



Mersin Üniversitesi Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, MEUDED, 2015; 12 (1), 63-92.

## SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF THE TURKISH DISCOURSE PARTICLE *HELE*: A CORPUS-DRIVEN STUDY IN LEXICAL PROFILING

M. Fatih Adıgüzel<sup>1</sup>

*Mersin University*

**Abstract:** The present study investigates the Turkish discourse particle *hele*, commonly used especially in spoken Turkish, in terms of its semantic and pragmatic uses in naturally occurring language. All analyses are based on attested data obtained from *Turkish National Corpus (demo version)*. This corpus-driven study is thus naturally a product of an inductive undertaking. First, the common senses and corpus-driven pragmatic functions of the discourse particle *hele* are determined and further analyzes are carried out to derive its lexical profile from a variety of contexts of use. To this end, *hele*'s common collocation patterns *hele o*, *hele şu*, *hele bir* and *hele bir de* are analyzed in their contexts and then basic observations on its colligations, semantic preference and semantic prosody are presented. The comparison of the senses and functions that the online reference dictionary of Turkish Language Association provides for *hele* to the patterns of use determined in this study indicates clearly the important role of corpus data in clarification of the senses and functions of a word.

<sup>1</sup> Mersin Üniversitesi, İngiliz Dilbilimi doktora programı öğrencisi,  
mfatihad@gmail.com

Makale gönderim tarihi: 12 Aralık, 2014 ; Kabul tarihi: 9 Nisan 2015

**Keywords:** *Discourse particle, discourse marker, hele, corpus-driven study, lexical profile*

## **TÜRKÇE SÖYLEM İŞARETÇİSİ HELE’NİN ANLAMBİLİMSEL VE EDİMBİLİMSEL ÇÖZÜMLEMESİ VE SÖZCÜKSEL PROFİLİ: DERLEM-ÇIKIŞLI BİR ÇALIŞMA**

**Öz:** Bu çalışmada özellikle konuşma dilinde yaygın olarak kullanılan söylem parçacığı *hele* anlambilimsel ve edimbilimsel açıdan incelenmiştir. Bütün çözümlenmeler Türkçe Ulusal Derlemindeki (TUD) gerçekleşmiş dil verileri temel alınarak yapılmıştır. Çalışma derlem-çıkışlı ve bu yüzden de doğal olarak tümevarımsal bir incelemenin sonucudur. Öncelikle söylem işaretçisi *hele*’nin yaygın anlamı ve derlem çıkışlı edimbilimsel işlevleri çıkarılmış, daha sonra sözcüksel profiline yönelik çözümlenmeler yapılmıştır. Bu amaçla söylem parçacığı *hele*’nin yaygın eşdizilim örüntüleri olan *hele o*, *hele şu*, *hele bir* ve *hele bir de* edimbilimsel olarak incelenmiş ve son olarak *hele*’nin dilbilgisel eşdizilimleri, anlambilimsel tercihi ve uyumu konusundaki gözlemler belirtilmiştir. *Hele* için TDK sözlüğünün verdiği anlam ve işlevler ile bu çalışmadaki bulgular karşılaştırıldığında, bir sözcüğün anlam ve işlevleri konusunda derlem verisinin önemli olduğu açıkça görülmektedir.

**Anahtar sözcükler:** *Söylem parçacığı, söylem işaretçisi, hele, derlem- çıkışlı, sözcüksel profil.*

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The present paper is a corpus-driven study on the lexical profile of the Turkish discourse particle *hele*. *Hele* is a multifunctional and multi-sense lexical item whose pragmatic functions and meanings can only be revealed through an exhaustive research into attested data. The online dictionary of the Turkish Language Association (TDK Türkçe Sözlük) seems far from supplying satisfactory explanations or descriptions for *hele*’s meanings and functions. The dictionary simply gives the basic meanings *especially* (özellikle), then adds “*at last*”(*sonunda*) as its second meaning to mark a late decision to do something long delayed. It finally mentions its pragmatic functions like “It is a word that expresses warning, threatening or promising.” This obscure explanation supplied by the online dictionary does not reflect *hele*’s lexical profile nor its multitude of senses and pragmatic

functions. This paper is an attempt to reveal its distinct meanings, pragmatic functions and its lexical profile based on *the Turkish National Corpus-Demo Version (TNC Demo)*.

Section two presents the theoretical framework of a corpus-driven research. It presents fundamental aspects of corpus methodology on pattern recognition – collocation, colligation, semantic prosody, semantic preference and the basics of pragmatics of discourse particle. Section three introduces the methodology – data collection and data analysis. Section four sheds light on the common and corpus-driven meanings of *hele*. Section five focuses on the lexical profile of the particle – its common collocates, colligates, semantic preference and prosody.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As a corpus-driven study on the Turkish discourse particle “hele,” the study necessitates the definition of corpus related terms. The concepts associated with corpus-related researches in this study include semantic prosody, semantic preference, collocation, colligation and pragmatic concept of discourse particle which should be defined before any analysis to be pursued.

### 2.1. COLLOCATION

Collocation is a main organizing feature of texts. McEnery and Hardie (2012, p. 123) use this term “to refer to a wide range of different co-occurrence patterns that may be extracted from a corpus.” It is a co-occurrence pattern between two items that exist in close proximity to each other even though the items may not be adjacent. If an item habitually comes after or before another item more often than would be by chance, there is a collocation pattern and one is the collocate of the other. The item whose total pattern of co-occurrence with other words is under examination is called a *node* and a collocate is any of the items which occur with the node (Sinclair et al 2004, cited in McEnery and Hardie, 2012, p. 124). A node’s collocates help it display its true meaning in any utterance, which was observed by J.R. Firth as early as 1957 when he said “You shall judge a word by the company it keeps.”

Collocation is not simply a juxtaposition of words. Rather, it is an

order of mutual expectancy (Stewart, 2010, p. 85). Some words are lexically primed to occur together. It is a mind-internal phenomenon and lexical priming or mutual expectancy about words attracting each other forming habitual co-occurrences is built up in a culture through repeated exposure to examples of words in context (McEnery & Hardie, 2012, p. 146).

## 2.2. COLLIGATION

A word collocates not only with meaningful lexical items but also with grammatical markers of categories. Such collocations are called *colligation*. For instance, colligation with *the* is typical of the category *noun*. Similarly, in our corpus citations, *hele* often colligates with *o*, *şu* (demonstrative adjectives), *ki* (conjunctions) and formal categories *imperative*, *optative*, *conditional* and *converbs*.

## 2.3. SEMANTIC PROSODY

Also referred to as *discourse prosody*, semantic prosody is a concept rooted in the neo-Firthian concordance-based analysis of collocation (McEnery & Hardie, 2012, p. 136). Louw (1993) is often cited as the first to outline the concept of semantic prosody. Louw (1993, p. 157, cited in McEnery & Hardie, 2012, p. 136) describes semantic prosody as “[a] consistent aura of meaning with which a form is imbued by its collocates.” Thus, habitual collocates of a form imbue it with a certain colour of meaning over time and it can no longer be seen in isolation from its semantic prosody. The lexical environment in which a lexical item or bundle occurs gives it a certain prosody and its imbue, connotation and semantic preference – all its features which are entrenched in our mental lexicon.

Semantic prosody cannot be interpreted from the lexical item itself or a single concordance line from the corpus. All the concordances of a node should be scrutinized before any judgement can be made about the prosody associated with it. Prosody is evaluative and attitudinal and therefore reflects the analyst’s observation based on the unit of meaning that the node in question is a part of. As prosody is evaluative, it is often labelled as favourable/positive or unfavourable/negative. Semantic prosody is not directly visible or accessible to the pure co-text in a concordance line. Analysing all the concordance lines, the

linguist identifies prosody as the final arbiter.

Partington (2004, p. 132) argues that the evaluative meaning of a lexical item is communicated through the whole unit – item plus lexical environment. Therefore when we say *cause*, *set in*, *happen* have unfavourable prosodies, we do not mean that negativity is inherent in these items, but tends to occur as a result of diachronic priming process which imbues an item with an aura of sense. Partington (2004, p. 133) suggests that prosodies of some units are such that diverging from them can only be a result of accident or insincerity if not for an ironic effect.

According to McEnery & Hardie (2012, p. 136), negative or positive prosody does not necessarily result from only the significant collocates of a lexical item. Rather, words or phrases that the node in question co-occurs with may be different in each concordance and may still have a common prosody. For instance, the lemma *happen* occurs with subjects that have negative meanings, but in each case the subject may be different. To put it more simply, not all subjects with a negative meaning which are selected to co-occur with *happen* are from a limited number of its habitual collocates.

The relevance of semantic prosody to pragmatics, more specifically, the role of speaker's intended meaning has been previously discussed by Sinclair (2004, p. 34). The ordinary semantic values of lexical items are not necessarily relevant; however, semantic prosody provides a link between the node in question and its lexical environment. "It expresses something close to the 'function' of the item." In his identification of the semantic prosody of the lexical unit *the naked eye*, Sinclair postulates a prosody of *difficulty*. He bases this identification upon the item's lexical environment – what words the items semantically prefers: *see*, *visible*, *invisible*, *faint*, *weak*, *small*, and *difficult*. His assignment of the prosody of *difficulty* for *the naked item* demonstrates that semantic prosodies are not always labelled as favourable or unfavourable.

As for the postulation of semantic prosodies, a prosody associated with a lexical item is not its inherent feature in most cases. For example, Stewart (2010, p. 58) suggests that semantic prosody extends across a lexical item or unit. Therefore, a statement like "word x has a

prosody y” is controversial because prosody does not belong to the word alone. The word and its co-text should be taken into account together. Stewart (2010, p. 60), along with Sinclair, seems to agree with the formulation “the unit of meaning containing node x is characterized by a prosody y.”

#### 2.4. SEMANTIC PREFERENCE

Partington (2004, p. 145) refers to semantic preference as the relationship between a lemma and a set of semantically related words. Semantic preference is about the collocational behaviour of a lexical item – what semantic set of words that it habitually co-occurs with. For example, the maximizing adverb *utterly* tends to co-occur with words from the semantic category of *absence* or *change*. Thus we find it with words like *helpless, useless, unable, forgotten* – all expressing absence of something or words like *changed, transformed, different* – which represent the semantic category of *change*.

Semantic preference is closely linked with semantic prosody. Semantic preference links a particular node to a particular category of a semantic set, while semantic prosody affects wider stretches of text (Partington, 2004, p. 151). The collocates for which a node has a semantic preference contribute to its semantic prosody. Conversely, semantic prosody of a node dictates a lexical environment which restricts the node’s preferential choices. A concrete example to show the distinction between the two concepts would be Sinclair’s (2004, p. 34) analysis of the behaviour of the lexical unit *the naked eye*. The unit has a semantic preference for words about *visibility* (*see, perceive, detect, visible, invisible*) and has the semantic prosody of *difficulty*. In sum, semantic prosody is like the taste of a meal, whereas semantic preference refers to the right group of ingredients to make the meal.

#### 2.5. DISCOURSE PARTICLES

Every language has discourse particles and they are typically idiosyncratic and untranslatable because we normally do not find exact equivalents for them in other languages. On the other hand, they are so ubiquitous in speech that without understanding them one’s communicative competence in that language would be greatly impaired (Aijmer, 2002, p. 1). Discourse particles have pragmatic

functions, so they are also called pragmatic particles. They are interactional signals or discourse markers functioning as signposts in communication and facilitate the hearer's or reader's accurate interpretation of an utterance. In English, *now, well, oh, ah, sort of, actually, you see, I mean* are examples of discourse particles often scattered in speech. They mostly do not have any particular meanings in isolation but give clues about how discourse is to be segmented or processed.

Yılmaz (2004, p. 2) focuses on pragmatic functions of discourse particles, stating that their importance does not lie with the syntactic and semantic aspects of a constructional unit. He also mentions the multiple roles of discourse particles in the literature as connectives, fillers, hedges, conversational greasers, compromisers and so on. On her work on Turkish discourse marker *tamam* with data based on the Spoken Turkish Corpus, Ruhi (2013) sheds light on pragmatic meanings of *tamam* as different from its lexical denotation of completeness. As Ruhi (2013) mentions at the end of her work, interactional markers in Turkish have not been investigated adequately yet in terms of their discursive functions and they deserve focus as a topic of inquiry.

In the present paper, we tried to clarify the lexical profile of *hele* by digging through the Turkish National Corpus. *Hele*, which functions as a discourse particle in Turkish, has no exact equivalents in English in many cases. Therefore, in the paper we had to resort to periphrastic expressions in our concordance analyses of its pragmatic functions.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

The present paper is a corpus-driven work to describe the lexical profile of the Turkish discourse particle *hele*. It is largely a qualitative work, though it is impossible to avoid using quantified data in corpus linguistic studies. As a corpus-driven study, the paper approaches the corpus (TNC Demo) in an inductive way to form hypotheses about the lexical profile of *hele*. It is characteristic of a linguist to approach the corpus data in an exploratory way without previously formulated hypotheses (McEnery & Hardie, 2012, p. 151).

### 3.1. DATA COLLECTION

We used the Turkish National Corpus (TNC Demo) to base our study on attested data. First we entered *hele* in the query box of the TNC-Demo to find out its common meaning. We limited our search to the categories *books*, *fiction* and *children* and obtained a manageable datum of 398 concordance lines, 4 of which were later removed, which left us with 394 lines we identified the common meaning and corpus-driven other meanings of the particle *hele*.

To make a pragmatic and semantic analysis of its collocation patterns, we looked at the collocation list of *hele* and observed that it often collocates with *o*, *şu*, *bir*, *bir de* and *bi*. For *hele o* 160 concordance lines; for *hele şu* 90 lines; for *hele bir* 50 lines; for *hele bir de* 50 lines and for *hele bi* 16 lines (the total number in the corpus) were cited in the corpus and later analyzed.

To see what *hele bir* and *hele bir de* colligate with, a mixed list of concordance lines with *hele bir* and *hele bir de* was obtained. Then the first 50 lines for each were analyzed to see what they colligate with.

### 3.2. DATA ANALYSIS

McEnery & Hardie (2012, p. 126) states that “the computer’s role ends with supplying the analyst with a set of concordance lines. Then “the linguist examines each concordance line individually, identifying by eye the items and patterns which occur in proximity to the node...”

In this study we followed the same procedure. First we obtained relevant concordance lines and then cancelled out any irrelevant lines. We checked each line and marked each for any collocational, colligational and prosodic features. Finally, we manually counted the concordance citations to group similar patterns and meanings into emerging categories.

We did not need any statistical testing to describe what *hele* means or what functions it has. What is more important is to discern distinct senses or functions which *hele* or lexical units like *hele bir*, *hele o* imbue an utterance with. However, in order to determine prosodic

features of our nodes, we manually counted lines with the same prosody and from the raw frequency counts we drew conclusions about prosodic features. Whenever a citation was unclear, the wider text encapsulating it was retrieved from the computer and examined.

#### 4. COMMON MEANING AND CORPUS-DRIVEN MEANINGS OF HELE

##### 4.1. COMMON MEANING OF HELE

We carried out a restricted query of *hele* in the Turkish National Corpus (TNC Demo) limiting our search to the subcategories *book*, *fiction* and *children* to obtain a manageable number of concordance lines. Our search with the node *hele* returned 398 lines, four of which were removed because they were ambiguous. It was observed that in 235 lines *hele* is used to mean *özellikle* – the exact English match for *especially*. In 35 of these 235 lines we encountered its more emphatic reduplicated form *hele hele*, which places additional stress on its meaning of *especially*. To sum up, out of 394 concordance lines, 235 lines displayed *hele* in its most common meaning: *özellikle* (especially). Like its English match, *hele* as a focus adverb precedes noun phrases, time clauses or conditional clauses. Below are sample citations from the corpus data where *hele* occurs sentence initially:

- (1) *Hele* Veli'nin son hareketinden sonra...  
(*Especially* after Veli's last conduct...) (UA16B2A-1206, TNC Demo version)
- (2) *Hele* hafif bir yağmur yağınca ...  
(*Especially* when there is a light rain...) (FA14B1A-1617, TNC Demo)
- (3) Üstelik annesiyle kardeşlerini de özlemişti. *Hele* annesinin sıcaklığını...  
(She had missed her mother and brother, *especially* her mother's warmth...)  
(GA16B1A-0732, TNC Demo)

#### 4.2. CORPUS-DRIVEN MEANINGS OF HELE

When *hele* does not mean *özellikle* (especially), it functions as a discourse particle which represents a culture specific use too hard to be translated to other languages with exact matches. Therefore, what we mean by the title above actually refers to its pragmatic functions for which we will be using periphrastic expressions throughout the paper as it is quite hard to determine the meaning of a discourse particle (Aijmer, 2002, p. 23). As indicated before, in 235 out of 394 concordance lines with our node *hele* we see its common meaning *özellikle* (especially). In the remaining 159 lines *hele* has various discursive functions. It tends to carry a core meaning of *urgency*. In many cases it gives force to several illocutionary acts to be dealt with in the subsequent parts of the study.

Here we present what it means or how it functions in the 159 concordance lines where it does not mean *özellikle* (especially).

##### 4.2.1. URGENT REQUEST OR WISH

When *hele* marks a request, wish or command, it tends to colligate with the imperative form. In such examples, *hele* is part of a unit of meaning like “*Lütfen hemen yap*” (*Please do that as soon as possible or at once*). The user begs or makes a demand for an immediate response. *Hele* denotes urgent request in 79 of the 159 lines which denote meanings other than *especially*, which occurs in 235 lines in our total concordance of 394 lines. Sample concordance lines:

- (4) Mehmet Ağa: Neymiş o? De *hele*.  
(Aga Mehmet: What’s that? Say it *please at once*.)  
(SA14B1A-1585, TNC Demo)
- (5) Ne oldu kızım, *hele* anlat bakalım...  
(What is the matter, daughter. *Please* tell about it *at once*)  
(UA16B1A-1206, TNC Demo)
- (6) “Dur, dinle *hele!*” diyerek Ege’yi susturdu Postacı Erkan.  
(Erkan the Postman silenced Ege saying “Calm down and listen *at once please*”)   
(PA16B4A-1247, TNC Demo)

In this utterance, Erkan urges Ege to give up whatever he is doing or saying and to listen to him at once. The utterance denotes an insistent request to be fulfilled without delay. While *hele* already denotes urgency in Turkish, the inherent urgency sense is maximized with the imperative form added.

#### 4.2.2. PRECONDITION OR PREREQUISITE

*Hele* marks an action to be prioritised before another can occur. It is a prerequisite that something should happen first for a purpose to be fulfilled. In such cases, *hele* seems to be part of a unit of meaning like *önce, öncelikle ....olsun* (if / once..... at first). In 32 lines we detected this sense of *hele*. In this sense, it tends to colligate with the Turkish optative form and often collocates with *bir*. Typical lines:

- (7) Annesi, “*Hele* bir ağabeyi gelsin de konuşalım,” demiş.  
 (“*It is a prerequisite that* her elder brother come *first* before we talk about the matter,” said her mother. (UA16B1A-1207, TNC Demo)

The utterance can also be paraphrased as “For her elder brother to come is a precondition for us to start talking the matter.”

- (8) Siz razı olun *hele*, gider mal sandığını kendim alırım.  
 (*If / Once* you agree (*which I urgently insist on*), I’ll go and fetch the box of goods.) (FA16B1A-1920, TNC Demo)

#### 4.2.3. FOCUSING ON SOMEONE/SOMETHING SURPRISING / ASTONISHING / STRIKING

This distinct meaning is similar to the most common meaning of *hele* –*özellikle* (especially), but they are not interchangeable. In 24 lines we detected that *hele* marks someone or something surprising, astonishing, unexpected etc. *Hele* as a discourse marker invites the addressee to focus on something or someone’s astonishing, unusual, unexpected behaviour, feature or condition.

- (9) ...boy boy Süper Boy oyuncağı vardı. *Hele* bir tanesi pilliydi ve kendi kendine hareket edebiliyordu.

(.....he had supersize toys of all sizes. (with *hele* I now invite you to focus on the toy which astonishes me/him so much) *One of them even* had batteries and was automatic. (OA16B2A-1253, TNC Demo)

Make sure that *özellikle* (especially) feels out of place in the instance above (...*Hele* (özellikle?) bir tanesi pilliydi)

- (10) ...düşümde karısını çok seviyordu ve ona çok saygılıydı. *Hele* bir düşümde karısına, “Ah hatun ah, ben senden önce ölmek istiyorum” bile demişti.  
 (...in my dreams he loved his wife a lot and was very respectful towards her. (With *hele* I now invite you to focus on a specific/striking dream of mine) *In one particular dream of mine he even* said “Oh, my wife, I would like to die before you.”)  
 (UA16B1A-1233, TNC demo)

- (11) AYKÛ (IQ) su çok gelişmiş şu şaşkına bakın *hele!*  
 (*Focus your attention on and* look at that confused man with a high IQ!) (QA14B1A1631, TNC Demo)

The final position of *hele* on the syntagmatic progression of the utterance gives additional force to it, placed just after the verb in the imperative form.

#### 4.2.4. DEFYING / CHALLENGING

We discerned this distinct sense of *hele* in 12 concordance lines of our restricted search. In this sense, *hele* collocates with *bir* (literally *one* in English) and colligates with the imperative form and the optative form, especially the third person singular and plural optative forms (-sIn, -sInAr). Make sure to notice the difference of this meaning from the precondition sense of *hele* in 4.2.2. In this *defying* sense, a bad result will occur if whatever you defy someone to do is fulfilled. Sample citations include:

- (12) Seni küçük yaratık! *Hele* bir ağaçtan in ...Bir de sırtıyorsun ha!...”  
 (You little creature! *I defy / dare you to* get down from the tree....And you are smirking!) (GA16B1A-1929, TNC Demo)

- (13) Zaten annemden ödüm kopar. Vururken sesini çıkarmayacaksın.  
*Hele* bağıır...”  
 (I dread mom. While she is beating you, you mustn't scream.  
 Scream *if you can*. (Then you will bear the consequences)  
 (LA16B1A-1366)
- (14) Durun siz, *hele* bir başkan olayım da görürsünüz.  
 (Wait and see, once I've become the head, I will make you suffer  
 badly) (LA14B1A-1623, TNC Demo)

#### 4.2.5. “AT LAST!”

*Hele* is used in contexts where you at last decide to do something which has long preoccupied you or which has long been procrastinated. In 7 concordance lines, we detected this sense of *hele*. Of course *hele* is not the exact equivalent of *at last* because its Turkish match *sonunda* is not appropriate for the optative form with which *hele* tends to colligate. *Hele* in this sense co-occurs with first person singular or plural subjects. Sample lines:

- (15) *Hele* şu ocağın başına oturup da biraz kestireyim.  
 (*It is high time* I sat near the fireplace and took a nap for a while OR  
*I have decided at last* to sit near....) (UA16B2A, TNC Demo)

#### 4.2.6. “TESTING” FOR EXPERIENCE-SHARING

In our restricted search we discerned three cases in which the speaker uses *hele* to urge the addressee to test/try/experience something which the speaker seems to have tried already. *Hele* implies the action *dene-* (try, test). Intuitively the following utterance is quite typical and natural in Turkish:

- (16) A: Ali'nin çantasını kaldır *hele*. (*Do try and lift* Ali's schoolbag)  
 B: Ne oldu ki? (Why, should I?)  
 A: Ya sen kaldır. (Come on, do that)  
 B: (Kaldırırken) Bu ne kadar ağır! Bunda ne var?  
 (While lifting it) (How heavy it is! What is in it?)

Apparently Speaker A has already experienced how heavy Ali's

schoolbag is and then wants to share his experience with Speaker B, urging him to try lifting the bag. In such utterances *hele* tends to colligate with the imperative to the left of the node.

- (17) Gel de bak şunlara ne olur. ... Şu resmi görüyor musun? Şu lüle lüle saçlara, şu alımlı güzel yüze, gülen gözlere bir bak *hele*. Ne kadar da güzel değil mi?  
 (Come and look at those please. ... Do you see that photo? *Try and agree with my experience* while looking at those tresses, that charming face and those smiley eyes. They are so beautiful, aren't they? (SA14B1A-4732, TNC Demo)

In this concordance line, the speaker shares his / her experience of a lady's portrait with the addressee. In this line the speaker not only invites the addressee to test or experience what the speaker has already had but also gives traces of what the addressee will experience while looking at the photo.

#### 4.2.7. "I WONDER / REALLY"

In one concordance line of our search, we concluded that *hele* occurs to denote a meaning like *I wonder / He or she wonders or really* in questions. *Hele* seems to mean another Turkish word *acaba*.

- (18) İki de bir de anlattıklarına dair bana sorular soruyor, *hele* dinliyor mu diye imtihan ediyi.  
 (He often asks me questions about what he has been saying, *wondering* and *checking* whether I am *really* listening. (UA16B1A-1233, TNC)

#### 4.2.8. "LUCKILY"

In one line *hele* with "ki" to the right of the node is used in the sense of *iyi ki / neyse ki* (Luckily):

- (19) Ayşe parmak kaldırmıştı –Ben söyleyeyim öğretmenin, dedi. Ben biliyorum. –Sakın söyleme, diye fısıldadım. *Hele ki* öğretmen anlayışla karşıladi.

(Ayşe had raised her hand. She said “I’ll say the answer. I do know it.” I whispered “Do never say it” *Luckily*, the teacher showed us understanding...) (SA16B1A-0768, TNC Demo)

#### 4.3. OVERALL LOOK AT *HELE*’S USES

From our semantic analysis of the 394 concordance lines which displayed our node *hele*, the following corpus-driven distribution about the different senses of *hele* emerges:

**Table 1. Common and corpus-driven meanings of *hele* and structural collocates**

<b>Total Concordance Lines of <i>hele</i> in our restricted search</b>	394	Structural collocates ▼
<b>Most Common meaning of <i>hele</i>: especially (özellikle)</b>	235	nominals and clauses
<b>Other corpus-driven senses / functions of <i>hele</i> in total</b>	159	
1) Urgent Request or Wish (Please do at once / <i>Lütfen hemen yap</i> )	79	imperative/optative
2) Precondition / Prerequisite (If/once ...first / öncelikle, önce...)	32	imperative/optative
3) Focusing on someone/something surprising/striking	24	noun phrase / nominal verb
4) Defying / Challenging (I defy you / <i>Sıkıyorsa...</i> )	12	imperative/optative
5) At last / It is high time I did	7	optative
6) Testing for experience sharing (please test / try it / <i>Denesene</i> )	3	imperative
7) I wonder / Really (?) ( <i>Acaba / Gerçekten ?</i> )	1	interrogative

8) Luckily (İyi ki, neyse ki) 1 statement

---

*Hele* occurs in 6163 concordance lines in TNC-Demo. It is natural that there must be other meanings waiting to be uncovered. For example, in the following dialogue, what *hele* means is not clear possibly because it represents a special idiosyncratic use:

**A: Elması Mehmet Çalmış!**

(I've heard Mehmet stole the diomond!)

**B: *Hele* geçen ay çok para harcıyordu.**

(*It must be for that reason that* he was spending a lot last month)

*Hele* is used here to mark hindsight evidence; a reason or evidence from the past is added to its right. It is interchangeable with “demek ki o yüzden” (apparently for that reason). This distinct sense and many others must be hiding somewhere in the corpus waiting to be discovered.

## 5. LEXICAL PROFILING OF HELE

In this part most common collocations and colligations of *hele* will be covered. We will also discuss semantic preference and semantic prosody of *hele* and lexical units formed by it.

### 5.1. COLLOCATES OF HELE.

Of the collocates of *hele*, we focussed on the pragmatic and semantic functions *o*, *şu*, *bir*, *bi* and *bir de*, respectively occurring as *hele o*, *hele şu*, *hele bir*, *hele bi*, and *hele bir de*. All these collocates occur adjacently on the right of the node *hele*.

#### 5.1.1. HELE O

*O* is one of the most common words that *hele* habitually co-occurs with. In most concordance lines, *hele* and *o* are not semantically

disconnected words, with either adding its own meaning to the utterance. Rather, *hele o* is a single lexical unit – as if fused together – a fixed chunk of language that is used to add the most striking example to the previously given information or expresses the most important constituent of the entity under consideration mentioned syntagmatically on the left of the node. When it functions as a single inter-fused lexical unit, *hele o* always adds the most striking example and is pronounced like single word /helo:/. However, *hele* and *o* are pronounced separately in other meanings of *hele* (/hele+/o/).

In our search for *hele o* we noted 204 concordance lines. 44 lines were removed as they were totally irrelevant. We were left with 160 lines to focus on. We discerned *hele o* as a fixed lexical unit in 87 lines in all of which *hele o* focuses the most striking example or constituent for the already mentioned thing(s) or person(s). *O* in the unit is not a demonstrative adjective used indexically. It simply makes the meaning *especially* of *hele* more emphatic. *Hele o* itself colligates with a noun phrase (20, 21 below) or a nominalised verb (in 22). The corresponding lines:

- (20) Yazdığımız notları çok iyi bulduğumu belirtmeliyim. *Hele o* son paragraph...  
(I must admit that I found your notes very good. *Especially (that)* last paragraph.) (KA16B5A-0098, TNC Demo)
- (21) Arkamdan sürekli itilmekteydim. *Hele o* self servis tepşileri!  
(I was kept pushing. *Especially (those)* self-service trays! (most annoying) (FA16B2A-0004, TNC Demo)
- (22) Kızının çocuklarına verdiği terbiyeyi çok beğeniyordu. *Hele o* küçüklerin selam vermesi ona dünyalara bedeldi.  
(He very much liked the way his daughter raised her children. *Especially (those)* juniors' greeting him was worth everything. (HA16B2A-0717, TNC Demo).

In all the three citations, *hele o* can also be used in the sense of *especially* without *o* though less emphatically. On the other hand, what makes *hele o* much more emphatic is the use of *yok mu* as its collocate on the right of the node in 14 lines of the 87 lines with *hele o* as a single lexical unit. *Yok mu* is not marked with a question mark in such

lines.

- (23) Zaten Almanlardan nefret ederdi. *Hele o* Alman diplomatlar *yok mu*.  
 (He used to hate Germans *especially (those)* German diplomats  
 (yok mu = literally *aren't they absent?*) (LA16B4A-1948, TNC  
 Demo)

In 73 of the total 160 *hele o* concordance lines, *hele* and *o* are semantically independent. They are like two strangers who happen to be adjacently seated on a bus during a journey. *O* is the Turkish match for the English *that* or *those* as demonstrative adjectives and *hele* has any of the meanings we displayed in section 4.

- (24) Siz hiç merak buyurmayın. *Hele o* günler bir gelsin.  
 (You do not worry. *Once those* days come...) (SA14B3A-1588,  
 TNC Demo)

**Table 2. “Hele” with its collocate “o”**

“Hele o” (multi-word expression)	87 (14 of them have “yok mu” in their lexical environment)
“Hele + o” (coincidental co-occurrence)	73
Total	160

### 5.1.2. HELE ŞU

*Şu* in Turkish is the equivalent of the English demonstratives *that* / *those*. These forms are usually used to point at something or things distant from the deictic centre – the speaker’s location. However, both in Turkish and English there are some cases where these forms are not used ostensively or gesturally. Rather, the speaker introduces a psychological distance between himself/herself and the thing(s) or person(s) modified with *şu* (that/those). Yule (1996:13) notes that even things close to the speaker may be marked as psychologically distant as in the sentence “I don’t like that!” for a perfume that he or she is

just sniffing in his/her hand.

For a close analysis of *şu* as a collocate of *hele*, we typed *hele şu* in the query box and obtained 162 lines first. Then we saw that 64 lines were totally irrelevant or unclear either because of syntactic or semantic obstacles that hinder considering the co-occurrence of the two words as having a distinct collocational meaning and in 8 other lines *şu* was part of time adverbs like *şu günler* (these days). With all these removed, we were left with 90 lines to check for a semantic pattern. It was seen that in 62 of the 90 lines at hand *şu* (that/those) was used non-gesturally – which we marked as non-indexical. In 28 of the total 87 lines *şu* was used to point to things or people, which we marked as indexical. In 41 of the 62 lines in which *şu* was non-indexical, *hele şu* colligates with the Turkish optative form. In such lines, this colligation of *hele şu* with the optative form creates a unit of meaning in which someone “at last” finds it necessary to handle a job about something long procrastinated or sees it as a precondition for a purpose. Sample lines:

- (25) Gürel'im için katlandıklarımı filan bir kenara koy da, *hele şu* öbür meselem için bir yol göster, bakalım.  
(Now forget about what I suffered for my dear Gürel and *urgently* give me guidance for *that* other problem of mine (which?) please)  
(QA14B1A-1631, TNC Demo).
- (26) *Hele şu* çaylarımızı içelim yoksa buz kesecek. (Let's *just* drink *those* teas (cups of tea) of us, or else they will become ice cold)  
(SA16B2A-0516, TNC)
- (27) Gördüğün gibi geçen hafta pek hareketli değildi şekerim. *Hele şu* ocak ayı rehavetini atlatalım. Pek yakında sana fişek gibi haberlerim olabilir.  
(As you know, last week was not so hectic, sweetie. *My urgent wish* is to get over *that* January lethargy, so that I may soon give you fascinating news) (TE36E1B-3295, TNC Demo)

In 28 of the 90 lines *şu* is used gesturally, which we marked as indexical. Sample line:

- (28) Ufukta ne kadar çok gemi vardı. *Hele şu kırmızılı olanı, turuncu çizgili.*  
 (There are so many ships on the horizon. *Especially that red one with orange lines*) (OA16B3A-0109, TNC Demo)

**Table 3. *Hele* with its collocates *şu***

Total	Non-indexical		Indexical
	62		
90	Optative	Other	28
	41	21	

### 5.1.3. *HELE BİR*

When *hele* collocates with *bir* the two words constitute a single lexical unit which itself colligates with either the Turkish optative form or the imperative form. The lexical bundle *hele bir*, when it colligates with the optative form, tends to mark a precondition for another thing to happen or a strong wish for something to happen.

- (29) Yüksek okula başlayanlar yurttan ayrılıyorlar. –İyi de o zaman nerede kalacaksın? *Hele bir okulu kazanayım* da, Reyhan hanım bizim için bir kolaylık düşünür elbet.  
 (Those accepted by a university check out of the dormitory. –Then when will you stay? *Let me win a university place first*, Reyhan will probably help me in some way. (Winning a university place is my urgent wish or my top priority; whether I can find a place to stay at is of secondary importance for now) (LA16B4A-0431, TNC Demo)

In the following line *hele bir* with the optative form is like “I wish” in English:

- (30) *Hele bir gelsin*, ayaklarına kapanacağım. (How urgently *I wish* he would come, then I would go down on my knees to him)  
 (FA16B2A-0984, TNC Demo)

*Hele bir*, when it colligates with the imperative form, marks a threat or

a challenge.

- (31) *Hele bir* dokun gör ne olur! (I defy you to touch (it) / Touch it *if you can*; then you will bear the consequences!) (JA14B1A-1689, TNC Demo)

There are also 16 concordance lines in the corpus with *hele bi* which is reduced from *hele bir*. The lexical unit *hele bi* is more likely to colligate with the optative or imperative form than *hele bir* but has the same function as *hele bir*. Sample lines:

- (32) Hani birlikte avukatlık yapacaktık, zilli? ...*Hele bi* gel buraya. Ben sana yapacağımı bilirim. (Wouldn't we work as lawyers together, bitch?...*I defy* her to come here, then I know what I will do to her) (SI22C2A-0449, TNC Demo)

#### 5.1.4. HELE BIR DE

This lexical bundle has a maximizing effect. Typically a situation is described before *hele* and to the right of this bundle is added whatever makes it best or worst. The last and most desirable or undesirable thing is marked that completes the given favourable or unfavourable picture. The discourse connective *-da* in the lexical unit *hele bir de* has an additive function per se (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, p. 101), but *bir de* in the phrase has the function of making the last addition to entities being enumerated or the entity being described. The lexical unit *hele bir de* maximizes these functional effects. *Hele bir de* and the phrase to its right function like the idiom “the last straw that broke the camel’s back.”

- (33) Geçenlerde banyonun tavanı çöktü. Bir gürültü koştuk banyoya. Allah'tan kimse yokmuş. *Hele bir de* çocuklar olsaydı ne olurdu. (The other day the ceiling of the bathroom fell in. We hurried to the bathroom just after the noise. Luckily, there was nobody in it. *What if* it were *also* true that the children were in it!) (SI09C4A-1027, TNC Demo)

In the above line, *hele bir de* marks what would have made the situation much worse or the worst.

- (34) K1ymık korku filmlerini çok sever. *Hele bir de* kucağında bir torba dolusu patlamış mısır varsa.  
 (K1ymık likes horror films a lot. *Especially if* there is a bag of corn in his lap.) (The presence of a bag of corn while K1ymık is watching a horror film maximizes the pleasure he gets from watching it) (MA16B1A-1221, TNC Demo)

In the line above *hele bir de* marks what would put K1ymık's pleasure at its peak.

#### 5.2. COLLIGATES OF HELE

From the concordance lines of *hele* given so far and many others in the corpus, the two most common structural collocates are the optative form and the imperative form. These forms become commonplace when the lexical bundles *hele bir* and *hele bi* are considered. Therefore, we should as well say that the optative form and the imperative form are actually colligations of these frozen lexical units rather than directly those of the node *hele*. The following table shows the results of randomly selected 50 *hele bir* lines and the total 16 *hele bi* lines in the corpus.

**Table 4. Structural Collocates of *Hele bir* and *Hele bi***

	Hele bir	Hele bi
Optative	35 (70 %)	7 (43,75 %)
Imperative	15 (30 %)	9 (56,25 %)
Total	50	16

As for *hele bir de*, in its lexical environment, it has verbs with conditional suffix *-sA*, or converbial temporal suffix *-IncA* and conditional copular marker *-(y)sA* or *ise*. From the total 665 concordance lines with *hele bir / hele bir de* in the TNC-Demo, the first 50 *hele bir de* lines were checked to see its colligation patterns and we got the following results in the table:

**Table 5. Colligates of *hele bir de***

Conditional -sA; -(y)sA or ise	Temporal -IncA	Other	Total
33 (66 %)	6 (12 %)	11 (22 %)	50

It seems from the table that the lexical bundle *hele bir de* tends to colligate with verbs with a conditional suffix on them. These co-occurrences of *hele* worth discussing in a further study in terms of the senses of modality markers.

In TNC *hele* colligates with the demonstrative *o* 166 times. In many cases “hele” and “o” are not disconnected, but rather a semantically fused lexical unit and marks something/someone surprising or striking (see 5.1.1. above).

Another demonstrative that *hele* colligates with is *şu*. In the whole corpus *hele şu* occurs 107 times (see 5.1.2 above for a discussion about its semantic functions).

*Hele bir, hele bir de, hele bi, hele o, hele şu* and *hele de* (especially, more emphatic) seem to have become frozen chunks of language that serve certain semantic and pragmatic functions. We looked at their colligates as if they were single lexical units. As a purely single lexical unit *hele* itself often colligates with the imperative form, while expressing an urgent request, inviting someone to test or experience something or to focus on something (see section 4).

### 5.3. SEMANTIC PREFERENCE OF HELE

*Hele* has a semantic preference for *focusing* words such as *bak, dinle, de, söyle, anlat, dur, bekle* (*look, listen, say, tell, stop, wait*) when it is used to express an urgent wish or request to persuade or convince someone to do something and these verbs are used in the imperative form. *Look* (have a look) and *stop* denote punctual actions; *listen, say, tell, and wait* are durative actions. Whatever aspectual features they have, *hele* and the imperative form focus on the initial endpoint of an entry into a process or a state during which the addressee is to be persuaded or warned.

- (35) Dur *hele dur*. Ağlama *hele*. Bir çaresi bulunur elbet. (*Please stop that at once. Stop crying at once please.* We will certainly find a solution. (SA14B1A-1585, TNC Demo)

It seems that when we use *hele* we either want something to happen urgently or recommend waiting until a certain precondition has been fulfilled. We have structural preferences rather than lexical preferences for (*im*)*patience* or *urgency*: the imperative form, the optative form and conditional and temporal converbials (see table 5 above) allow *hele* to mean exactly what it means. The fixed lexical bundles *hele bir*, *hele bir de*, *hele o*, *hele şu* each tend to have certain structural collocations to express certain colours of meaning.

#### 5.4. SEMANTIC PROSODY OF HELE

*Hele*, when it means *özellikle* (especially), is used to emphasize an example or examples for a situation, entity or person already described. Out of 235 concordance lines where *hele* means *özellikle* (especially), *hele* marks something favourable in 104 cases, unfavourable in 131 cases. Therefore, it seems that *hele* in the sense of *özellikle* (especially) cannot be said to have either favourable or unfavourable prosody. Sample lines for favourable and unfavourable prosodies of *hele* (with the sense *especially*):

- (36) ...ne kadar mutlu olurlardı oysa ki. *Hele* Zeynep'in arkadaşlarıyla kartopu oynadıkları zamanlarda. (How happy they used to become, *especially* when they played snowball with Zeynep's friends) (UA16B1A-0775, TNC Demo)
- (37) ...hiç böyle havada yola çıkılır mıydı? *Hele* babam; "İlçeye gidiyoruz," deyince çok şaşılar. (was it right at all to set out in that adverse weather? They were surprised *especially* when my father said "We're going to the town.") (MA161A-0729, TNC Demo)

As for the lexical bundles formed by *hele*'s usual collocates, that's *hele bir*, *hele bi*, *hele bir de*, *hele şu* and *hele o*, we reached the following conclusions:

We looked at 87 concordance lines with *hele o* and identified that in 43 lines it was part of a unit of meaning which was favourable and in 45 lines unfavourable. Therefore, it cannot be said that *hele o* has either favourable or unfavourable prosody (see concordance lines 38 and 39 below). When *hele o* collocates with *yok mu* as in 14 of the 87 total lines we checked for *hele o*, the situation is similar with 6 favourable and 8 unfavourable. However, *hele o* has a fixed prosody in all the lines checked: a prosody of highlighting the most striking. Thus, anything or anyone that follows *hele o* can be associated with an utterance with the implied superlative form.

(38) Hayriye hanım, giysiniz ne kadar güzel. *Hele o yakasındaki tüyler*.  
(Mrs Hayriye, how beautiful your dress is, *especially (those) feathers on its collar.*) = Those feathers on its collar are the most beautiful part of your dress.  
(CA14B1A-1616, TNC Demo)

(39) Zaten Almanlardan nefret ederdi. *Hele o* Alman diplomatlar *yok mu*.  
(He used to hate Germans *especially (those) German diplomats* (*yok mu* = literally *aren't they absent?*) =He hated German diplomats *the most*.  
(LA16B4A-1948, TNC Demo)

For *hele şu* we ended up with 90 lines after cancelling out irrelevant lines (see 5.1.2). In 62 of them *şu* (that/those) is non-indexical and fused with *hele* into a single lexical unit. In 41 of them, *hele şu* colligates with the optative form. The analysis of these 41 lines showed that *hele şu* with the optative form has a distinctly unfavourable prosody with 35 cases marked as unfavourable and the rest favourable or unclear.

(40) Daha sana anlatacağım çok olaylar var. *Hele şu* mahkeme bir sonuçlansın.  
(I have many other things to tell you. I urgently wish that trial would end first) (GD36C4A-0206, TNC Demo)

Whether followed by the optative form or not, in 62 lines with non-indexical *şu* fused with *hele*, the lexical unit *hele şu* tends to have a prosody of urgency for something procrastinated. The lexical

environment makes such urgency felt either by implying there is no more time left to delay an action or by stating that another action is dependent on the action marked by *hele şü* being fulfilled first.

In section 5.2, we said that we had checked randomly selected 50 *hele bir* lines and the total 16 *hele bi* lines in the corpus. As table 4 above shows, 35 of the 50 *hele bir* lines turned out to be used with the optative and 15 of them with the imperative form. Of the 35 optative lines, 16 have favourable and 19 unfavourable meanings; thus it has a neutral prosody; and of the 15 imperative lines, 9 have favourable and 6 unfavourable meanings; thus it also has a neutral prosody. So what prosody does *hele bir* have? If *hele bir* colligates with the optative form, it has a prosody of urgent wish. Except for 4 lines where we feel a defiance or challenge with *hele bir*, the lines display impatience about an urgent wish whose fulfilment is a precondition for another thing to happen. In cases where *hele bir* colligates with the imperative form, it has a prosody of urgent request. The speaker urges the addressee to fulfil their request at once. The imperative per se in the phrase *hele bir yap* is pragmatically an invitation for something to be done; *bir* in the phrase *bir yap* adds an illocutionary force of urgency to the imperative and *hele* contributes to this illocutionary force further. In short, *hele bir + imperative* implies that the imperative to be fulfilled by the addressee is urgent; highly important.

*Hele bi*, reduced from *hele bir* and used informally, occurs 16 times in the corpus. It also seems to have a neutral prosody in terms of negativity or positivity with 8 favourable and 8 unfavourable lines. *Hele bi* shares the prosodic features of *hele bir*, usually expressing urgent wish or request.

Our last lexical unit to check for its prosodic features was *hele bir de*. The first 50 random *hele bir de* lines in our search were analyzed. As can be seen in table 5 above, *hele bir de* was seen to colligate with conditional verbs in 33 lines and 6 temporal converbial (-InçA) and 11 other forms. From the conditional lines, *hele bir de* seems to have a negative prosody with 23 of the 33 lines being negative. Of the 6 temporal converbial lines, 4 have negative, 2 positive meanings. Added together, of the 39 lines with conditional and temporal colligates, 27 have a negative meaning – to emphasize the bad. Hence *hele bir de* has an unfavourable prosody. Sample lines:

- (41) Şehirden gelenleri o karşıları çoğunluk. Daha görür görmez notunu verir. Köylerde kaç gün dayanacağını bilir. Karda kışta bazen fazladan zora koşar, inadına yolu uzatır. *Hele bir de ukala ise* gelen, çekeceği var elinden. (Conditional colligate)  
 (It was he that usually welcomed anyone coming from the town. No sooner did he see the city dweller than he judged them about their personality. He knew how many days they could endure in a village. He used to put additional hardships in their way in those ice cold winters and follow a roundabout way to the village. *If* the visitor he accompanied was *also* bossy, he would turn the journey into an ordeal. (AA16B3A-1557, TNC Demo).

The words both after and before *hele bir de* in the concordance line above have negative meanings. (endure, hardships, ice cold winters, bossy and ordeal)

- (42) Birşeyler yapmaya kalkışınca “dünyada sadece iyiliklerin olmadığını” farketmiş Alakuş. *Hele bir de yabancı olunca.* (Temporal colligate)  
 (Alakuş realised that “there aren’t only good things in the world” when one attempts to do something. *Especially when one is also* a stranger... (MG24D18-3361, TNC Demo)

What makes the concordance line above negative are Alakuş’s disillusionment that there are also bad things in the world and being a stranger makes you more vulnerable to the bad.

**Table 6. Distribution of the prosodies of *hele* and its collocation patterns**

Form	Polar (+/-)	Prosody	Other Prosodic / Functional Feature
<i>Hele</i> (özellikle)	Neutral		---
<i>Hele o</i>	Neutral		Highlighting the most striking
<i>Hele şu</i> (with optative)	Unfavourable (-)		Urgency for something delayed (with optative)

<i>Hele bir</i>	Neutral	Urgent wish (with optative) Urgent request or command (with imperative)
<i>Hele bi</i>	Neutral	Urgent wish or request (like <i>hele bir</i> )
<i>Hele bir de</i> (with conditional verb)	Unfavourable (-)	Maximizing effect

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

One can rely on linguistic intuitions in order to show what distinct meanings and pragmatic functions of *hele*; however, we have “trusted the text”, drawing conclusions from the attested data in the TNC corpus. The corpus-driven analysis presented here scrutinized each concordance in order to discern a new pattern, a new function or a new meaning for the node item. From the naturally occurring language data we have observed the following concerning the Turkish discourse particle *hele*:

- 1) The most common meaning of *hele* is *especially* (özellikle).
- 2) *Hele* adds urgency to a request or a wish or is used to mark a prerequisite, a warning or a promise.
- 3) It is used to focus on something surprising or striking.
- 4) One can defy or challenge another one to do something by using *hele* in colligation with the optative or imperative form.
- 5) It can mark a delayed decision to do something long procrastinated. Then it usually means “it is high time I did.”
- 6) It may be used to invite someone to test or experience something that the speaker has just or already experienced. Hence it has a function of experience sharing.
- 7) It has a checking meaning like *I wonder / really* with a question (see 4.2.7)
- 8) When it collocates with *ki* as *hele ki*, it may mean *luckily* (iyi ki, neyse ki).

These results are based on pure observation and description of what appears in concordance lines and do not need any quantitative data. On the other hand, we also drew the following conclusions based on quantitative data, usually raw frequency data:

- 1) As a lexical unit *hele o* is used to add the most striking example to a previously given information or situation (see 5.1.1)
- 2) *Hele şu* is a single lexical unit consisting of *hele* and *şu* (that/those) fused together in many cases and *şu* is not used gesturally, that's *şu* is not indexical but expresses a psychological distance. *Hele şu* with the optative form creates a unit of meaning in which someone at last finds it necessary to handle a job – one especially long delayed.
- 3) *Hele bir* –another collocational unit– colligates with the optative or imperative form to mark a precondition or a strong wish.
- 4) *Hele bir de* as a chunk of language has a maximizing function. *Hele bir de* is followed by something or someone that typically makes the picture described before the node worst or best (see 5.1.4)
- 5) *Hele bir* colligates with the optative or imperative form and *hele bir de* colligates with conditional and temporal converbials (tables 4 and 5).
- 6) *Hele* has a semantic preference for focusing words.
- 7) When it means *especially* (özellikle), *hele* has a neutral prosody.
- 8) The lexical unit *hele o* has a neutral prosody. However, it has a prosody of highlighting the most striking.
- 9) *Hele şu* has a distinctly unfavourable prosody when it colligates with the optative form.
- 10) *Hele şu*, when used non-gesturally, has a prosody of urgency.
- 11) *Hele bir* has a neutral prosody. However, when it colligates with the optative form it has a prosody of urgent wish.
- 12) *Hele bir de*, when it colligates with conditional converbials, has a distinctly negative prosody.

Further corpus-driven or corpus-based studies will uncover many other aspects of lexical units and their particular uses in a variety of contexts in Turkish. With distinct meanings and functions of the Turkish discourse particle *hele* which we derived from the Turkish National Corpus, it is clear that lexicographers should not turn a blind eye to the power of the corpus. As attested data in a corpus can clearly show some context-based functions and senses of a lexical item that remains hidden to the lexicographer's intuition, defining vocabulary in future Turkish dictionaries should benefit considerably from

corpus-driven studies. It is already the case for English lexicography as most dictionaries of English use corpus examples to define and exemplify words (McEnery et al, 2006, p. 209). McEnery et al (2006, p. 221-222) compare the information provided for the entry *sweet* in the 1978 and 2003 editions of the Longman Dictionary of English and demonstrate that the latter edition contains more illustrative and satisfactory information about the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties of *sweet*. They state that “the use of the corpus has enabled this” (p. 222).

Similarly, our corpus-driven work on the Turkish discourse particle *hele* has unearthed many distinct senses and functions which are not observed in the Turkish dictionaries available. Such studies should pave the way for a corpus-driven approach to the preparation of new Turkish dictionaries.

#### REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (2002). *English discourse particles: Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Aksan, Y. et al. (2012). Construction of the Turkish National Corpus (TNC). *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2012)*. (pp. 3223-3227) İstanbul. Türkiye. <http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/papers.html>.
- Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.
- McEnery, et al. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies*. London: Routledge.
- McEnery, T., & Hardie A. (2012). *Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge.
- Partington, A. (2004). “Utterly content in each other’s company”: Semantic prosody and semantic preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 9 (1), 131–56.
- Ruhi, Ş. (2013). The interactional functions of *tamam* in spoken Turkish. *Mersin University Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 10 (2), 9-32.
- Sinclair, J. (2004). *Trust the text. Language, corpus and discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Steward, D. (2010). *Semantic prosody: A critical evaluation*. London, Routledge.
- Yılmaz, E. (2004). *A pragmatic analysis of Turkish discourse particles: Yani, işte and şey* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), METU, Ankara.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.