

# ADDITIVE ENCLITIC SUFFIX -dA IN TURKISH AS A COHESIVE DEVICE

**Dönercan Dönük**

## *Abstract*

*This study aims to throw light upon the focusing and continuative functions of -dA at the intersentential and intrasentential level focusing on the study by Kerslake (1992).*

**Key words:** *intrasentential, intersentential, morpheme, enclitic, cohesion, coherence*

## **Özet**

*Bu çalışmada, Kerslake (1992) çıkış noktası olarak kabul edilerek -dA biçimbiriminin odaklama ve sürerlilik işlevlerine göre tümce içi ve tümceler arası kullanımları incelenmiştir.*

**Key words:** *tümce içi, tümceler arası, biçimbirim, ek, bağdaşıklık, tutarlılık*

## I. Introduction

In Turkish, copulative conjunctions operate on the surface structure both to provide cohesion by linking two items and to form coherent units by means of linking the extended ideas. These conjunctions have been dealt with in Kerslak<sup>1</sup> (1992), and some of these connectives, additive devices such as ‘-da’, ‘ve’, ‘zaten’ ,etc., will be the focus of this study. It is pointed out in Kerslake (1992), these devices are not individually expanded as the study covers all the Turkish discourse connectives (additive, expansive, alternative and adversative) in a functional category. Therefore, this study aims to specify the additive functional category **-dA**, out of all the other areas and give further discourse examples to expand the fields pinpointed in Kerslake (1992).

This enclitic suffix, when added to the unit, connects the two words of the same class with the connection of equality and relation (Lewis, 1967). If it follows the verb of the second sentence, it combines that sentence to the first one meaning “additionally”. Kerslake (1992) states that this function can be called continuative, for what the connective does is to signal that the content of the discourse goes in the same way it has been directed. In this sense, to Kerslake (1992), such behaviour characterizes the additive class, one of the members of which is the ‘continuative’ or ‘non-focusing’ **-dA**, as in *in.çeviri de yaparsın* She also states that this enclitic mostly translates into English as ‘and’ or ‘so’ or simply omitted together and that continuative **-dA** indicates a shift of ‘sentence topic’ or ‘theme’ between discourse fragments.

The other additive function of **-dA** is in the focusing sense as in *Ayşe de geliyor*. Kerslake (1992) suggests that the necessary condition for **-dA** to be used in this way is that the discourse part where **-dA** takes place has to have a semantic content that has already been or precisely said or implied in the discourse segment given before, or at least it is covertly implied in the extra linguistic content or the hearer is presupposed to be familiar with it. To test the function of focusing **-dA**, she suggests the use of ellipsis of the shared component. She argues that if the shared component can be elided, **-dA** works as a focusing enclitic.

The following study aims to be continuative both because it relies on various data ranging from intrasentential to intersentential units and because a native speaker can rely on intuitions more while collecting the data and grouping them. From this point of view, there seem to be some other points to make on one of these bound morphemes, **-dA**. In this study, the data have been grouped in view of Kerslake (1992) with a few exceptions.

---

<sup>1</sup> As the study aims to be the extension of the study by Kerslake (1992 ), the terminology used by Kerslake has been used throughout this paper.

## 2. Continuative (non-focusing, additive) -dA

This enclitic works as an additional element in the continuative sense as an external conjunctive to Kerslake's (1992) classification.

- 1) Şimdilik sana birkaç ders uydururuz. Haftada birkaç kez gidersin olur. Çeviri de yaparsın.(10)<sup>2</sup>

*We can arrange a few lessons for you for the time being. You go once or twice a week, and that is all. Moreover, you do translations.*

- 2) Dört duvar arasında olduğunu unut, istediğini yaparsın. Üstelik de hafiften bir kahramanlık, soylu bir de son tasarladın mı kendine, istediğin kadar da dayanabilirsin.

*Forget the fact that you are captured among the four walls, you can do whatever you would like to. Moreover, if you plan a slight heroism and a noble end for yourself, you can endure as long as you wish.*

- 3) Çok küstahsınız, üstelik de sarhoşsunuz.(37)

*You are vain; moreover, you are drunk.*

In the statements above, it can be seen that the two segments of one utterance can stand apart from each other; and the removal of -dA from the second segment causes the sentence to be completely independent, so the hearer or reader can combine the two segments as an additional point of view by means of -dA. When processing (1) and (2), the hearer comes to the conclusion that -dA creates a kind of suggestion or presents an optional task in each example. The same situation is encountered in (2) and (3) where the only difference seems to be the existence of the word, *üstelik* to which -dA is appended as the left most constituent. The message conveyed in utterance (2) seems to be clear to understand: A kind of suggestion is made to somebody who suffers from imprisonment or something of that kind, which is inferred from the lexical selection of the speaker, *among four walls*, covertly implying the bleak atmosphere and reflecting the mood the addressee is in. The consolation suggested is to assume a kind of heroism resulting in the death of the person whom the discourse is based on, and the suggestion is supposed to be of use that brings out endurance. On the other hand, in the discourse fragment (3), the intersentential order is different. The first segment is independent as well as the second, but they are related to each other with a semi-colon, and the second segment consists of the additive; *moreover*, by which the two personality

---

<sup>2</sup> The numbers given in parentheses are the page numbers of the book, *İssizliğin Ortasında* by Mehmet Eroğlu. The data collected are limited to the additive function of -dA as a cohesive device. The data were grouped under two headings with the continuative numerical system. As Kerslake (1992) states, -dA as an enclitic, the examples of which were given merely as an additive device, can be subject to a more detailed argument.

traits of a person is made explicit. While one of these traits is inherent, the other one is temporary and it is based on the situation, yet each seems to leave a negative impression on the speaker.

- 3) Artık sağıma soluma çizilen çizgilerin belirlediği o dar sınırlar içinde yaşayacağım. Şu duvardaki parlak kağıda basılmış resim de katlanmak zorunda olduğum bir ayrıntı artık.(10)

*I will be living within the limits determined by the lines on my right and left. This picture printed on bright paper is also a detail I have to bear from now on.*

- 5) Kızarmış yanaklarına bakıyorum. Evet, kızgınlık da yakışıyor bu kadına.(36)

*I am looking at her blushed cheeks. Yes, anger becomes this woman, as well.*

Both utterances above imply the existence of a preceding discourse whose content is obvious to have the entities such as the other things like the picture which seems to be rubbish and unbearable, and the anger like the other properties that become the woman. What the sentences include is an additional element to the preceding ideas. Yet, the noun to which the enclitic is appended seems to be the continuation of the preceding discourse either in a direct or indirect relationship. What is regarded to be the continuative element in example (4) is the representative of the abstract limits that have been made concrete with the new viewpoint the author adopted for himself. This limitation is syntactically maintained by means of a relative clause structure. The other discourse segment (5) bears the same syntactic structure and there is a more direct connection between the feature of anger and the effect it has left on the physical appearance of the woman.

- 6) Yine sözlerini birden kesip o ilk konuşmaya, gerçeğin tanımına dönmüştü. Sonra susmuş ve bahçeyi asma yapraklarında hışırdayan rüzgara bırakıvermişti. Kilisedeki çocuk gelip nargilesinin ateşini tazeleyinceye kadar da hiç konuşmamıştı.

*He had suddenly abandoned his words and resumed to the definition of reality and then he had fallen silent and let the garden be occupied by the wind swaying the vine leaves. And he had not talked until after the boy from the church had come and kindled the fire of his narghile.*

- 7) İyiyim dese parmaklarımdan koluma tırmanan o iğrenç duyguyu kovacağım. Sızı şimdi de şakaklarımı oyuyor.(51)

*If he said he was fine, I would dismiss the feeling creeping up my arm from my fingers. And now the pain is drilling my temples.*

The examples (6) and (7) can be gathered under the common rule: When **-dA** is added to a time expression like *kadar* and *şimdi* it forms a kind of connection between the time the speaker is talking about and the time preceding that speech. The speaker seems to conceive the time in two parts in the temporal relation of the narration: In (6), the first part refers to the time when the agent kept quiet and the second refers to the action of speaking. These two portions of action within the given time, although they seem to be divided, gives the before-after relation with the addition of the particle. So, it can be said that when it is appended to *kadar*, **-dA** can be observed to contribute to the meaning as a transition from the first lapse of time to the second. In the English version, it can be seen to be equal to 'and' which functions as a connective device.

On the other hand, *şimdi* as it appears in example (7) seems to have another implication although it can be classified within the case of (6): With the addition of **-dA** the word seems to bear another meaning: First of all, it covertly implies that there had been some problems with the pain before. Secondly, as it is the case above, it has a time division: It divides the time as now and before, which allows the reader to process the sequence of events.

- 8) Yaralandığımda doktor yazmıştı. Üç hafta önce de üçüncü mektubu aldım.  
(10) *The doctor had written to me when he was injured. And I received the third letter three weeks ago.*
- 9) Başımı kaldırıp karyolanın tepesine, ölü renklerle boyanmış tabloya çeviriyorum. Gözlerim bu kez de camekanlı büyük kitaplığa düşüyor.(31)  
*I am looking up at the painting on top of the bed painted with faded colours. And this time I cannot take my eyes off the bookcase with a glass window.*
- 10) Sigarayı yakıyorum. Aç karnıma ikinci bu. (9)  
Üçüncü sigarayı da yakıyorum.(17)  
*I am lighting the cigarette. This is the second I am smoking when hungry. And I am lighting the third cigarette.*
- 11) Elinde bir sigara vardı. Az sonra bir tane de bana uzatmıştı. (18)  
*He had been smoking a cigarette. And he had offered me one shortly after.*

Examples (8), (9), (10), (11) above can be grouped under the function of **-dA** mentioning the frequency or numerical entity which precedes the enclitic **-dA**. Thus, it enables the reader to interpret that the action which was performed or is being performed is sure to have been done before. As these four fragments display, with the removal of **-dA** there does not seem to be much change in the meaning of

the utterances when they are considered independently, for the meaning is somehow maintained by the ordinal numbers or other determiners. Yet, the addition of the enclitic enhances the meaning in that the segments subsequently imply the repetition of the actions to which the enclitic is appended. Since this is a continuative study of Kerslake, the function of *-dA* as an enclitic in the continuation sense was foregrounded.

### 3. Focusing *-dA*

#### 3.1. *-dA* meaning too, as well

The three examples given below are all related to the function of *-dA* as an enclitic meaning ‘too’, ‘as well’, etc. In these sentences, *-dA* is appended to the pronoun (sen, o) of the segment in the argument position.

- 12) Kağıdı masadan alıp düzgün yazıyı izliyorum. “Cuma akşamı her zamanki yerde içeceğiz. Halit de gelecek. Sen de gel.” (24)

*I am taking the paper from the table and following the eligible handwriting. “We are going to have something to drink at the same place. Halit will come, too. You could come as well.”*

- 13) “Saçlarınız kısa kemeriniz de asker kemeri” diyor. Gülüyorum. O da gülüyor.(39)

*Your hair is short and your belt is a soldier belt.” she is saying. I am smiling. She is smiling, too.*

- 14) Halit içki dilini yakıyormuş gibi ağzını büzüp karşılık veriyor.”Zayıflamışsın” “Sen de ” diyorum.(57)

*Halit is answering as if the drink tastes sour. “You have lost weight”, he is saying. “So have you”, I am saying.*

In example (12), the semantic content in terms of the third and fourth segments has got nothing remarkable, the former is a declarative sentence bearing a future reference and the latter is an illocutionary act implying an invitation. The semantic content of the preceding discourse is some kind of giving information about something planned and the second utterance is giving the listener information about Halit’s participation as well, from which it can be inferred that Halit and the speaker won’t be the only attendants of the place. This information is provided by the enclitic *-dA* meaning *too*. The third segment of the discourse sounds like an invitation or suggestion for the hearer’s taking part in the meeting. The use of *-dA* meaning *as well* equally in English contributes to the idea of invitation. As Kerslake (1992) suggests, the availability of the ellipsis clarifies the function of the enclitic either as a focusing or as a non focusing element. The ellipsis of the predicate (zayıflamışsın) in the third segment would foreground the focus of the

noun phrase and lead to another reading. The semantic reference of *-dA* is a kind of focus, a meaning reinforcement through the noun phrase focus, *Halit de*. The ellipsis of the predicate (*gelecek*) in the segment would make the reading sound like a must, implying that both Halit and the addressee are obliged to go. Another and less likely reading could be as a strong invitation or insistence on somebody's doing something.

In example (13), the first segment of the utterance was not taken into consideration, for it can be related to the case in examples (15) and (16), in which *-dA* works as a focusing element of a noun phrase. The second segment is a statement of what somebody is doing declaratively. The third segment is the mere repetition of the second one as for the verb phrase; yet the pro drop in the second utterance and the verb inflection with the first person singular is replaced by *o, he* which precedes the enclitic *-dA* indicating that a second argument as well as the first one is performing the same action in the second utterance. The ellipsis testing the focus of *-dA* does not leave a semantically accurate fragment behind, for the ellipsis of the verb in the immediate environment of the enclitic can not be omitted, and this leads to a question whether it is the case in all situations.

Example (14) is an extract from a conversation between two people, in return for the speaker's statement of the hearer's having lost weight, the hearer points out that she/he bears the opinion that having lost weight is equally true both for the speaker and the hearer. The statement the speaker makes carries the modality reference by means of the inflectional morpheme, *-miş* appended to the verb, to lose weight. Its semantic reference is a remark on somebody's appearance that changed without the awareness of the speaker. The inflectional agreement morpheme, *-sin* works as a second person singular marker in agreement with the pro drop of *sen*. Therefore; by giving a short response using the elided form of the verb phrase, and adding *de* as the final participant of the utterance, which should be processed as *so have you or you (have lost weight) too*; the speaker economised with the language and the message was fully conveyed. The ellipsis of the predicate (*zayıflamışsın*) in the second segment does not hinder the production of a semantically correct sentence and this indicates that another exception to the rule comes out. In other words, the focused item, which is the counterpart of the dialogue does not occur on the surface structure, for it is the shared item and is elided.

In example (13), the action of smiling is reported by the argument. Yet, in example (14), the dialogue has two arguments, each declaring a personal opinion of the other relying on his observations. In other words, the predicate of having lost weight is similarly shared by the two arguments but not as a direct action as in the

case of smiling, but as a statement one is making to the other. The morpheme *-sin* contributes to this judgement.

### 3.2. *-dA* meaning *as to*

The other pragmatically common version of *-dA* is the way it occurs meaning ‘as to’ or ‘as for’ in English when the speaker intends to make a change of the subject that did not take place in the preceding discourse segment. In this way, with the shift of the subject an automatic topic shift comes out. The enclitic is added to the inanimate noun phrases of the segments, thus forming the arguments in both cases. Yet, in example (15), another topic is introduced and the indirect link is made by means of the same entity. In example (16), the noun phrase *-dA* is appended to has an anaphoric reference of ellipsis with a definiteness marker.

- 15) Birden saati merak ediyorum. On bir. Ancak güneş günü saat gibi yarılıyamadım. Sokak da şaşılacak kadar sessiz.(9)

*I suddenly want to know the time. Eleven o'clock. Yet, the sun has not risen although it is almost midday. And the street is surprisingly quiet.*

In example (15), the notion of midday is implied, but the sun having failed to rise, and the speaker’s implication of the time in the former discourse can well be understood. In the first segment of the discourse, the speaker thinks that although it is almost midday, the sun has not risen; on the other hand, he is also surprised at the silence in the street and by using *-dA* appended to a noun phrase, he forms a type of semantic relation between the two ideas although they sound different when processed independently. The sun and the clock are wrapped up in animate properties for the sake of literature and the two inanimate entities occur as the argument of the predicate meaning to finish almost half of something.

- 16) Ferda Hanım bu kadın olmalı. Sesi de dudaklarındaki küstahlığa bulaşmış gibi sivri ve soğuk.(33)

*This woman must be Ferda Hanım, and her voice sounds as cold and sharp as the pride stuck on her lips.*

In example (16), the speaker’s utterance involves his personal deduction of a *Ferda Hanım*, whom she does not think highly of, and we can deduce this from the lexical selection: *kadın*. The idea of addition or continuation is provided by *-dA*, which relates the first segment to the second through a noun phrase, *Ferda Hanım* and another noun phrase, *her voice*. The quality attributed to the lady mentioned is highlighted by the enclitic and despite the change of the entity in the statement, the meaning is coherent thanks to *-dA* appended to the noun phrase as the left most constituent of the segment.



The test of ellipsis as Kerslake suggests does not match with the examples in some cases. That is why the grouping suggested here does not exactly fit her classification. It can be argued that when the verb in the following segment repeats itself as in the examples (1), (2), (3), (12), (14) and (16) the second segment of the discourse can be freed from the verb regardless of the action either repeated by the same person or reciprocal or subsequent.

### 3.3. *-dA* as an element of causality

*-dA* as a focusing enclitic works as an element of causality when it is appended to a lexical category of reason.

17) Çirkinliğine eklenen yeniliği buldum. Kulakları uzamış gibi duruyor.

Nedeni de kısa saçları.(57)

*I have discovered the new element added to his ugliness. His ears appear to be pointed. The reason for this is his short hair.*

The last two segments of the discourse are clear to have been uttered by the speaker though there is no preceding discourse revealing it. The person speaking is making a personal comment on another person's wearing short hair while conveying his observations. As it can be understood from the fragment, *-dA* assumes to be explanatory and additive working as a discourse connective. When the last two segments are combined, the noun phrase coming out suggests a kind of causality stated explicitly.. The enclitic was appended to the word, semantically cause which includes the null subject *bunun* in the word *neden-i* provided by the definiteness case marker, *-i*. Another operator on the modality scale, *-dır* follows the zero tense marker and is not present in the third segment of the surface structure. This seems to be a natural representation of the aorist particle, *-dır* as a nonverbal element. The distance between the causality marker and the noun phrase argument being short allows such a zero representation of the aorist particle, and the nonverbal ending should have normally finished with the plurality marker, *-dırlar* which is not used and such a statement and the inanimate argument of a simple sentence in the object position sounds absurd. The definiteness marker governs the nonverbal ending. Supposing that *-dır* was presented on the surface structure, the agreement between the argument and the predicate would be in a different way: In the sentence, *(Onun) çirkinliğine eklenen yeniliği buldum. Kulakları uzamış gibi duruyor. (Bunun )nedeni de kısa saçları(dır)*, the adjectival complement, *kısa saç-lar-ı* would have another reading, as if we are describing a series of events or narrating a story using the aorist leading to a factive reading that implies a permanent status.

18) Şarap kırmızısı suratıyla karşımda, masadaydı.(19)

Yüzü daha da kızarmıştı.(20 )

*He was before me with his wine red face. His face had become redder than before.*

19) Halit! Yüzü daha da çirkinleşmiş, alını kısa saçlarının altından dışarıya uzamış bir çıkıntıyı andırıyor.(56)

*Halit! His face seems to have become uglier, his forehead looks like a protrusion out of his short hair.*

The fragments (18) and (19) share the same common feature in that the stress given to the context of a situation or description can be enhanced by means of an additional element as is the case here. The syntactic aspect of the two utterances may not explicitly display the semantic contribution of 'de' to the discourse. Though not explicitly stated, the particle represents a situation implying that an extra-linguistic context or the preceding discourse mentions the content of what the speaker includes in his statement. In other words, there seems to be a result such as *çirkinleşmek* depending on a cause and the particle, *-dA* appended to 'daha' foregrounds it. The modality content of the indirectly encoded *-miş* appended to the verb in the two cases flows in a different way when the tense and aspect of the predicates are taken into consideration. While in (18) the sentence is based on one simple proposition, in (19), it consists of two propositions whose tenses are different from each other.

20) Konuşmanın başındaki üstünlüğünü nasıl olup da kaybettiğini düşünüyor.(37)

*He is thinking about how he has lost superiority he had at the beginning of the conversation.*

21) Şaşırdığımı görmemiş gibi başımı sallıyorum. Öyleyse nasıl oldu da...(37)

*I am nodding as if he did not see that I am surprised. Then what caused..*

The semantic content of the utterances above is nearly the same. The speaker in both (20) and (21) imply a sort of surprise which gives the impression of reporting a situation from the person who was subject to an experience leaving a spark of bewilderment on the person mentioned. In the first utterance the element of surprise based on an implicit cause can be clearly processed. Yet, in the second the discourse was not finalised and the continuation of the utterance which will never come to the surface remains to be seen, again based on a cause. But it is clear to have an extension the reader can easily process relying on the input he was exposed to within and out of the context. Although the person the speaker mentions

both in (20) and in (21) refers to the same subject, who is clear to be understood in Turkish taking the subject verb agreement into consideration but in English with the sole use of the subject pronoun, the enclitic **-dA** operates in a rather different way when added to the other question words as well as *nasıl* with a common particle *oluyor* which can be translated as “how on earth”, “what on earth” or “who on earth” and be confined to these three questions bearing a covert element of surprise or fury taking its roots from a cause.

### 3.4. **-dA** as a device for coherence

22) Ama elbisemi, hafif ayakkabılarımı yadırgıyorum, yadırgadıkça da sinirleniyorum. (38)

*But I get alienated to my clothes and light shoes, and the more I get alienated, the more angry I become.*

In the example above, the second segment of the sentence is improved depending on the first segment. Although this seems to be **-dA** in the additive sense, it also operates as a focusing element. It conveys the continuation of the idea as for duration and the structure allowing for these successive events that makes a text coherent.

23) Doğayı bilinçsizce katledenleri gördüm. Ancak onların ne yaptıklarını, ne zarar verdiklerini bilmediklerini de gördüm. ( Bülent Eğriboz )

*I saw people who destroyed the nature unconsciously. Yet, I also saw that they did not know what they were doing and the extent of the harm they were giving .*

The sentence given in (23) consists of two semantic components: One is the sentence which gives an account for the fact that the nature is being destroyed, and the second displays the fact that the agents of this destruction are utterly unaware of this fact. Therefore, the way these two fragments are connected to each other with the adversative conjunction, *ancak* (yet) and the enclitic, **-dA** working as a transition signal by means of which the topic of the two sentences remains the same while the notion of destroying the nature is presented from two differing perspectives which focus on the same person’s experience.

24) Yazar, yaşamı boyunca dillere destan bir suskunluk örneği sergiledi. Dahası, yakınlarına da bu suskunluğu kalıt bıraktı. ( Cumhuriyet Dergi, 28<sup>th</sup> March)

*The author displayed a legendary silence all his life. Moreover, he left this silence to his relatives as a reminder of himself.*

The discourse connective, *dahası*, though it does not take place in descriptive Turkish grammar books, in fact works as a connective because it connects the two segments of the sentence with a kind of relation as a cohesive device. One segment, preceded by the other, is semantically reinforced with the contribution of the preceding idea and what it presents as new information is based on the old information implying that the author inspired the idea of silence he himself kept stuck to as long as he lived.

25) Çevremdeki insanlar öldü. Kelebekler de...(13)

*Everybody around me died. So did the butterflies.*

In the discourse fragment in (25) **-dA** bears a continuation between the two segments conjoining one to the other. The additive function of *de* continuing the idea of death for two different entities: *insanlar* (people) and *kelebekler* (butterflies) are semantically tied to each other since they both use the same verb: *ölmek* in the segments subsequently. The elided form of the verb *öldü(ler)* was adequately used to cover up the meaning of the first segment and to extend it to the second segment through **-dA**, which functions as a bridge covertly implying that there is no topic shift in the utterances and the same idea continues despite the omission.

### 3.5. **-dA** as a connective

#### 3.5.1. **-dA**: **-den sonra, daha sonra**

**-dA** also has a function as a discourse connective with a semantic conveyence of *after*.

26) Ali : Ödevime yardım eder misin?

Ayşe: Bu işi bitireyim de...

*Can you help me with my homework? Yes, but let me finish this work first.*

27) Bu işi bitireyim de, senin ödevine de yardım ederim.

*I will help you with your homework, but first I must finish this work.*

*I will help you with your homework too, once I finish my work.*

In (26), Ayşe answers Ali's earlier ask for help positively, but with a disjunction foregrounding the immediateness of the work she has to finalise.

The situation in example (27) displays a different aspect of the particle **-dA** in that the segment preceding the second one assumes a connection of the two actions following each other, one after the first has been completed. **-dA**(26) apparently differs from **-dA** (27) in the way it bears completion or a kind of incomplete sentence as in the dialogue between Ali and Ayşe. The English versions of the first sentence seem to have two different readings. One puts forward a kind of

conditioning, the speaker promises to help with the homework as long as she finishes the work she is busy with; and it is understood that by using the demonstrative adjective, *bu* she feels a sort of responsibility or intimacy to the work she points out. On the other hand, the second alternative gives the message of completion of the first action; rather than conditioning, it requires the temporal range of the two actions.

### 3.5.2.-*da*: ...*ve de (bundan sonra da)*.....

28) Dediklerini yapmadım, yapmayacağım da.

*I did not do what you told me, and mind you, I will certainly not.*

The segment given in the utterance (28) as the first part semantically bears resistance or refusal to do something declaratively. The syntactic order consists of negation of a past form whose subject is a noun clause. *-da* is the representative of .....*ve de*.....taking place between the two segments. This works as a focusing element although there is pro drop in the second segment. The noun clause construction based subject was elided and phonetic prominence was given to the verb negation to imply refusal.

### 3.5.3.-*da*: *hem...hem de*.....

Halliday and Hasan (1976) generalise conjunctions as elements that presuppose the presence of other components in discourse. The following items match with this definition. They also syntactically match with the way Kerslake (1992) categorises the function of conjunctions as at the discourse level and at the intrasentential level. The following examples can be included at the intrasentential level which do not take place in Kerslake's study.

29) Hafta sonu ikimiz de izinliydik.(18)

*We were both off at the weekend.*

30) Sonra ikimiz de sustuk.(22)

*And then we both fell silent.*

31) Eski bir ezgiyi dinler gibi ikimiz de sessiziz. (44)

*We are both silent as if we were listening to an old melody.*

32) Hava da kum da sırlıklam. (55)

*Both the air and the sand are soaked.*

33) Ama artık Zafer'e de Ali'ye de küçük burjuva diyemeyecekler.

*But they will be able to call neither Zafer nor Ali as bourgeois any more.*

The five sentences above can be grouped under the same category, **-dA** which is equal to the co-ordinating conjunction, *both...and...* though (32) and (33) apparently have a different structure. The utterances all focus on the one main aspect of **-dA**: This kind of a particle combines the words of the same class with the principle of unity, equality, and contrastive features. The utterance was economised by adding the enclitic ‘de’ to the number or the nominal case in each sentence. Yet, the surface structure of the utterance (32) when translated into English is different from the others. This change in the surface does not affect the core, the semantic content remains the same.

#### 4. Conclusion

The data collected and gathered verify the functional grouping Kerslake (1992) makes in the area of the enclitic **-dA**. According to this grouping, there are two major areas of classification as focusing and continuative **-dA** in the additive sense. It has been observed that the morpheme works as the continuative particle for addition function. It combines two independent sentences with a relation to a previous discourse with time expressions and with numerical entities. On the other hand, when it works as the focusing particle, it follows pronouns meaning *and*, or *as for*, it follows nouns focusing on causality comparison and personal reactions such as surprise, bewilderment, etc.

Yet, these two areas have subcategories which must be highlighted through further research. Besides, some subcategories processed from the data need to be given further insight. A further study is likely to throw light upon intrasentential function of **-dA** in correlative conjunctions. The data taken into consideration, it has been observed that ellipsis plays a role on the classification of the enclitic being focusing and non focusing.

#### SOURCES FOR EXAMPLES

Cumhuriyet Dergi, weekly periodical  
Erođlu, M. 1987. **İssızlıđın Ortasında**. İstanbul: Özal Basımevi.

#### REFERENCES

Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, Ruqaiya. 1976 .Cohesion in English. London: Longman.  
Kerslake, C. 1992. The Role of Connectives in Discourse Construction. Ahmet Konrot (haz.)1996 içinde. Modern Studies in Turkish. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.  
Lewis,G.L.1967. Turkish Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press.