DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v7i2.1476

A Neo-Humean Analysis of Turkish Enclitic "dE" in Coherence Relations

Türkçe'deki "dE" Enklitiğinin Tutarlık İlişkilerinin Neo-Humean Analiz Yöntemine Göre İncelenmesi

Eda Duruk*[1]

Abstract

This quantitative study aims to investigate the role of enclitic *dE* in Turkish coherence relations by depending on Kehler's (2002) taxonomy. It also explores the applicability of the taxonomy with regard to its relevance for the analysis of written-text discourse and *focusing dE* in Turkish. He proposed three main categories such as *Resemblance*, *Cause-Effect*, and *Contiguity*. The first category was divided into subcategories as *Similarity, Contrast, Exemplification, Generalization, Exception*, and *Elaboration.* The subcategories of the second one were listed as *Result, Explanation, Violated Expectation*, and *Denial of Preventer.* The last category was noted to include *Occasion.* While gathering data, tokens of *dE* were extracted from naturally occurring written-discourse gathered from a novel titled "Türkan Tek ve Tek Başına". These were selected as representatives of the target item's use in Turkish and discourse context was taken into consideration. The frequency count showed that the most common relations are *Occasion, Parallel (Similarity),* and *Result* relations. It was concluded that enclitic *dE* could establish coherence relations within the text in many different ways. The results shed some light onto the understanding of what kind of coherence relations this enclitic contribute to in written discourse.

Keywords: Discourse markers, Coherence relations, Enclitic dE, Neo-Humean analysis.

---

[1] Corresponding author. Asst. Prof. Dr. Pamukkale University, School of Foreign Languages, Kınıklı/Denizli, 20100, Turkey. E-mail: durukeda@gmail.com

Öz

Bu nicel çalışmanın amacı Türkçe'deki dE enklitiğinin tutarlık ilişkisini Kehler'in (2002) taksonomisine göre incelemektir. Kehler şu ana kategorileri önermiştir: *Benzerlik, Sebep-Sonuç* ve *Bitişiklik*. İlk kategori *Benzerlik, Zıtlık, Örnekleme, Genelleme, Hariç tutma* ve *Detaylandırma* olarak alt gruplara ayrılmaktadır. İkinci kategorinin altında ise *Sonuç, Açıklama, Gerçekleşmemiş Beklenti* ve *Sebebi Çürütme* grupları vardır. *Zaman* da son kategoriyi oluşturmaktadır. Veriyi toplarken ayrı yazılan dE bağlacı ile ilgili örnekler doğal söylem örneklerinden alınmıştır. Bunların hedef yapının Türkçe'deki kullanımını temsil ettiği öngörülmüştür ve söylem bağlamı göz önünde bulundurulmuştur. Sıklık sayımı en fazla kullanılan ilişkilerin *Zaman, Benzerlik* ve *Sonuç* ilişkileri olduğunu göstermiştir. Sonuç olarak dE enklitiğinin birçok farklı tutarlık ilişkisi kurabileceği sonucuna varılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları bu enklitiğin yazılı söyleme tutarlık ilişkileri açısından neler kattığının anlaşılmasına ışık tutmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Bağlaçlar, Tutarlık ilişkileri, dE enklitiği, Neo-Humean analiz yöntemi.

1. INTRODUCTION

In discourse coherence, the terms text and discourse can be interchangeably used by some authors. On the other hand, while Coulthard (1985) distinguishes text as written language from discourse as spoken language, Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.1) take text as "a unit of language in use" which can be "any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole". Unlike Halliday and Hasan, Leech (1982) takes discourse as both written and spoken English. Some linguists also distinguish text and discourse from the functional perspective. Brown and Yule (1983, p.6) define text as the "verbal record of a communicative act" and distinguish text-as-product from discourse-as-process.

Coherence is one of the fundamental properties of discourse and it has been examined by many researhers since its centrality. Linguistic analyses of the notion of coherence in discourse have been discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Brown & Yule (1983), Coulthard (1985), etc. Cohesion in English written by Halliday and Hasan in 1976 is accepted as the origin of the study of discourse coherence, and since then a multifarious development in the theory of discourse coherence have been observed and a large number of theoretical systems have been proposed. One of those systems comes from Turkish in which the enclitic particles form coherence relations.

In Turkish, the enclitic particle dE performs two main functions in a given discourse, which Kerslake (1992) and Dönük (2008) classify as focusing additive dE and non-focusing continuative dE. Kerslake (1992) stated that focusing additive dE requires marked stress and pitch prominence on the stressable syllable of the sentence constituent which it follows. She added that it can follow an NP, an adverbial, or a verb. The English translation of this category was listed as "too", "as well" etc.

On the other hand, as for non-focusing continuative dE, Dönük (2008) noted that it works as an additional element in the continuative sense as an external conjunctive. The meaning of this enclitic was represented as "and" or "so". Kerslake (1992) added that it can be omitted altogether. When added to the unit, this enclitic particle connects the two words of the same class with the connection of equality and relation (Lewis, 1967).

Banguoğlu (1986), Ergin (1962), Kerslake (1992) and Dönük (2008) proposed some taxonomies for such connectives (enclitics) which include adversative, causal, additive, etc. Within this context, the objective of the present study is to analyze the relation between the enclitic particle dE and the discourse within the text in which it occurs. However, the research limited itself to focusing dE due to the fact that even focusing

to one aspect requires exhaustive research on the subject field. Moreover, it was assumed that focusing on one aspect would enable the researcher to examine the issue more systematically and in greater depth.

Thus, the present quantitative study aims to fill the gap in the literature related to focusing dE and its discourse functions in Turkish by analyzing the frequencies of each function. Moreover, it was aimed to explore the question whether the taxonomies offered by Kehler (2002) for discourse coherence are sufficient with regard to their relevance for the analysis of text discourse and focusing dE in Turkish.

The rationale of the study is formed by discussing the concept of enclitic and its counterparts offered by some researchers in Turkish. Next, the study moves from briefly discussing the enclitic particle dE in discourse to a more specified perspective of focusing dE. Besides, key findings about focusing dE are further discussed. Furthermore, Neo-humean analysis proposed by Kehler to examine the discourse is described. Finally, data collection procedure and the related findings within their frequencies are discussed.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 What is an enclitic

Cysouw (2004) defines clitics as a phenomenon on the boundary between words and affixes. He makes a distinction between clitics and affixes. He adds that a clitic looks like an affix to a certain degree, but it does not fulfill all characteristics one might expect from an affix. While affixes show a connection to a particular lexical class, many clitics do not share this characteristic. However, most clitics at least exhibit some kind of regularity in their choice of host. The most distinctive kinds of clitics are those that show no regularity at all in the kind of hosts on to which they can attach.

Mario, P. and Gaynor, F. (1954) go one step further by moving from the concept of clitics to the one, enclitics. They explain the concept "enclitic" by referring a clitic which is phonologically combined at the end of a preceding word to form a single unit. For instance, the English negative morpheme "not" becomes an enclitic when de-stressed and joined to the preceding <u>auxiliary verb</u> such as isn't. Therefore, it can be concluded that enclitic is in a way denoting or relating to a monosyllabic word or form that is treated as a suffix of the preceding word.

2.2 The Enclitic Particles in Turkish

The Enclitic Particles in Turkish suggested by researchers so far are summarized in the following way:

- Ercilasun (2008):

  lA: *"Ahmet <u>ile</u> gittik."*

     'We went (there) <u>with</u> Ahmet.'

- Banguoğlu (1986; p.394):

  dE: *"Söyledi <u>de</u>, inanmadık."*

     'She said, <u>but</u> we didn't believe.'

  ki: *"Anladım <u>ki</u>, söz dinlemeyecek."*

     'I understood <u>that</u> he won't listen to me.'

ama: *"Getirdin ama, bir işe yaramadı."*

'You brought (it), <u>but</u> it didn't work.'

diye: *"Gücenmesin diye, en iyisini gönderdim."*

'I sent the best one <u>so that</u> he wouldn't be offended.'

Banguoğlu (1986) added that it is accurate to use a comma just after the enclitics mentioned above.

- Kerslake (1992; p.82):

ise: *"Kışın ise bizim oluyordu."*

'....<u>but</u> it became ours during winter.

Similar to Banguoğlu (1986), Lewis (1978) and Kerslake (1992) also described dE as an enclitic. Kerslake (1992) mentioned that "the enclitic particles dE and 'ise' are located in the second of the two conjoined segments but are debarred from the sentence-initial (or segment-initial) position" (p.82). She added that these particles are closely integrated into the structure of the clause in which they are located due to their enclitic nature. Lewis (1978), another researcher pointing dE as an enclitic, asserted that dE never begins a sentence. He adds that although this enclitic is written as a separate word, "it is enclitic and changes to dA after back vowels" (p.206).

2.3 The Enclitic Particle dE in Discourse

Researchers have examined the roles of certain Turkish connectives marking the direction in which a discourse is being developed. However, such kind of studies is very limited in Turkish. Among these studies related to connectives is the enclitic particle dE which has quite distinctive functions as a discourse connective.

Kerslake (1992) investigated the cohesive functions of some of the most common discourse connectives in Turkish. One of the connectives she examined was the enclitic particle dE. She proposed mainly two functions which she referred as non-focusing continuative dE and focusing additive dE. The former one was defined as marking a shift of "sentence topic" or "theme" between discourse segments A and B (Kerslake, 1992; Erguvanlı, 1984). The latter one, on the other hand, was described as making an "addition" to the message conveyed by a preceding segment of discourse (Kerslake, 1992; Dönük, 2008). Due to the fact that it is the focus of the study, focusing dE will be further discussed in the following section.

2.3.1 Focusing dE

The necessary condition for the additive dE to be used the focusing sense is that the discourse part where dE is included has to have a semantic content which 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 (Kerslake, 1992; Dönük, 2008). Kerslake (1992) proposed the use of ellipsis of the shared component in order to test the function of focusing dE. She noted that if the shared component can be elided, dE works as a focusing enclitic*.* To illustrate, she gave the following example:

Ayşe: *"Ahmet'in kız arkadaşını beğendim."*

Barış: *"Ben <u>de</u> beğendim."*

Ayşe: 'I liked Ahmet's girlfriend.'

Barış: 'I liked her, <u>too</u>.'   (Kerslake, 1992; p.89)

The reiterated semantic content mentioned above "always excludes the focused item itself, which by definition is a replacement for the corresponding constituent of the presupposed version of the message" (Kerslake, 1992; p.89).

The studies carried out so far to investigate the focusing dE in Turkish are quite limited. Thus, the present study was mainly triggered by the analysis of Kerslake (1992), in which the focusing and continuative functions of dE were analyzed. However, due to the fact that the present study focuses on the focusing dE, the content is restricted to cover the relevant findings as discussed in the following section.

2.3.2 dE serving for a modality shift

Kerslake (1992, p.95) underlines the function of dE in which it follows a verb focusing on the modality shift from the generalized possibility encoded by –abilir to the (indirectly known) fact encoded by –mış:

"Tepeden inme kışkırtmalar olmadıkça Anadolu'da en değişik ırklar ve inançlar kardeşçe yaşayabilirler, yaşamışlar <u>da</u>."

'As long as there are no provocations from above, the most varied races and beliefs can live in brotherhood in Anatolia, <u>and</u> have done so, <u>too</u>.'

2.3.3 dE serving for a shared semantic content

One of the other functions of focusing dE is that it shows the shared semantic content of the focused item it follows. Kerslake (1992, p.87) provides the example below, in which the focused item (actually a pair of coordinate NPs jointly modified by a relative clause) is *orada tanıdığım genç bilim adamlarımız, araştırmacılarımız* ('our young scholars and researchers whom I met there'), and the last syllable carries the sentence stress and high pitch:

"Zürich'te iken, hastanede ve hastane dışında Prof. Dr. Gazi Yaşargil yüzünden gurur duyuyordum. Orada tanıdığım genç bilim adamlarımız, araştırmacılarımız <u>da</u> bana o mutluluğu verdiler."

'While I was in Zürich, in the hospital and outside it I felt pride in (Professor) Dr. Gazi Yaşargil. Our young scholars and researchers whom I met there <u>also</u> gave me that happiness.'

In the example above, the writer presented the common semantic material by paraphrasing rather than by simple repetition. The item which this expression supplants is Prof. Dr. Gazi Yaşargil, and the shared semantic content is the writer's feeling pride while in Zürich:

2.3.4 dE occuring between a numerical qualifier and its head

As Kerslake (1992, p.87) states, contrary to the rule that dE immediately follows the item which it focuses, it can also occur between a numerical qualifier and its head, or between a degree modifier and the adjective or

adverb which it modifies. In each case the stress is moved to the right on to the head of the construction, as seen in the examples below:

"Koltuklar alırız.Onlara çiçekli örtüler dikerim ben. Bir de kabul günümüz olur."

'We'll buy some armchairs. I'll make covers for them in floral print. And we'll have an 'at home' day.'

"Ahmet ne kadar tatlı bir çocuk, değil mi?"　　　*"Evet, çok da yakışıklı."*

'What a nice boy Ahmet is, isn't he?'　　　'Yes, and very good-looking, too.'

In each case it would be possible to rewrite the sentences with dE following the focused item. *Bir kabul günümüz de olur* is more formal, but there is no detectable difference in meaning. However, the second example, *Evet, çok yakışıklı da*, seems rather weaker than the original version.

3. METHOD

3.1 Research question

In the light of the coherence relations proposed by Kehler (2002), the present study aims to analyze the frequencies of the enclitic particle, namely the focusing dE, in Turkish by examining 100 Turkish texts from written discourse. Tokens of *dE* were extracted from naturally occurring written-discourse gathered from a novel titled "Türkan Tek ve Tek Başına". Based on this aim, the following research question was sought to be answered:

How do Turkish enclitic dE contributes to coherence relations proposed by Kehler (2002) when they are used in written discourse?

3.2 Data Collection

For the present quantitative study, 100 Turkish texts containing enclitic dE particle were gathered by analyzing a current novel titled "Türkan Tek ve Tek Başına." Two analysts read the novel and exctracted the first 100 tokens from the written discourse. While gathering the data, great attention was given to select the ones establishing coherence relations at intersentential level and exclude the others which make a relation at intrasentential level and do not from a coherence relation. These texts were selected as representatives of the target item's use in Turkish.

Next, these texts were classified according to Kehler's (2002) categories for coherence relations in discourse. The frequencies of each category were examined and further discussed. The most marked ones were provided as samples for each category.

Within these classifications, the clauses including focusing dE as well as the preceding or following clause were given to provide the coherence relation. While classifying the data, the whole text was considered. However, the clause(s) that corresponds to the proposed relation for each category will be written in bold.

3.3 Data Analysis

As discussed above, the data was analysed through Kehler's taxonomy (2002). For the analysis, two separate analysts coded the data for the relevant coherence relations proposed by Kehler (2002). In order to test the reliability between two analysts, Kappa coefficient was measured and found as 93.7.

In data analysis, Kehler's taxonomy (2002) was applied to the tokens. Kehler (2002) analyzed a set of coherence relations and argued that such relations could not be explained just by syntax and semantics. He gave VP elipsis as an example and put forward that it could only be accounted by his coherence theory. Hume's (1955, cited in Kehler, 2002) categorization triggered his theory of the possible ways, in which utterances form a coherent discourse. Hume states that "… there appear to be only three principles of connection among ideas, namely Resemblance, Contiguity in time or place, and Cause or Effect" (1955; p.32, cited in Kehler, 2002). Thus, Kehler (2002) examined the three classes of Hume. However, he offered certain subsections, all of which belong to these three general categories. In the following section, the subsections of each category will be further discussed within the light of Kehler's (2002) examples to clarify data categorization procedures of the present study.

A. Cause-Effect

Result

To discuss the "result" relation, Kehler (2002) gives the following example;

George is a politician, and therefore he's dishonest

Reason   ⟶   Result

It can be understood that George's being dishonest is the result of his being a politician. The conjunction "therefore" also supports this relation. There is a presupposition in the sentence: politicians are dishonest. In the result relation, first the reason is given, then the result is provided.

Explanation

Kehler's (2002) example for the "explanation" relation is the following one;

George is dishonest because he is a politician.

Result   ⟶   Reason

The example implies that George's being a politician is the reason of his being dishonest. The conjunction "because" also supports this relation. In the explanation relation, first the result is provided, and then the reason is given.

Violated Expectation

The following example to clarify the "violated expectation" relation is provided by Kehler (2002);

George is a politician, but he is honest.

Reason   ⟶   ¬ Result

There is a presupposition in the example: if someone is a politician, he is dishonest. However, in the sentence above, the result is negated. Thus, although George is a politician, he is not dishonest. The conjunction "but" supports this relation as well. In the violated expectation, first the reason is provided, and then the result is negated.

Denial of Preventer

The "denial of preventer" relation is shown in the following example:

George is dishonest, even though he is a politician.

Result ⟶ ¬ Reason

Again, there is a presupposition in the example: if someone is a politician, then, he is dishonest. However, in the sentence above, the reason is negated. Thus, George is dishonest, in spite of his being a politician. The conjunction "even though" supports this relation as well. In the denial of preventer, first the result is given, and then the reason is negated.

B. Resemblance

Similarity (Parallel)

To discuss the "similarity" relation, Kehler (2002) gives the following example;

<u>Gephardt</u> **organized rallies** for Gore, and <u>Daschle</u> **distributed pamphlets** for him.

In the example, both underlined names are parallel in that they are politicians. Moreover, both phrases writtten in bold are parallel in that they describe ways of supporting a political candidate. Thus, Kehler (2002) formulates that the similarity relation is enabled by clauses having parallel corresponding entities and events. The conjunction "and" also supports this relation.

Contrast

(a)

Dick <u>supports</u> a raise in defense spending, but George <u>opposes</u> it.

It can be inferred from the sentence that the second clause has a "direct negation" compared to the first one. The verbs underlined and the conjunction "but" also supports this type of contrast relation.

(b)

Dick supports <u>a raise in defense spending</u>, but George wants <u>a raise in education investment.</u>

As for the second type of contrast relation, in the second clause the underlined part presents an alternative to the one in the first clause. Thus, the conjunction "but" has the meaning "on the other hand".

Exemplification

Kehler's (2002) example for the "exemplification" relation is the following one;

Young aspiring politicians often support their party's presidental candidate. For instance, Bayh campaigned hard for Gore in 2000.

In the example, it can be understood that Bayh is one member of the young politicians and Gore is his party's presidental candidate.

Generalization

Kehler (2002) notes that "generalization" relation is similar to exemplification. The only difference is that the ordering of the clauses is reversed as given in the example;

Bayh campaigned hard for Gore in 2000. Young aspiring politicians often support their party's presidental candidate.

Exception

(a)

Kehler (2002) suggests that in the first type of "exception" relation, the generalized assertion of the first sentence is followed by the second clause, in which there is an exception as shown in the example;

Republican presidents do not usually put limits on federal funding of abortion immediately upon entering office. Nonetheless, in his first week, George W. Bush signed a ban on contributing money to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services.

(b)

In the second type of "exception" relation, the order of the sentences is reversed. Thus, in the first clause there is an exception, and then comes the general assertion;

In his first week, George W. Bush signed a ban on contributing money to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services. Nonethless, Republican presidents do not usually put limits on federal funding of abortion immediately upon entering office.

Elaboration

In the "elaboration" relation, two utterances refer to the same event. The second sentence, in a way, is a clarification of the first one;

The new Republican president took a swipe at abortion in his first week of office. In a White House ceremony yesterday, George W. Bush signed an executive order banning support to international agencies which offer abortion as one of their services.

C. Contiguity

Occasion (a)

Kehler (2002) suggests that in the first type of "occasion" relation, there is a chronological order. The events follow each other subsequently as shown in the example;

George picked up the speech. He began to read.

Occasion (b)

In the second type of "occasion" relation, there is not such kind of a subsequent order. The sequence of the events is interrupted as given in the example;

Larry went into a restaurant. The baked salmon sounded good and he ordered it.

One may fill in the gaps as "Larry went into a restaurant, looked around for a free seat. After finding one, he set and wanted the menu. After looking at the menu..."

4. FINDINGS

When the texts were analyzed, in general terms, it was observed that the enclitic dE in Turkish could be categorized under Kehler's coherence relations except "exception b". Although it was found that more frequently the enclitic dE particle establishes a coherence relation at intersentential level, *Occasion, Parallel (Similarity),* and *Result* relations were noted to come to the fore. The frequencies and samples provided in the following section verify the findings. The frequencies of each subcategory are provided in the main categories.

Cause-Effect

As discussed earlier, the first main category is the Cause-effect relations which include *Result, Explanation, Violated Expectation*, and *Denial of Preventer*. The frequencies of each subrelation are given in Table 1.

Table 1: The frequencies of Cause-Effect relations (out of 100)

Result	Explanation	Violated Expectation	Denial of Preventer
15	3	6	5

Depending on the table, it can be concluded that the most frequent relation is *Result* which is followed by *Violated Expectation, Denial of Preventer*, and *Explanation*, respectively. Sample texts of the most clearly marked relations are provided and further discussed in the following subtitles.

Result

Kehler (2002) argued that Cause-effect relation exists between two clauses if a plausible causal relation can be inferred to exist between the events described by the two clauses. Thus, it could be claimed that the clauses written in bold have a causal relation:

1) **Hatta bir zamanlar, Fulya'da dimdik bir yokuşun üzerindeki evi, sırf penceresinden mehtap gözüküyor diye kiralamıştım <u>da</u> deli demişlerdi bana arkadaşlarım**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.37)

The example (1) has a presupposition that renting a house on a ramp just because moonlight is visible there is not meaningful. Considering the presupposition, it is quite clear that the clauses are linked in the Result relation. The use of conjunction "diye" (because) also supports the Result relation.

2) Mektup elimde, "Gökşin, gel, gel! **Şu mektubu medyaya sızdıralım <u>da</u> adımı gâvura çıkaranları utandıralım**. Gel bak, neler yazmışım!" diye seslendim. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.40)

The example (2) also has a presupposition in which it is implied that the letter includes something which, in a way, makes it clear that she is religious. Again, considering the presupposition, the Result relation can be derived from the clauses.

Explanation

Having the Explanation relation requires that the hearer draw a chain of cause and effect inferences which connect the two eventualities that are related, as in the following samples:

1) Bu nefes nefese koşu bitecek. Dinlenmek benim de hakkım. **Uyumak istiyorum huzur içinde! Uzun zamandır uykularım <u>da</u> yok <u>çünkü.</u>** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.48)

For this relation, it is suggested that P is inferred from the assertion of S_1 and Q from S_2 and $Q \longrightarrow P$. When this formulation is taken into account, in example (1), it is clear that the enclitic dE and the conjunction "çünkü" (because) explain the proposition in the first clause. It is stated that she wants to sleep peacefully because she hasn't slept for a long time. It should be noted that the sentence "Uzun zamandır uykularım da yok çünkü" has a presupposition which implies that there is something else which is also negative like not sleeping for a long time.

2) Gökşin'in bana getirdikleri ilkgençlik dönemimizde yazdığımız mektuplar. **Onlara göz atarken boğazıma bir yumru geldi oturdu. Ben on beş yaşımı sürerken, <u>ne</u> Kürt <u>ne</u> de türban sorunumuz vardı.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.56)

Similar to the first one, example (2) also has the Explanation relation. It is explained that when she was looking at the old letters, she became dissappointed [because] when she was fifteen, there were neither Kurdish nor turban problems.

Violated Expectation

The enclitic dE is also noted to establish the Violated Expectation relation, in which

$P \longrightarrow \neg Q$. It is suggested that in the first clause there is an expected event; however, this expectation is violated in the second clause:

1) **Tüm yaşadıklarımızı, gündelik hayatımızın ayrıntılarını mektuplarda paylaştık. Sadece bunları <u>değil</u>, okuduğumuz tüm romanları, öyküleri, şiirleri <u>de</u> mektuplarda tartışır, karakter tanımlamaları yapardık.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.50)

In example (1), as the first clause explains that they shared all details about their daily lives in the letters, one does not expect that they also shared novels, poems, etc. with each other. However, the second sentence shows that this expectation is violated.

2) Ne zaman sokağa giren bir jandarma görsek, acaba hastaya yanlış bir şey yaptık da bizi almaya mı ge-liyorlar diye **aramızda şakalaşırdık. Gülmesine gülerdik <u>de</u> benim içime hep bir kurt düşerdi.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.62)

In example (2), it is stated that they were chaffing with each other and they were also laughing. Hence, one does expect that a person laughing is happy. However, this expectation is violated as it continues that while she was laughing, she became doubtful of the situation.

3) Gökşin'in, en doğrusunu yaptığım için **beni hem alkışlayan hem de teselli eden mektubu hemen gelmişti. Gelmişti <u>de</u> beni teselli edememişti**, o başka! (Kulin, A. 2009, p.67)

In example (3), when a person reads that the letter which both applauds and consoles her is received to her, he/she assumes that the girl will feel relieved. However, it is stated that such kind of a letter couldn't make her feel in that way. Again, the expectation is violated.

Denial of Preventer

In this last categorization of Cause-effect relations, $Q \longrightarrow \neg P$:

1) Ben ne müthiş bir romantikmişim on beş yaşımı sürerken! **Aslında romantizmle hiç bağdaşmayan mesleğime ve ayaklarımı yere sert bastıran hayat çizgime rağmen, içimdeki saf çocuğun yoğun duyguları yıllar içinde azal<u>sa da</u>, bu yaşıma dek beni tamamen terk edemedi**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.73)

In example (1), the text is about a doctor who labels herself as a very realistic person. However, romantic feelings of the innocent child which she had once does not finish completely. Thus, the negation provided the denial of the event. It should be noted that the affix "-sA dA" establishes this relation.

2) Şair arkadaşımın yaralar berelerle arası iyi değildi, **ben ise her gün bunlarla ilgileniyordum**. O yüzden anlatmaya kalkmadım. **Ama ona anlatmaktan çekindiğim o geceyi <u>de</u> hayatım boyunca unutmuş değilim. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.81)**

In example (2), there is a doctor who describes herself as always being faced with serious injuries. However, later, she states that she has never forgotten that night. Thus, the negation provided the denial of the event.

Resemblance

As mentioned before, the second main category is the Resemblance relations which include *Similarity, Contrast, Exemplification, Generalization, Exception*, and *Elaboration*. The frequencies of each subrelation are given in Table 2.

Table 2: The frequencies of Resemblance relations (out of 100)

Similarity	Contrast	Exemplification	Generalization	Exception	Elaboration
17	9	8	5	3	5

Table 2 suggests that the most frequent relation is *Similarity* which is followed by *Contrast*, *Exemplification*, *Elaboration, Generalization* and *Exception*, respectively. Sample texts of the most clearly marked relations are provided and further discussed in the following subtitles.

Similarity (Parallel)

Kehler (2002) claims that in the Parallel relation there is a set of properties which are shared by the two clauses and it is supposed that the hearer infers the common relation between the clauses:

1) "Hayrola," dedim, "**sen <u>de</u> mi beni rüyanda gördün yoksa**?"

   "Biri seni rüyasında mı görmüş?" diye sordu.

   "**Halime görmüş**, kalkmış Tunceli'den buralara kadar gelmiş." (Kulin, A. 2009, p.47)

In example (1), there is a presupposition which implies that someone else also saw the woman in his/her dream. This is covertly expressed as it is added that it was Halime who also saw the woman.

2) O yaşlarımızın elyazısıyla yazılmış **ortaokul mektuplarını mavi, lise yıllarını kırmızı kurdeleyle, üniversite yazışmalarını <u>da</u> bir sicimle bağlayarak ayrıştırmış**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.65)

In example (2), there is also a set of entities which are common among the phrases. The letters form this set. Blue and red ribbons, and another rope are mentioned to classify each school and university period in terms of the common subject, letters.

3) Halime tedavi süreci sırasında, ona iyi davranan Sülo Amca'yla anlaşmış. **O, şeker hastası olan Sülo'ya bakacak, evinin işlerini görecek, yemeğini pişirecek, Sülo <u>da</u>, emekli maaşı kıza kalsın, ilerde kendini geçindirecek parası olsun diye, Halime'ye nikâh kıyacakmış**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.79)

In example (3), it is mentioned that Halime will take care of Sülo who is a diabetic patient, and Sülo will marry her so that she will have money to continue her life. Thus, the common notion is the promise they give to each other.

Contrast

The Contrast relation focuses on the differences among corresponding sentences or clauses:

(a)

In this type of Contrast relation, the second clause has a "direct negation" compared to the first one, or it can be described as having two clauses in which opposing verbs are used:

1) "Halime hangisiydi, üvey oğullarından sürekli dayak yiyen kadın mı?"

   "O Yeter'di. Hani **bacağını donmuş diye <u>keseceklerdi</u> <u>de</u>, ben muayene sırasında ellerken bir sıcaklık hissetmiştim, <u>kurtarmıştık</u> bacağı**." (Kulin, A. 2009, p.83)

In example (1), it is stated that Halime's leg was going to be cut when the doctor felt some warmth, and so, they stopped getting ready for the operation and rescued the leg. The use of verbs "kesmek" (to cut) and "kurtarmak" (to rescue) also provides the contrast relation.

2) **İyileştirdiğim hastalarımla bir türlü <u>çözülemeyen bir bağım olmuştur</u>. <u>Halbuki</u> ne kadar <u>da</u> çok doktor tanıdım, hastaya hastalığı süresince bakar, iyileştirdikten sonra <u>yolları ayrılır</u>**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.91)

In example (2), it is stated that while the woman has a continuous relationship with her patients, she knows lots of doctors who end their relationship once their patients get better. The use of phrases "çözülemeyen bir bağ" (to have a continuous relationship) and "yolları ayırmak" (to end the relationship) also provides the contrast relation. It should be noted that the conjunction "hâlbuki" (however) also supports this relation.

(b)

The other type of the Contrast relation is established by the differences of a set of entities, in a way, it provides alternatives for an issue as in the following samples:

1) **Babama göre, annemin işi bitene kadar evde oturmalıyım. Allahtan Avrupalı bir annem var <u>da</u> kardeşlerimle denize inmeme izin veriyor.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.93)

In example (1), for the permission of their daughter, there are two point of views. According to her dad, she must stay at home until her mom finishes her house-chores. On the other hand, her mom lets her go to the shore with her sisters. Thus, there are contrasting point of views.

2) **Ali ilişkimizin daha da ciddileşmesini istediğini belirttiğinde <u>de</u> ben <u>henüz</u> arkadaş olarak kalma kanısındaydım**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.96)

In example (2), for their friendship, Ali wants to make it announced to their families, whereas the girl wants to continue their friendship in the same way for a certain period of time. Thus, again, there are contrasting point of views.

Exemplification

The Exemplification relation exists between a general statement and an example of that statement:

1) **Hakkında yazılmış pek çok kitap vardı**. *At Kız*, kendi kaleminden hayatının belli bir bölümüne dair otobiyografiydi. Mehmet Zaman Saçlıoğlu'nun kaleme aldığı *Güneş Umuttan Şimdi Doğar*, ise, hayatının tüm evrelerini gözden geçiren, kapsamlı, özenli bir nehir söyleşiydi. Ayrıca, **tıp ve eğitim alanlarındaki çalışmaları** <u>da</u> **çeşitli kitaplarda toplanmıştı**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.87)

Considering the phrases in bold, it could be mentioned that there are lots of books written about her such as the books titled as "*At Kız, Güneş Umuttan Şimdi Doğar*". Her studies on medicine and education are also (dA) gathered in various books. Through exemplification, the text becomes more coherent. While the first sentence forms the general category, other phrases in bold are its subsets.

2) **Evlenene kadar üzerimdeki baskı devam etti**, **annem** benden giden ve bana gelen **mektuplarımı okudu**, **sınıf pikniklerinde peşime kardeşlerimi takmadığı zaman** <u>da</u>, tesadüfmüş gibi kardeşlerimle birlikte, **bulunduğum yerlerde gezindi**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.98)

Similarly, it could be stated that the pressure on her continued until she got married. The examples given are her mom's reading her letters and walking around the places where she had a picnic with her friends. Again, while the first sentence forms the general category, other phrases in bold are its subsets.

Generalization

Except that the ordering of the clause is reversed, the Generalization relation is similar to Exemplification:

1) <u>Ben</u> **üzerime düşeni yapmıştım. Yeri geldiğinde** <u>her doktor</u> <u>da</u> **elinden geleni yapmak zorundadır**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.108)

In example (1), the woman says that she did what she was supposed to do. Then, she adds that when necessary, every doctor is obliged to do their best. Here, "ben" (the woman, as a single doctor) and "her doktor" (every doctor) establish the Generalization relation. While the former one is a subset, the latter is the general category.

2) **Nasıl ki** <u>cüzamlılarla</u> **ilgilenmem benim sorumluluğumdu,** <u>diğer hastalara</u> **kendimi adamam** <u>da</u> **öyle.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.117)

In example (2), the woman says that its her duty to take care of not only leper patients but also other ones. Here, "cüzamlılar" (leper patients) and "diğer hastalar" (other patients) establish the Generalization relation. While the former one is a subset, the latter is the general category.

Exception

Exception is another type of the Resemblance relation.

(a)

In this type of Exception relation, the generalized assertion of the first sentence is followed by the second clause, in which there is an exception:

1) **Türkan Saylan'ın hayırlı yaşamının, tıp ve eğitim alanında yaptıklarının, müstesna kişiliğinin bir kitapta eksiksiz verilmesi zaten** <u>mümkün değil</u>**.** <u>Yine de</u> **okuyacağınız satırlarda, ben ona verdiğim sözü tutuyor, bu eşsiz insanın portresine, birkaç** <u>fırça darbesi de ben vurmaya çalışıyorum</u>**.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.117)

To provide the coherence of the discourse, whole text is provided in the example. The first sentence in which it is discussed that it is impossible to depict the helpful life of Türkan Saylam, the things she did in medicine and education, and her personality in a single book. This sentence is the general statement, after which a subset relation comes; "Nonetheless, in the lines you will read I keep my promise and I try to throw light to her unique personality". Thus, this sentence explains the exception of the generalization. The conjunction "Yine de" (Nonetheless) also supports this relation.

2) **Üstüne düşülmesinden ve <u>yemek</u> konusunda baskı yapılmasından hoşlanmazsın <u>da</u> <u>ama</u> şimdi <u>bir dilim</u> ekmek bitecek.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.124)

Again, this example starts with a general statement which states that the woman does not like having all the attention on herself and being forced to eat something. However, a slice of bread is an exception. The conjunction "ama" (but) also supports this relation.

Elaboration

The final Resemblance relation is Elaboration, in which two eventualities described are in fact the same, in a way the second one clarifies a common subject:

1) **Hiç deneyimi olmayan gencecik bir doktordum. Dişçi arkadaşların <u>da</u> benden farkları yoktu. Üçümüzün <u>de</u> ilk muayenehane tecrübesiydi bu**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.129)

Example (1) gives details about the same set of entity. For this text, the common entity is being an inexperienced doctor. After stating that she was a very young doctor who was inexperienced, she adds that her friends who are dentists are similar to her. Thus, one can infer that they are also inexperienced. However, she makes a clarification and mentions that that was their first experience.

2) O benim büyüğüm ve keman hocam ama **çok iyi anlaşıyoruz, bana çocuk muamelesi <u>de</u> yapmıyor. Bir bisikleti var, kardeşlerimle ona binip durmadan geziyoruz. Geceleri <u>de</u> sandalla evin önüne gelip serenad yapıyor.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.135)

The example reveals that the common entity is getting along. Examining the two eventualities which are 1) using her teacher's (also her boyfriend) bike frequently with her sisters, and 2) her teacher's serenad to her by coming in front of the house via his boat, it is clear that they both refer to the same thing, getting along.

Contiguity

As explained earlier, the third main category is the Contiguity relations which include *Occasion.* The frequency of the subrelation is given in Table 3.

Table 3: The frequencies of Contiguity relations (out of 100)

Occasion	27

Table 3 suggests that *Occasion* relation is frequently expressed by the enclitic dE. Sample texts of the most clearly marked relations are provided and further discussed in the following subtitle.

Occasion

Kehler (2002) claims that the Contiguity relation and its subcategories could be defined as narration relation because it links the sentences with the sequence of events:

(a)

In the first type of Occasion, the events are narrated subsequently and there is a chronological order among them:

1) "**Zeynep hazırlıyor masayı. Seslen <u>de</u> sana da bir tabakla bir bardak çay koysun tepsiye**," dedim. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.130)

In the example, the routines of setting a table are described. In the example it is stated that Zeynep is setting the table. It continues; "Call her, (and so) she can put a dish and a cup of tea for you. It is quite clear that the events are expressed subsequently. Thus, it can be claimed that the enclitic dE contributes to the coherence by providing contiguity in time and place.

2) Sınav sabah yapılacak, akşam treniyle dönene kadar, onunla buluşacaktım. **Beni Çankaya'ya çıkaracak, <u>sonra</u> <u>da</u> hayvanat bahçesine götürecekti.** (Kulin, A. 2009, p.147)

Example (2) also supports the same relation. It is mentioned that the couple will first go to Çankaya, and then (sonra dA), they will visit the zoo. Hence, again the events are subsequently narrated.

(b)

In the second type of Occasion relation, there is not such kind of a subsequent order. There is an interruption in the flow of narration:

1) **Gökşin, bir ekmek parçasının üstüne <u>bu kez</u> <u>de</u> bal sürmüş bana uzatıyordu. Bu lokmanın <u>da</u> icabına baktım**. (Kulin, A. 2009, p.141)

In example (1), it is stated that "this time (bu kez de) Gökşin had spred the honey over the bread, and she was giving it to me. I got that bite done as well (dA)". However, the flow of the events are interrupted as she did not say something like "she was giving it to me. I took it, and I tried to eat it. I got that bite done, as well (dA)". Moreover, there is a presupposition: If one gets a bite done as well, it means that he/she has also overcome the earlier bites.

5. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The present study focused on the coherence relations of the enclitic dE in Turkish. When the main categories - *Cause Effect*, *Resemblance*, and *Contiguity* are compared, their frequencies are listed as 28, 45, and 27, respectively. Thus, *Resemblance* relations seem to be the most frequent ones in general. However, it should also be noted that this relation has 6 subrelations, whereas *Cause Effect* relation has 4 subrelations and *Contiguity* has 1 subrelation.

With respect to a more detailed analysis, when each subrelation is compared, the most common ones are *Occasion, Parallel (Similarity),* and *Result* relations. Their frequencies are listed as 27, 17, and 15, respectively. The results suggest that the enclitic dE particle in Turkish forms coherence relations especially within *Occasion* relation. When the discourse of this relation is examined, the reason is mostly due to the particle's preceding word(s) as in the given samples;

> "Beni Çankaya'ya çıkaracak, <u>sonra</u> <u>da</u> hayvanat bahçesine götürecekti."
> "Gökşin, bir ekmek parçasının üstüne <u>bu kez</u> <u>de</u> bal sürmüş bana uzatıyordu. Bu lokmanın <u>da</u> icabına baktım."

The underlined parts within the enclitic dE establish an *Occasion* relation which is very common in Turkish discourse. Therefore, it can be concluded that in Turkish the enclitic dE is widely used to form an *Occasion* relation, in which the preceding word(s) is of great importance.

The second most common subrelation enabled by the enclitic dE particle in Turkish is *Parallel (Similarity)* relation. The common use of the enclitic dE particle in this relation seems due to its similar uses such as VP Ellipsis, etc., in which there is a set of properties which are shared by the two clauses. The hearer is supposed to infer the common relation between the clauses as in the sample below;

> A: "Rüyamda Halime'yi gördüm."

> B: "Ben <u>de</u>."

Such kinds of ellipses are quite common in Turkish as they are very practical in daily use.

The last most frequent subrelation formed by the enclitic dE particle is *Result* relation. The tendency in Turkish seems to play a role in the relatively high frequency of this subrelation. In Turkish, generally the reason of an event which is followed by the enclitic dE precedes the result of the same event as in the given samples;

> "Fulya'da dimdik bir yokuşun üzerindeki evi, sırf pencereinden mehtap gözüküyor diye kiralamıştım <u>da</u> deli demişlerdi bana arkadaşlarım."

> "Şu mektubu medyaya sızdıralım <u>da</u> adımı gâvura çıkaranları utandıralım."

The underlined dE particles and the preceding clauses given above verify the clearly marked *Result* relation.

To conclude, it could be stated that the enclitic dE in Turkish can function as a discourse operator within the text. It can also link different segments of the discourse. As far as the findings of the present study are concerned, Kehler's (2002) discourse coherence theory is applicable to the enclitic dE. Such kind of an analysis is of great importance to explain the way in which the enclitic dE contributes to discourse coherence.

As for the limitations of the study, there remains a single sub-category, Exception b, for which no samples were available. Thus, further studies are necessary to throw some lights on that category.

References / Kaynakça

Banguoğlu, T. (1986). *Türkçenin Grameri.* Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi. Ankara.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulthard, M. (1985). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. (2th edition) London: Longman.

Cysouw, M. (2004). Morphology and its demarcations. Selected papers from the 11th Morphology meeting, Vienna, February 2004.

Dönük, D. (2008). Additive Enclitic suffix -dA in Turkish as a Cohesive Device. AÜ. Dil Dergisi.

Ercilasun, A. B. (2008). La Enklitiği ve Türkçede Bir "Pekiştirme Enklitiği" Teorisi. Retrieved from http://dilarastirmalari.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=45

Ergin, M. (1962). *Türk Dilbilgisi.* İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.

Erguvanlı, E. E. (1984). *The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Kehler, A. (2002). Coherence, Reference and the Theory of Grammar, Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Kerslake, C. (1992). The Role of Connectives in Discourse Construction. Modern Studies in Turkish. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Kulin, A. (2009). Türkan Tek ve Tek Başına. (1. Baskı). Everest Yayınları.

Leech, G.; Deuchar, M. & Hoogenraad, R. (1982). English Grammar for Today: a New Introduction, London: Macmillan.

Lewis, G. L. (1967). Turkish Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lewis, G. L. (1978). Turkish Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mario, P. A. & Gaynor, F. (1954). *A dictionary of linguistics.* New York: Philosophical Library.