NEOLOGISMSIN CONTEMPORARY TURKISH

Mehmet Çelik

This paper reports the results of a quantitative experimental study designed to reveal semantic changes involved in lexical variation in Turkish. Lexical variation under investigation has been the result of a linguistic policy, which has foreseen the replacement of Arabic and Persian loanwords with neologisms. It is hypothesised that lexical variation is not semantically free; semantic changes have occurred in the interaction process as each form is socially embedded. A questionnaire was conducted on more than one hundred subjects. Being a quantitative study, it makes use of socio-demographic factors such as sex, education, and age. Prototype theory was employed in the definitions of lexical items under investigation. It was found that semantic changes took place in the majority of the pairs tested.

1. Introduction

After the foundation of the Republic of Turkey in 1923, following the social, political and legal reforms, change in the lexicon of Turkish has been inevitable, reflecting the political and cultural needs of the new state. The Ottoman Turkish, which the new state inherited, was regarded by reformists as unsuitable to be the language of a populist republic, for it had too many incomprehensible Arabic and Persian loanwords and phrases (Giritli, 1969:35). Furthermore, the desired language should reflect the national characteristics of Turks, not those of Arabs or Persians. Such aspirations called for the elimination of foreign words. So the language policy was to replace the words of Arabic and Persian origin with the Turkish ones. To carry out this task, the Turkish Language (Investigation) Society was founded in 1932. The Society made use of mainly four categories of neological practice: (1) semantic extension of native words, (2) reviving obsolete Turkish words, (3) borrowing-lexical adaptation of loanwords, and (4) coinage of new terms (Heyd, 1954:88). In this study, lexical items produced by these neological practices will be referred to as 'neologisms'.

Most neologisms have gained acceptance as alternatives for established Arabic and Persian vocabulary, creating a broad lexical variation; variants have acquired not only stylistic values but also social and political dimensions (Cüceloğ lu & Slobin, 1980). The notion of synonymy in the broad sense is generally mentioned in connection with cases of lexical variation; two (or more) lexical items may at times be interchangeably used either in certain contexts or all contexts. In Turkish linguistics, the kind of lexical variation described above is seen as a case of synonymy in that speakers (are believed to) 'say the same thing' by employing either of the lexical items. Contrary to claims (Aksan, 1977; Aksoy, 1968; Cüceloğ lu & Slobin, 1980) that virtually no semantic change or even rearrangement has taken place in these competing variants, it is proposed in this paper that it is highly likely for semantic shifts to have taken place because lexical variation is ‘embedded’ in the social setting and behaviour (Labov, 1972:123): linguistic change presupposes linguistic variation. Also, as Bram (1955:27) notes, every change in beliefs, attitudes, or social institutions affects words and their meanings in numerous ways.

The definitions are constructed according to the Prototype theory of meanings. According to this theory, which was originally developed by Rosch (1973), a lexical item has central and non-central meanings, which are related to one another in appropriate ways through

metaphor, metonymy, and so on (Austin, 1961:71; Lakoff, 1987:xiv). Take, for example, the Turkish lexeme *hakim*; the original meaning appears to be 'judge in a law court'. Out of this meaning three meanings evolved: (1) person who determines who is right and wrong, (2) influential person, and (3) one that has a good view from above. As the questionnaires showed that (1) is the most frequently used meaning of *hakim*, then (1) must be considered as most central when defining this lexical item. Studies by Rosch (1973), Labov (1973), and Coleman & Kay (1981) form the conceptual and methodological framework of the design of this study.

Rosch (1973) argues that examples or instances of a concept may each share certain features and may not share certain others. Therefore, they may vary in the degree of membership of a category, showing a hierarchical trend. In this hierarchy some features get assigned a privileged, central status due to their presence in most of the members, which in turn become prototypical members, while members which have a low frequency of features are also considered members but to a lesser degree. The members which have the fewest number of features are not ‘good’ examples of a category, and therefore sit on the borderlines. Investigating the category of *bird*, Rosch (1973) discovered the existence of what is called 'prototype effects' and asymmetries within the members of the category. In a variety of experiments she asked her subjects to judge the members of category such as *robin*, *chicken*, *penguin*, *ostrich* in terms of greater representativeness for that category. The results showed that certain members of the category *bird* were consistently judged more representative than others. For instance, *robin* is more representative than *chicken* or *penguin*. Rosch called the most representative members of a category 'prototypical' members.

In his testings of the responses of subjects to a set of drawings which depicted varying degrees of typical and non-typical cups and cup-like objects, Labov (1973:343) found that the applicability of words *cup*, *bowl*, etc. to objects depicted in the drawings is a matter of degree, displaying a prototypical structure. For instance, the word *cup* is 100 per cent applicable to typical drawings of typical cups. As the width of the container increases, the percentage of applicability keeps dropping down until it is exceeded by the applicability of the word *bowl*. At the crossing point, it is possible to have two conflicting statements : the object is a 'cup' and it is not a 'cup', because 'bowl' is also nominated for that object too.

In their study of the English verb *lie* 'prevaricate', Coleman & Kay (1981) investigated the semantic structure with a view to finding a gradient character as far as the elements that make up the meaning-whole are concerned. They hypothesised that properties assigned to a lexical item may be of differential importance and that assignment of each property given in a list does not necessarily contribute equally to the degree of membership of that property in the lexical item. Their view of the prototype structure of lexical meaning is that semantic categories have blurry edges and permit degrees of membership. In their trial of the hypothesis for the lexical item *lie*, they elicited three properties for the definition; in order for an utterance to be protoypically *lie*, it should be false, deliberate, and intended to deceive. If an utterance has all of these elements, they anticipated their subjects to consider it as a full-fledged *lie*. However, if the utterance has one or more of the elements lacking, it will still be called a *lie*, but to a lesser degree. This feature will, they anticipated, prove that *lie* has a gradient structure in terms elements that make it up. Furthermore, they found that falsity of belief (deliberate) is the most important element of *lie* and that the next important element is the intention to deceive and the least important element is factual falsity.

This paper examines semantic changes in 11 pairs of Turkish lexical items by comparing each neologism with the word it was designed to replace. These pairs are *şehir-kent* 'city', *hikaye-öykü* 'story', *imtihan-sınav* 'exam', *ş ahit-tanık* 'witness', *talebe-öğ renci* 'student', *cevap-yanıt* 'answer', *hakim-yargıç* 'judge', *delil-kanıt* 'evidence', *hayal-düş* 'dream', *netice-sonuç* 'result', and *beraat etmek-aklanmak* 'to be acquitted'.

2. Methodology

In total, 105 subjects were tested; 65 females and 40 males in three education groups: primary educated (25), secondary educated (30), and tertiary educated (50). The subjects were also divided by age differences; young (45), adult (30), and old (30); for convenience, subjects aged 18 to 23 were labelled as 'young' while those aged 24 to 30 were labelled as 'adult', and those subjects aged 31 and more were labelled as 'old'. All subjects live in the capital city of Turkey, Ankara. Subjects were contacted in their workplaces, schools, and suburbs. Three suburbs, two workplaces and one university were selected for this purpose.

The subjects were presented a multiple choice questionnaire in which definitions of lexical items were provided. Meanings are either in the form of statements or phrases. Each choice (a, b, c, etc.) states one of the meanings of a lexical item. Table 1 illustrates definitions for the pair *hikaye-öykü* 'story'.

Table 1: **Explication of a lexical meaning for *hikaye-öykü* 'story'**

STORY	Frequency of Usage				
a. Oral narration of an incident.	1	2	3	4	5
b. A piece of literary writing of interesting past and imaginary events.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Untrue oral statement.	1	2	3	4	5

The same definitions were given for each of the alternative lexical items, with slight alterations in wording in order not to create a wholly repetitive task for the subjects. They were asked to select meaning(s) with which they use a particular lexical item by indicating options (a), (b), (c), and so on. Further, in order to capture the relative frequency of the usage of meanings selected, a range of figures from 1 to 5 was given for each meaning. Higher figures were for more frequent usage and lower figures for less frequent usage; the numeral (1) stands for NEVER, (2) stands for SELDOM, (3) stands for SOMETIMES, numeral (4) stands for FREQUENTLY, and (5) stands for VERY FREQUENTLY. The subjects were told that the frequency range would only be used when more than one of choices of meaning is circled. Secondly, they were asked to circle a number depending on how frequently they use a word with a particular meaning.

The aim of eliciting data on the frequency of usage for each meaning was to determine the prototypical semantic structure of lexical items under investigation; thereby a particular meaning can be specified as the most central, more central, less central, etc. Thus, such a specification scheme would allow the reporting of a change of meaning when various designates for meanings are not in the same order as far as centrality is concerned, even if lexical variants may share the same meanings.

3. Results[1]

Description and analysis cover the following areas:

a) the findings concerning the subjects' reporting of the definitions given for the lexical items,
b) the correlations between lexical variables,
c) the correlations between speaker characteristics and lexical variables,
d) identifying central and non-central meanings of the lexical items under investigation.

3.1 *Şehir -Kent* 'City'[2]

Ş is the traditional word, and *kent* is the neologism introduced to replace it. The three meanings for these two lexical items, each of which were given in the questionnaire on two occasions, can be rendered in English as follows:

a) large settlement area, provincial town.
b) a town with good living conditions.
c) a centre of industry, commerce, and administration.

The number of subjects who responded was 103. It appears that the two lexical items differ in relation to meaning (c) only (Table 2).

Table 2: **Distribution of Meanings for *şehir* and *kent* 'city'**

	Meaning (a)		Meaning (b)		Meaning (c)*	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
şehir	84	81.5	21	20.4	63	61.2
kent	92	89.3	23	22.3	41	39.8

Proportions of meanings for these two lexical items are selected in the same order. That is, meaning (a) in both lexical items was chosen by most of the subjects followed by meaning (c), and meaning (b) received the fewest number of responses. The meanings for *kent* and *şehir* overlap in (a) and (b) but the distinction in meaning (c) is significant.[3] Table 3 shows how speaker variables stand in relation to meaning (c).

---

1 Statistical documentation was carried out by means of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences-Version 4.1 (SPSS).

2 The first member of each pair is the traditional word.

3 Significant differences will be marked with an asterisk on tables throughout this chapter. A variable is significant if it is at or below the level of significance, which is 0.05 calculated by chi squared.

Table 3: **Meaning (c) by Dependent Variables**

		şehir (Mean 61.2%)		*kent* (Mean 39.8%)	
		Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	41	63.1	23	35.4
	Male	22	55.0	18	45.0
Age	Young	27	60.0	14	31.1
	Adult	16	53.3	11	36.6
	Old	20	66.6	16	53.3
Education	Primary	15	60.0	12	48.0
	Secondary	18	60.0	11	36.0
	Tertiary	30	62.5	18	36.0

No significant differentiation is observed among the speaker groups. As far as *kent* is concerned, the groups which chose the highest number of meaning (c) are male, old, and primary educated. That is, *kent* appears to be more of a 'centre of commerce and administration' for these groups than for female, young and non-primary educated subjects.

3.2 Hikaye-Öykü 'Story'

There were 100 respondents for *hikaye* and for *öykü*, 103. The three meanings given were the following:

a) oral narration of an incident.
b) a piece of literary writing of interesting past imaginary events.
c) untrue oral statement.

It appears that the neologism *öykü* has largely managed to assume the meanings designated by the traditional word *hikaye* (Table 4). The percentage of meanings given for *öykü* in this section puts it at a competing position against *hikaye*.

Table 4: **Distribution of Meanings for *hikaye* and *öykü* 'story'**

	Meaning (a)		Meaning (b)		Meaning (c)*	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
hikaye	45	45.0	78	78.0	40	40.0
öykü	44	42.7	78	75.7	22	21.4

Meaning (b) was attributed to both items with the highest percentage: above 75 per cent. Over 40 per cent of the subjects circled meaning (a) for *hikaye* and *öykü*. For both items, the order of meanings is (b), (a), and (c). Unlike meanings (a) and (b), meaning (c) is highly significant in its differentiation between the two lexical items (Table 4).

Table 5 illustrates how speakers of various groups contributed to the results obtained for meaning (c). The combination of male, adult, and secondary educated subjects gave meaning (c) for *hikaye* at the highest proportions while giving it for *öykü* at the lowest proportions.

Table 5: **Meaning (c) by Dependent Variables**

		hikaye (Mean 40.0%)		*öykü* (Mean 21.5%)	
		Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	21	32.3	13	20.0
	Male	19	47.5	9	22.5
Age	Young	14	31.1	10	22.2
	Adult	11	36.6	8	26.6
	Old	15	50.0	4	13.3
Education	Primary	9	36.0	8	32.0
	Secondary	12	40.0	5	16.6
	Tertiary	19	38.0	9	18.0

3.3 *İ mtihan-Sınav* 'Exam'

İ mtihan received 103 responses while *sınav* had 101. The following meanings were proposed to the subjects:

a) testing, trial.
b) examining someone's knowledge.
c) a trying situation which requires resisting and courage.
d) a testing of human beings in terms of good and bad deeds.

Significant differences exist between the traditional item and the neologisms for meaning (a) and (b) (Table 6). Meaning (b), which was assigned to both lexical items by more than three quarters of the subject population, seems to be the primary meaning, followed by meaning (a). In terms of centrality of the four meanings, both lexical items are most frequently used with meaning (b), more frequently used with meaning (a), less frequently with meaning (c), and least frequently with meaning (d).

Table 6: **Distribution of Meanings for *imtihan* and *sınav* 'exam'**

	Meaning (a)*		Meaning (b)		Meaning (c)		Meaning (d)*	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
imtihan	53	51.5	89	86.4	24	23.3	31	30.1
sınav	34	33.7	90	89.1	24	23.8	19	18.9

The figures in the table above do not reveal semantic differences for meanings (b) and (c). The differences for meaning (a) and meaning (d) are, however, significant. Obviously, *sınav* does not mean 'testing', 'experimenting', or even 'trial' as much as *imtihan* does. Also, *sınav* does not include the morality aspect of testing of human beings as much as *imtihan* does. The following table is given to show how the various speaker groups assign meanings (a) and (d) differently. The meaning components 'testing, trial' on one hand and 'moral responsibility' on the other hand are not significantly associated with any particular speaker group (Table 7).

Table 7: **Meanings (a) and (d) by Dependent Variables**

		Meaning (a)				Meaning (d)			
		imtihan		*sınav*		*imtihan*		*sınav*	
		(Mean 51.5%)		(Mean 33.7%)		(Mean 30.1%)		(Mean 18.9%)	
		Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	32	49.2	20	30.8	20	30.8	12	18.5
	Male	21	52.5	14	35.0	11	27.5	7	17.5
Age	Young	25	55.6	13	28.8	13	28.8	8	17.7
	Adult	12	40.0	8	26.6	7	23.3	6	20.0
	Old	16	53.3	13	43.3	11	36.6	5	16.6
Education	Primary	13	52.0	9	36.0	7	28.0	4	16.0
	Secondary	16	53.3	12	40.0	7	23.3	6	20.0
	Tertiary	24	48.0	13	26.0	17	34.0	9	18.0

3.4 *Ş ahit-Tanık* 'Witness'

The pair received an equal number of useable responses: 103. The following were the three meanings provided for *ş ahit* and *tanık* 'witness':

a) person who is present at the scene of an incident.
b) person who gives evidence in a law court in relation an incident s/he saw.
c) person who provides professional information in a law court as requested from him/her.

There appears to be a semantic shift for meanings (a) and (b), while meaning (c) is equally represented for both lexical variants. Meaning (a) was assigned by more subjects to *ş ahit* than to *tanık* while meaning (b) was assigned by more subjects to *tanık* than to *ş ahit* (Table 8). In other words, for more of subjects, *ş ahit* is a person who is present at the scene of an incident whereas *tanık* is someone who gives evidence in court about what s/he saw. This may be the beginning of a differentiation of meanings (a) and (b): *ş ahit* is more often used in informal contexts while *tanık* is specialised to contexts of law.

Table 8: **Distribution of Meanings for *ş ahit* and *tanık* 'witness'**

	Meaning (a)*		Meaning (b)*		Meaning (c)	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
ş ahit	85	82.5	72	69.9	19	18.4
tanık	66	64.1	82	79.6	17	16.5

Significant differentiation occurred for meanings (a) and (b). In Table 9, these two meanings are broken down according to dependent variables.

Table 9: **Meanings (a) and (b) by Dependent Variables**

		Meaning (a)				Meaning (d)			
		tanık		*tanık*		*ş ahit*		*tanık*	
		(Mean 82.5%)		(Mean 64.1%)		(Mean 69.9%)		(Mean 79.6%)	
		Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	53	82.8	43	67.2	42	65.6	47	73.4
	Male	32	82.0	23	59.0	30	76.9	35	89.7
Age	Young	39	86.6	29	64.4	29	64.4	34	75.5
	Adult	21	75.0	15	51.7	19	67.9	26	89.7
	Old	25	83.3	22	75.9	24	80.0	22	79.9
Education	Primary	20	80.0	14	58.3	16	66.6	21	87.5
	Secondary	23	82.1	19	65.5	20	71.4	20	69.0
	Tertiary	42	82.4	33	66.0	36	72.0	41	82.0

For both lexical items, more women than men chose meaning (a), and more men than women gave meaning (b). Interestingly, male, adult, and primary educated subjects contributed to the meaning (b) for *tanık* more than other groups.

3.5 *Talebe-Öğ renci* 'Student'

Subjects provided 104 codable responses for *talebe* and 103 for *öğ renci*. The following three meanings were offered to the subjects:

a) child who attends school.
b) person who receives private tuition from either a teacher or institution.
c) person who pursues knowledge.

There does not seem to be a large semantic difference between the competing variants (Table 10). Meaning (c) was assigned to both variants at virtually the same percentage. Both meaning (a) and (b) were more frequently assigned to the neologism, *öğ renci*.

Table 10: **Distribution of Meanings for *talebe* and *öğ renci* 'student'**

	Meaning (a)		Meaning (b)		Meaning (c)	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
talebe	90	86.5	40	38.5	30	28.8
öğ renci	93	90.3	46	44.7	28	27.2

As is shown in Table 10, the component 'child who goes to school' is what the majority of the subjects considers essential in the designation of both lexical items. To less than 50 per cent of the subjects, both lexical alternatives have the component 'person who receives private tuition', which is a common phenomenon in Turkey.[4] Therefore, the best example of *talebe*

[4] A person who goes through primary to tertiary education usually sits for at least four general examinations to get into a desired school. Prior to these examinations, guardians make sure that children either get private tuition or enrol at exam oriented fee paying small schools.

and *öğ renci* is that reference contained in meaning (a), while the reference in meaning (b) is a better example than that stated in meaning (c).

3.6 *Cevap-Yanıt* 'Answer'

102 subjects provided processable data for *cevap*, and 104 subjects did so for *yanıt*. The three definitions given for these two words are as follows:

a) response to a question.
b) response to a query in writing.
c) meeting of a demand.

It appears that the traditional word, *cevap*, and the neologism, *yanıt*, are not substantially differentiated semantically, except for meaning (c) (Table 11). Meaning (a) was circled by most of the subjects (about 93 per cent) for both items, followed by meaning (b) which was used by about 45 per cent of the subjects. The order of meanings, then, is (a), (b), and (c).

Table 11: **Distribution of Meanings for *cevap* and *yanıt* 'answer'**

	Meaning (a)		Meaning (b)		Meaning (c)*	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
cevap	98	96.1	45	44.1	30	29.4
yanıt	93	89.4	49	47.1	12	11.5

As indicated above, the only major differentiation of meaning between *cevap* and *yanıt* occurred with meaning (c). Table 12 details meaning (c) by speaker variables. Of all the factors, education is significant with *yanıt*; *yanıt* virtually lacks the meaning (c) for groups such as old and secondary educated. With *cevap*, the combination of female, young, and tertiary educated produced the highest percentages. There is not much substantial differentiation in regard to other variables.

Table 12: **Meaning (c) by Dependent Variables**

		cevap (Mean 29.4%)		*yanıt* (Mean 11.5%)	
		Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	20	31.2	7	10.8
	Male	10	26.3	5	12.8
Age	Young	13	30.2	6	13.3
	Adult	8	27.6	4	13.8
	Old	9	30.0	2	6.6
Education	Primary	7	30.4	5	20.8
	Secondary	7	23.3	1	3.3
	Tertiary	16	32.0	6	12.0

3.7 *Hakim-Yargıç* 'Judge'

There were 103 responses for traditional word, *hakim*, and 104 for the loanword, *yargıç*. The four meanings given were as follows:

a) influential person.
b) person with legal authority to decide on disputed cases in a law court.
c) person who determines who is right and wrong.
d) one who has a good view from above.

Differences between the traditional item and the neologism permeate all four meanings (Table 13). The traditional item, *hakim*, was given more meanings than its counterpart, *yargıç*. It is interesting that *yargıç* only scores ahead of *hakim* for meaning (b).

Table 13: **Distribution of Meanings for *hakim* and *yargıç* 'judge'**

	Meaning (a)*		Meaning (b)*		Meaning (c)*		Meaning (d)*	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
hakim	30	29.1	69	67.0	71	68.9	22	21.4
yargıç	13	12.5	92	88.5	45	43.3	2	1.9

The central meaning for *yargıç* is no doubt meaning (b), which was given by almost 90 per cent of the subjects, whereas which meaning is the central meaning for *hakim* is not clear at all given the close percentages of meaning (b) and (c). However, as indicated in Tables 13 and 14, when the assignment of frequencies is examined, it is clear that a higher percentage of the subjects who gave more than one meaning preferred meaning (b) over meaning (c) as the most central meaning for *hakim*. The order of meanings for both items is the same: (b), (c), (a), and (d). In fact, the existence of meaning (d) for *yargıç* seems to be dubious as it was only given by 1.9 per cent of the subjects.

Table 14: **Frequencies of Usage for Meanings (b) and (c) of *hakim*.**

Frequencies	5		4		3		2		1	
Meaning (b)	23	43.4	18	34.0	11	20.8	1	1.9	0	0
Meaning (c)	15	35.7	14	33.3	11	26.2	1	2.4	1	2.4

3.8 *Delil-Kanıt* 'Evidence'

There were 104 responses for *delil* and 101 responses for *kanıt*. Five meanings were given for these two words. They were:

a) a sign that brings something to light.
b) a clue or document which reveals whether something is true or not.
c) the thing on which a judge bases his decision in a matter of dispute.
d) a trace which leads someone to truth.
e) guide.

There does not seem to be any substantial semantic difference between the traditional word and the neologism (Table 15). The overall proportional difference between the two words is less than 10 per cent, with *kanıt* close behind *delil*.

Table 15: **Distribution of Meanings for *delil* and *kanıt* 'evidence'**

	Meaning (a)		Meaning (b)		Meaning (c)		Meaning (d)		Meaning (e)	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
delil	70	67.3	69	66.3	32	30.8	37	35.6	6	5.8
kanıt	64	63.4	60	59.4	39	38.6	27	26.7	4	3.9

In all of the meanings, *delil* was given more meanings than *kanıt* except for meaning (c). About 8 per cent more of the subjects preferred meaning (c) for *kanıt*. Here, the possibility that *kanıt* was being used more for legal domains may be entertained.

Table 16 shows how various groups differ in their assignment of this meaning for both words. The only significant factor appears to be education. Tertiary educated subjects gave significantly higher proportions for both words than any other group. Tertiary educated subjects gave meaning (c) more than twice as frequently as primary educated subjects for *kanıt*, and three times as much as primary educated subjects for *delil*. As the educational level goes up, so do the proportions of meaning (c) for both words.

Table 16: **Meaning (c) by Dependent Variables**

		delil (Mean 30.8%)		*kanıt* (Mean 38.6%)	
		Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	21	32.3	24	37.5
	Male	11	28.2	15	40.5
Age	Young	14	31.1	17	39.5
	Adult	8	27.6	11	39.3
	Old	10	33.3	11	36.7
Education	Primary	3	12.5	5	21.7
	Secondary	9	31.0	10	35.7
	Tertiary	20	39.2	24	48.0

3.9 *Hayal-Düş* 'Dream'

104 subjects gave responses for *hayal* while 101 subjects gave responses for *düş* . The following three meanings were given:

a) conception of an idea.
b) unreal (expectation).
c) mental picture of a wish.

As is seen in Table 17, there seems to be a case of semantic differentiation between two lexical items. The order of meanings is also different for both words. It is (a), (c), and (b) for *hayal*, and (b), (c), then (a) for *düş* .

Table 17: **Distribution of Meanings for *hayal* and *düş* 'dream'**

	Meaning (a)*		Meaning (b)*		Meaning (c)*	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
hayal	74	71.2	45	43.3	66	63.5
düş	32	31.7	60	59.4	51	50.5

The two lexical items were significantly differentiated in their assignment for all three of these meanings. Table 18 (facing page) illustrates these meanings as they are broken down by speaker groups. With meaning (a), *hayal* is significantly differentiated for education; primary educated subjects chose this meaning at the highest proportion (87.5 per cent), followed by tertiary educated subjects (70.6 per cent), and the secondary educated subjects gave the lowest proportion (58.6 per cent). With meaning (b), gender was the factor for differentiation; men selected meaning (b) at 53.8 per cent while women selected it at 36.9 per cent. As to meaning (c), education was the significant factor group; secondary educated subjects gave the highest percentage, followed by primary educated subjects.

3.10 *Netice -Sonuç* 'Result'

There were 104 responses for *netice*, and 103 responses for *sonuç*. Three meanings were given for these two words:

a) outcome of an incident or event.
b) positive consequence after long hard work.
c) ending part of a speech or writing.

The pair appear to have semantically diverged to considerable extent although they converge for meaning (c) (Table 19).

Table 18: **Distribution of Meanings (a), (b), and (c) for *hayal* and *düş* 'dream'**

		Meaning (a)				Meaning (b)				Meaning (c)			
		hayal		*düş*		*hayal*		*düş*		*hayal*		*düş*	
		Mean 71.2%		Mean 31.7%		Mean 43.3%		Mean 59.4%		Mean 63.5%		Mean 50.5%	
		Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	47	72.3	19	30.6	*24	36.9	36	58.1	42	64.6	31	50.0
	Male	27	69.2	13	33.3	*21	53.8	24	61.5	24	61.5	20	51.3
Age	Young	33	73.3	11	24.4	17	37.8	27	60.0	28	62.2	19	42.2
	Adult	20	69.0	7	25.0	14	48.3	18	64.3	18	62.1	17	60.7
	Old	21	70.0	14	50.0	14	46.7	15	53.6	20	66.7	15	53.6
Education	Primary	*21	87.5	10	41.7	9	37.5	12	50.0	12	45.8	*13	54.2
	Secondary	*17	58.6	11	40.7	12	41.8	14	51.9	14	72.4	*16	59.3
	Tertiary	*36	70.6	11	22.0	24	47.1	34	68.0	34	66.7	*22	44.0

Table 19: **Distribution of Meanings for *netice* and *sonuç* 'result'**

	Meaning (a)*		Meaning (b)*		Meaning (c)	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
netice	87	83.7	35	33.7	40	38.5
sonuç	60	58.3	80	77.7	44	42.7

The central meaning for *netice* is no doubt meaning (a), and meaning (c) appears slightly more central than meaning (b). For *sonuç*, the most central meaning is meaning (b), while meaning (a) is less central and meaning (c) is the least central. The two lexical items are significantly differentiated for meanings (a) and (b). Table 20 gives a profile of these meanings in regard to dependent variables.

Table 20: **Meaning (a) and (b) by Dependent Variables**

		Meaning (a)				Meaning (b)			
		netice		*sonuç*		*netice*		*sonuç*	
		Mean 83.7%		Mean 58.3%		Mean 33.7%		Mean 77.7%	
		Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	57	87.7	34	53.3	21	32.3	49	76.6
	Male	30	76.9	26	66.7	14	35.9	31	79.5
Age	Young	38	84.4	26	59.1	13	28.9	32	72.7
	Adult	26	89.7	17	58.6	8	27.6	24	82.8
	Old	23	76.7	17	56.6	14	46.7	24	80.0
Education	Primary	20	83.3	15	62.5	12	50.0	18	75.0
	Secondary	22	75.9	15	51.7	10	34.5	23	79.3
	Tertiary	45	88.2	30	60.0	13	25.5	39	76.5

The central meaning (a) for *netice* was contributed mostly by the combination of female, adult, and tertiary educated groups. The groups which contributed to meaning (a) for *sonuç* at the highest proportion were male, young, and primary educated. The central meaning (b) for *sonuç* was favoured at the highest percentages by male, adult, and secondary educated subjects. The groups that gave the highest frequency of meaning (b) for netice were male, adult, and secondary educated. Otherwise there were no significantly differentiated groups.

3.11 *Beraat etmek-Aklanmak* 'To be acquitted'

The traditional item, beraat etmek, received 102 responses while the neologism, *aklanmak*, received 104 responses. They had three meanings in the questionnaire.

a) to turn out to be morally intact.
b) to be cleared following a legal charge.
c) to be relieved of a responsibility (of a board) by giving accurate and persuasive explanation before members (of an association) as to the dealings they carried out during their term in office.

The two items appear to converge for meanings (b) and (c) while differentiating significantly for meaning (a) (Table 21). The central meaning for both words is meaning (b); more than 85 per cent of the subjects gave this meaning. The order of meanings for both lexical items is meaning (b), (a), then (c).

Table 21: **Distribution of Meanings for *beraat etmek* and *aklanmak* 'to be acquitted'**

	Meaning (a)*		Meaning (b)		Meaning (c)	
	Cases	%	Cases	%	Cases	%
beraat etmek	58	56.9	87	85.3	8	7.8
aklanmak	42	40.4	95	91.3	13	12.5

Table 22 illustrates meaning (a) broken down by dependent variables. With *beraat etmek*, the combination of factors male, old, and primary educated chose this meaning at the highest proportions whereas female, young, and tertiary educated groups chose it at the lowest proportions. As far as *aklanmak* is concerned, this meaning was favoured most frequently again by male, old, and primary educated subjects. The lowest frequency was obtained from female, adult, and tertiary educated subjects.

Table 22: **Meaning (a) by Dependent Variables**

		beraat etmek (Mean 56.9%)		*aklanmak* (Mean 40.4%)	
		Cases	%	Cases	%
Sex	Female	31	48.4	24	36.9
	Male	27	71.1	18	46.2
Age	Young	19	42.2	18	40.0
	Adult	17	60.7	9	31.0
	Old	22	75.9	15	50.0
Education	Primary	16	69.6	14	58.3
	Secondary	17	60.7	14	48.3
	Tertiary	25	49.0	14	27.5

4. Conclusion

In this paper I have investigated semantic changes involved in (postulated) synonymous lexical items (traditional words vs. neologisms) using the Prototype approach for definitions. Many of the pairs investigated did not appear to be semantically equivalent, thus confirming

the initial hypothesis that semantic changes have occurred upon the introduction of neologisms as alternative lexical items to traditional words. Furthermore, it was found that the nature of semantic changes is generally one of a differentiation (specialisation). Therefore, according to the results of this study, the assumption that alternative lexical items of this kind in contemporary Turkish are conceptually synonymous has been annulled.

More specifically, there were only two pairs which did not differentiate significantly in the meanings they had; these are *talebe-öğ renci* (student) and *delil-kanıt* (evidence). The remaining pairs can be divided into two groups on the basis of the number of meanings the pairs differentiated: 'mild differentiation' and 'strong differentiation'. Mild differentiation is here defined as that which occurs in pairs which differentiate significantly in one meaning only. Strong differentiation is here defined as that which takes place in pairs which differentiates significantly in more than one meaning. There were three pairs with mild differentiation. Table 23 below lists these pairs.

Table 23: List of Mildly Differentiated Pairs

Traditional Word	Neologism	Gloss
hikaye	*öykü*	story
cevap	*yanıt*	answer
beraat etmek	*aklanmak*	to be acquitted

Strong differentiation took place in six pairs, as listed in Table 24.

Table 24: List of Strongly Differentiated Pairs

Traditional Word	Neologism	Gloss
şehir	*kent*	city
imtihan	*sınav*	exam
ş ahit	*tanık*	witness
hakim	*yargıç*	judge
hayal	*düş*	dream
netice	*sonuç*	result

It is hard to make a generalisation for the semantic changes in terms of centrality; it has been shown that each word pair is different and unique. Thus it is impossible to see an overall pattern. To the best of my knowledge, this is the first quantitative investigation of semantic changes occurring in the interaction of lexical variants using socio-demographic factors such as sex, age, and education. However, as has been seen, in the assignment of meanings to the alternative lexical expressions, none of the socio-demographic factors is able to predict how the centrality of any particular item will vary.

REFERENCES

Aksan, D. 1977. Köktürkçeden bugüne (From Proto-Turkish to contemporary). *Türk Dili*, 36.313: 344-347.

Aksoy, Ö.A. 1968. *Geliş en ve özleş en dilimiz* (The development and purification of our language). Ankara: TDK Publications.

Austin, J.L. 1961. *Philosophical papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bram, J. 1955. *Language and society*. New York: Random House.

Cüceloğ lu, D. & D.I. Slobin. 1980. Effects of Turkish language reform on person perception. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology* 11: 297-326.

Coleman, L. & P. Kay. 1981. Prototype semantics: the English word *lie*. *Language* 57: 26-44.

Giritli, I. 1969. *Fifty years of Turkish political development: 1919-1969.* Istanbul: Fakülteler Matbaası.

Heyd, U. 1954. *Foundations of Turkish nationalism: the life and teachings of Ziya Gökalp*. Great Britain: Luzac & Company and The Harvill Press.

Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Labov, W. 1973. The boundaries of words and their meanings. In C.J.N. Bailey & R.W. Shuy (eds) *New ways of analyzing variation in English*, 340-373. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, fire and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rosch, E. 1973. Natural categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 4: 328-350.