

(14) [After a disappointing test drive, the passenger speaks to the driver.]
Sen ne tiyi araba kullan-tyor-muş-sun!
You how good car drive-PRES-Imlş-2SG
‘So you can drive really well!’

5 See Johanson (2000: 82) for an extensive discussion of this use of -mış and -Imlş.
The diverse functions of -mls and -mls express a psychological, cognitive as well as physical distance between the event or the experience and the speaker (Yavaş 1980, Akso-Koc - Slobin 1986, Johanson 2000). As we have illustrated above, whenever the speaker uses -mls or -mls, s/he does not directly talk about the event itself, but rather about its reported form, its consequence, or its unexpected perception. In this way, the speaker dissociates herself/himself from the narrated event cognitively and emotionally. In a more general sense, -mls and -mls forms create a distance between "the speaker and his or her own discourse, or between a speaker as the person acquiring evidence and the person expressing it" (Lazard 2001: 362).

2.2. Turkish evidentials and their English renditions

While all languages have linguistic units to qualify utterances in terms of the reference to the source of information, not all languages have grammaticalized evidentiality. English is one of the languages which does not have morphological evidentiality in its verb system. Evidential meanings in English are rendered via lexical items such as apparently, evidently, reported, or they are expressed by means of such expressions as it seems, it appears, as I see, as I have heard, and it is said. Turkish, on the other hand, grammaticalizes the distinction between direct and indirect evidence. It obligatorily and systematically marks the distinction between them by means of the verbal morphemes -DI, -mls, and the postclitic -mls.

There may be a few complications in translating reporting and inferring functions of -mls or -mls into English. English translations of these functions should include the above-mentioned lexical items or expressions. To render admiring use of -mls or -mls into English, an exclamation mark is employed. As is expected, the pragmatic extensions of these markers like irony and scorn are lost in the English translation. Similarly, the psychological implication, that is the distance between the speaker and her/his discourse conveyed by -mls and -mls, cannot be rendered easily in the English translation.

3. Novelistic hybrids

Novelistic hybrids are based on speech diversity and language stratification (heteroglossia), which serve as the basis for style in the novel. Bakhtin thinks that the styilitics of the novel should concern itself with the problem of artistically representing language in fiction: "Characteristic for the novel as a genre is not the image of man in his own right, but precisely the image of a language" (Bakhtin 1981: 336). The images of language consisting of novelistic hybrids are the intersection grounds for complex and sometimes fuzzy aspects of different voices in fiction. These are the represented forms of speech and thought in an utterance, stylistic or lexical echoes of other discourses within one's own speech and modality. There is no formal-compositional and syntactic boundary between these utterances, styles, and languages in novelistic hybrids. The division and intermixing of voices take place within the limits of a simple sentence, and such re-contextualized sentences can accommodate the reporter's evaluations of them.

On the micro levels of the construction of novelistic discourse in The white castle, we can identify different functions of the evidential markers -DI, -mls, and -mls and their interaction with the fictional authorial perspective. Through his choice of these markers in fictional discourse, the author builds up a dialogic tension between the Western self of the slave and his authorial voice.

3.1. Pseudo-objective motivation

(15) [The Venetian narrator relates his first encounter with an Ottoman pasha.]

Paşa derdini anlamaya öyle bir başladı ki, buman, düşmanları iftiralarıyla Allah'ı kandırıkları için yeryüzünde bir tek Paşa'nın yakaladığı özel bir hastalık olduğunu düşünmek zorunda kaldım. Oysa, derdi, bildiğimiz nefes darlığıydı (17)

[He began to describe his situation in such a way that I was forced to conclude that it was a rare illness which had stricken only the pasha of all the men on the face of the earth, because his enemies had deceived God with their calumnies. But his complaint was simply shortness of breath (18)]

Pseudo objective motivation is characteristic of the style in novelistic language, and it is one of the many forms for concealing another’s speech in a hybrid form. The logic motivating the sentence seems to belong to the author; but it actually lies within the subjective belief system of one of the characters. Subordinate conjunctions and link words like thus, because, for the reason that, and words used to build up a logical sequence, such as therefore and consequently, “lose their direct authorial intention, take on the flavour of someone else’s language, become refracted or even completely reified” (Bakhtin 1981: 305).

Here, the narrator, the Venetian slave, is also the main voice of the implied author. He uses the forms constructed with -DI for reporting distal thought. However, it is not clear whether the expression because his enemies had deceived God with their calumnies belongs to the narrator or to the pasha. The narrator seems to adopt the pasha’s point of view as regards the involvement of Allah (not God in the original text) in this mysterious illness, which turns out to be ironic when they

6 See also Banfield (1982), Chafe (1994), and Thompson (1996).
realize that his illness is actually shortness of breath. In this double voiced hybrid a voice of a Westerner using the Easterner’s language can be heard which is itself ‘other’ to him in explaining the unlikely cause of a common illness.

If the narrator used -mıs instead of -DI to report the pasha’s thoughts, especially when he says his enemies had deceived God, this would mean that he would dissociate himself from the narrated content by distancing himself psychologically from it. His choice of -DI, on the other hand, makes the humorous effect of Allah’s inflicting the pasha with shortness of breath doubly stronger. The use of -DI here implies the narrator’s direct involvement and his naive belief in what he narrates.

3.2. Unintroduced citation (echoing)

(16) [The narrator relates his first reception at the Ottoman court.]

Bir cesarete kapilarak, dinimi değiştirmeyeceğini söyleyince, Paşa şaşırı, biraz, sonra, aptal olduğunu söyledi. Dinimi değiştirdim diyerek yüzüne hakahayacağım kimse yokmuş ki çevremde (29)

[In a sudden moment of courage, I said I would not change my religion, and the pasha surprised, called me a fool. After all, there was no one around me whom I would be ashamed to tell I had become a Muslim (29)]

In the Turkish version of this extract, the last sentence is a hybrid which clearly reflects the pasha’s words as an introduced citation within the narrator’s discourse. The postclitic -mıs makes it clear that this sentence reflects second-hand information, and it represents the pasha’s ideology. The slave carries the pasha’s tone within his speech. However, the adverbial after all creates a totally different hybrid in the English version. It is not clear whether these words belong to the pasha or to the narrator. In the Turkish version, this hybrid has reporative function, whereas in the English rendition it blurs the lines of the Easterner’s and the Westerner’s attitude towards religious conversion, and the reader has to make a decision about the owner of this thought depending on the context.

3.3. Parodic stylization of social discourses

(17) [The narrator portrays a lecture that Hoja gives at the Ottoman palace.]

Sonunda başlayabilmiş; hikayesine pekeyi şeyler eklenmiştir: Yıldızlardan akılları olan canlı yaratıklar gibi sözetti, geometri ve aritmetik bilen ve bildiklerine göre uyumla dönen, çekici essarlı yaratıklara benzetti onları (42)

[At last he was able to begin; he’d added new things to his tale; he talked about the stars as if they were intelligent, living beings, likening them to attractive, mysterious creatures who knew arithmetic and geometry, and who revolved in accord with their knowledge (40)]

Parodic stylization is characteristic of the comic style, but it is also an essential component of double-accented, ironic style that we find in The white castle. When a language or belief system is incorporated within the narrator’s discourse for parodic purposes, the object language is “unmasked and destroyed as something false, hypocritical, greedy, limited, narrowly rationalistic, inadequate to reality” (Bakhtin 1981: 311-312). Orhan Pamuk uses this property of hybrid discourse extensively to portray the slave’s attitude against the master and the culture he represents.

Although on a superficial level the slave seems to portray a scene at court, he adopts the superstitious tone of popular pseudo-scientific discourse of the scholars around the sultan. -mıs has admiring use here, and it implies that the slave did not have previous knowledge of Hoja’s new additions to his ‘tale’, although they had spent a considerable amount of time together. The English past perfect carries a more impersonal and factual sense than the Turkish -mıs here, and the surprise effect carried by the admiring -mıs is lost.

3.4. Multi-voiced reporting

(18) [The narrator talks about a meeting of Hoja and the child sultan.]

Çevresindekilerden, vebayla uğramışın Allah’a karşı gelmek olduğunu söyleyenler ikimşa da, aloudnamış Padişah; sonra, bir de hayvanlarını sormuş; sahinlerine, doğanlarına, aslanlarına, maymunlarına veba şekti ne işitt miyim? (102)

[Although among his [sultan’s] retinue there were those who said that to make war on the plague was to oppose God, the sultan paid no attention; and later he asked about his animals; would the plague-devil harm his falcons, his hawks, his lions, his monkeys? (92)]

Here -mıs and -ımıs make it obvious that this scene is related to the reader indirectly by the slave through Hoja’s words, but in the English version the narrator talks as if he has witnessed what took place between the sultan and Hoja. The sentence to make war on the plague was to oppose God can reflect the actual wording of the Sultan’s retinue (common opinion), Hoja, or the slave. Similarly, the expression would the plague-devil harm his falcons, his hawks, his lions, his monkeys can reflect the Sultan’s, Hoja’s or the slave’s words. If we take into ac-
count that the idea of devil appearing in the form of a plague is instilled in the young sultan’s mind by Hoja in the previous passage, we can conclude that the sentence is a cross between Hoja’s and the young Sultan’s words.

3.5. Contextual hybrid

(19) [narrator’s views on the military defeat against the West]

Yıktan imparatorluğun elindeki ülkeleri bir bir kaybetmesini mi anlıyor-duk? Haritalarımızın masanın üzerine yayar, önce hangi ülkenin, sonra hangi dağlarla hangi nehirlerin eden çıkacağını hüzünle saptardık [...] Bitte İstanbululların bir sabah sıcak yataklarından başla birer insan olarak kalktıklarını düşlerdim; elbilerini nasıl giyeceklerini bilemiyordur, minarelerin neye yaradığını hatırlamıyorlardı. Belki de yarım, ötekilerin üstünüğini gördük onlara benzemeye çalışmak demektı (122)

[Did we understand ‘defeat’ to mean that the empire would lose all of its territories one by one? We’d lay out our maps on the table and mournfully determine first which territories, then which mountains or rivers would be lost. Or did defeat mean that people would change and alter their beliefs without noticing it? We imagined how everyone in Istanbul might rise from their warm beds one morning as changed people, they wouldn’t know how to wear their clothes, wouldn’t be able to remember what minarets were for. Or perhaps defeat meant to accept the superiority of others and try to emulate them (109)]

This type of hybrid can only be explained with reference to the content of the novel as a whole. The extract above is written with the forms involving -DI. The parts rendered in bold reveal that the western slave mourns for the loss of territories of the Ottoman empire along with his eastern master. He does not even seem to rejoice in the fact that there is a possibility of defeating Islam altogether for the West. The word others here implies the Westerners from the viewpoint of the Easterners. The slave feels the pang of psychological defeat together with his master long before the onset of material defeat. This extract represents authorial speech, judging by its syntactic markers, however its entire emotional and cultural overtones belong to Hoja himself.

4. Distribution of the morpheme -mLŞ in The white castle

The frequency of the -mLŞ occurrence in the first and the second halves of the book implies that there is no significant difference between the two parts. However, when evidential values of -mLŞ are taken into account, a crucial difference can be noticed.

The general distribution of -mLŞ in the novel (see Table 1 and Figure 1 below) indicates that -mLŞ is used more in the first half of the novel (first seven chapters), when the narrator feels and acts as an observer rather than a participant of the Ottoman life style. In this part he narrates second-hand information that he has gained from Hoja, and his voice displays irony, disbelief and scorn. As the narrator adapts himself to his foreign surroundings, and starts to identify with the consciousness of his master, there is a drop in the use of -mLŞ (after Chapter 7), combined with a simultaneous rise in the use of -DI in narration (a decrease in the use of -mLŞ implies a natural increase in the use of -DI), because the narrator participates in the events narrated physically and mentally. Finally, in the last chapter there is a significant increase in the use of -mLŞ when the question of identity between the two main characters is left as an unresolved issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of -mLŞ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The count of the morpheme -mLŞ in the chapters of The white castle

Figure 1. The distribution of the morpheme -mLŞ in the chapters of The white castle

5. Conclusion

In view of the discussions above, the following observations can be made regarding the functions of evidential markers -DI and -mLŞ in novelistic hybrids:

- In the Turkish version of The white castle, we can perceive the tone of a Westerner who is looking down upon Easterners. This helps to create a double-accented ironic style which sets up the tone especially for the first half of the novel. The pragmatic functions of the forms -mLŞ and -mLŞ emphasize this tone.
- Because -DI is mainly a past tense marker, and it is used to convey the speaker’s direct experiences, it naturally appears in novelistic hybrids that set an objective perspective. On the other hand, -mLŞ, with its multi-functioned
form, appears more in multi-voiced double-accented hybrids. As a consequence, different hybrids constructed with -DI and -mls create a dialogic tension and a lively ‘to’ and ‘from’ movement between the pseudo-objective authorial voice and the voice of a character physically and emotionally involved in what s/he narrates.

The present paper has aimed to point out the cognitive barriers involved in processing novelistic language. It has been shown that these barriers stem from multifunctional values of language-specific grammatical categories. They can be identified through the cross-linguistic analysis of content and form in a novel. An interdisciplinary approach to hybrids based on Bakhtin’s theory of heteroglossia can be a step towards closing the methodological gap in the existing literary and linguistic analyses of novelistic language.
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