Getting even without "even" in Turkish[*]

Yağmur Sağ & Ömer Demirok

Harvard University, Boğaziçi University

1. Introduction

It has been shown that additive particles in some languages may additionally license scalar inferences in certain contexts.[1] To contribute to our general understanding of the scalar uses of additive particles, we investigate the additive particle *da* in Turkish, which also licenses scalar inferences in certain contexts such as antecedents of conditionals.

As is typologically common, additive particles appearing in conditional antecedents often yield *concessive* readings (Haspelmath and König 1998). This is also the case in Turkish. The concessive reading arises if the additive particle *da* attaches to the right edge of the antecedent, as shown in 1a. However, Turkish also allows antecedent-internal attachment of *da* as in 1b, in which case a scalar reading arises, which we distinguish from the alternative concessive conditional reading in 1a. We show that the existing accounts of additive particles yielding concessive readings (Guerzoni and Lim 2019, Faller 2022) do not extend to the scalar reading arising from the use of *da* in sentences like 1b.

(1) a. [[Yağmur yağ-sa] **da**], pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
         rain   precipitate-COND TOO picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
         'Whether it rains or not, we will go on a picnic.'

     b. [[Yağmur] **da** yağ-sa]   pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
         rain   TOO precipitate-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
         'Even if it rains, we will go on a picnic.'

[1]Typical examples are German *noch*, Mandarin *hái*, and Hungarin *még*. These particles have been analyzed as generating scalar readings under similar conditions in Zhang and Ling (2016), as explained below. However, other additive particles exhibit scalar inferences that are contingent upon different factors. For example, Etxeberria and Irurtzun (2015) experimentally show that *ere* in Basque yields both additive and scalar readings, distinguished solely by prosody. Additionally, Mari and Tovena (2006) argue that the availability of additive and scalar readings of *neppure* in Italian depends on whether the existential presupposition is checked by linguistic antecedents in the previous discourse, as well as the presentation order of the antecedents.

Building on the typology of additive particles proposed in Zhang and Ling (2016), we analyze the even-like reading arising from the antecedent-internal *da* as a scalar implicature, derived through the discourse incrementalism requirement associated with *da* and test further predictions of our analysis within Turkish.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we provide background on *da*, justifying its status as an additive particle and reviewing its syntactic and semantic characteristics. In Section 3, we turn to the core of our analysis, detailing how the scalar reading arises with an additive particle in conditional antecedents. Section 4 briefly discusses further contexts where *da* yields scalar inferences. Section 5 concludes along with some open questions.

2. Background on *da*

The particle *da* in Turkish has a rich variety of uses (Göksel and Özsoy 2006, Bayırlı 2021). We focus on its use as a run-of-the-mill focus particle in the sense of Rooth (1985). In what follows, we review what the syntactic distribution and the semantic contribution of *da* are in its canonical use as a focus particle (henceforth the additive particle *da*). Then, we turn to its use in conditional antecedents and discuss why the scalar use of *da* constitutes a puzzle.

2.1 *da* as an additive particle

The additive particle *da* behaves like the Japanese MO-particle in the sense of Szabolcsi (2015). Its semantic requirement, which amounts to additivity, can be checked in two ways.

The first way in which the semantic requirement of the *da* particle can be checked is by an utterance that precedes the *da*-sentence, as shown in 2. In this dialogue, since B's utterance features the *da* particle, it semantically requires it to be true that somebody other than Harun applied to the PhD programs this year. Since A's utterance meets this requirement, the use of *da* is licensed.

(2)   Which students applied to the PhD programs this year?

    a.   A: Ayşe ile   Mehmet başvurdu.
            Ayşe with Mehmet applied.
            'Ayşe and Mehmet did.'

    b.   B: Harun **da**   (doktora-ya) başvurdu.
            Harun TOO PhD-DAT   applied
            'Harun applied (to the PhD programs), too.'

The second way for the semantic requirement of the *da* particle to be met is mutually in *da-da* 'both … and' conjunctions, as shown in 3. In *da-da* conjunctions, the two conjuncts each come with the *da* particle, which means that each has its own semantic requirement. Harun's application satisfies the semantic requirement associated with the *da* particle in the second conjunct while Şeyma's application satisfies the semantic requirement associated with the *da* particle in the first conjunct.

(3)   Did Harun or Şeyma apply to the PhD programs this year? [alternative question]

    a.   A: Harun **da**   başvurdu, Şeyma **da**   (başvurdu).
          Harun TOO applied   Şeyma TOO (applied).
          'Both Harun and Şeyma did.'

    b.   A': Harun **da**   Şeyma **da**   başvurdu.
          Harun TOO Şeyma TOO applied.
          'Both Harun and Şeyma did.'

In addition to its semantic contribution, the syntactic placement of the *da* particle is also going to be important for our purposes. As we have already illustrated in the examples above, we find the *da* particle attaching to DPs. Another canonical position for the *da* particle is the preverbal position. When the *da* particle occurs in this position, it is either attaching to the DP (yielding DP focus cases) or attaching to the VP (yielding VP focus cases). The latter possibility is verified by the fact that in *da-da* conjunctions, VPs can vary in the overt alternatives (i.e., conjuncts), as illustrated in 5.

(4)   a.   Sema [[$_{DP}$ elma] **da**] ye-di.
        Sema   apple TOO eat-PST
        ⤳ Sema also ate something other than apples.   (DP focus)

    b.   Sema [[$_{VP}$ elma t$_V$] **da**] ye-di.
        Sema   apple   TOO eat-PST
        ⤳ Sema also did something other than eating apples.   (VP focus)

(5)   Sema elma **da** ye-di, süt **de** iç-ti,   kahve **de** demle-di.
    Sema apple TOO eat-PST milk TOO drink-PST coffee TOO brew-PST
    'Sema ate apples, drank milk, and brewed coffee.'

    The placement of the particle *da* in the VP focus cases may seem curious given that it occurs between the object DP and the verb. We speculate that if *da* is attached to the VP (as a head-final particle) and the verb alone is raised to T, leaving out its complement in-situ, the preverbal syntactic placement of the *da* particle follows.

2.2 *da* in conditionals

In conditional antecedents, the *da* particle yields a salient *even*-like interpretation. Take the examples in 6. Most natural translations of the conditional sentences in 6 would make use of *even if* in English. The example in 6a and the example in 6b differ in one important respect, namely in the syntactic placement of the *da* particle. We will argue that 6a is an alternative concessive conditional where the alternatives are logical opposites whereas 6b has a genuinely scalar, even-like reading.

(6) a. [[Yağmur yağ-sa]   **da**], pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
         rain   precipitate-COND TOO picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
         '**Even** if it rains, we will go on a picnic.'   (antecedent-final)

     b. [[Yağmur] **da** yağ-sa]   pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
         rain   TOO precipitate-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
         '**Even** if it rains, we will go on a picnic.'   (antecedent-internal)

Recall from the discussion in the previous section that the preverbal attachment of the *da* particle allows VP focus. Hence, we hypothesize that the antecedent-internal attachment of the *da* particle can be VP focus. This is verified by the fact that in *da-da* conjunctions, where alternatives are overt conjuncts, VPs can vary, as shown in 7.

(7) [Yağmur da   yağ-sa],   [şimşek de   çak-sa],   pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
     rain   TOO precipitate-COND thunder TOO clap-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
     Lit.: 'Both if it rains and if thunder claps, we will go on a picnic.'
     'Even if it rains or thunder claps, we will go on a picnic.'

Setting aside the question of how *da* here generates an *even*-like reading for now, let us turn to the cases where the *da* particle exhibits antecedent-final attachment. The evidence from *da-da* conjunctions shows that the alternatives are logical opposites, as shown in 8. Notably, this is not possible for the antecedent-internal attachment of *da*, as shown in 9.

(8) [Yağmur yağ-sa   da], [yağ-**ma**-sa   da], pikniğ-e
     rain   precipitate-COND TOO precipitate-NEG-COND TOO picnic-DAT
     gid-eceğ-iz.
     go-FUT-2PL
     'We will go on a picnic whether it rains or not.'

(9) *[Yağmur da   yağ-sa],   [yağmur da   yağ-**ma**-sa],   pikniğ-e
     rain   TOO precipitate-COND rain   TOO precipitate-NEG-COND picnic-DAT
     gid-eceğ-iz.
     go-FUT-2PL

Therefore, we argue that the antecedent-final attachment of *da* is polarity focus (also called verum focus), where alternatives are logical opposites. It is typical for clause-final focus particles in Turkish to have polarity focus (Kamali 2011). For example, the YNQ particle *mI* in Turkish can only generate a polar question if *mI* is clause-final, as shown in 10.

(10) Sinemaya git-ti-n   **mi**, (git-**me**-di-n   **mi**)?
      movies.DAT go-PST-2SG Q   go-NEG-PST-2SG Q
      'Did you go to the movies (or not)?'

In fact, we even find *da* occurring clause-finally in *da-da* conjunctions, as shown in 11.

Although this utterance asserts the conjunction of logical opposites, in a context where it is followed by an explanation like ('I went there but I felt sick after 5 minutes, so I had to leave.'), it would be felicitous.

(11)   Sinemaya   git-ti-m   **de**, git-**me**-di-m   **de**.
       movies.DAT go-PST-1SG TOO go-NEG-PST-1SG TOO
       Lit: 'I both went to the movies and did not go (to the movies).'

2.3   Why is the scalar reading of *da* puzzling?

Now let us turn to the question of how the *even*-like reading can arise with antecedent-internal and antecedent-final *da*. Given that antecedent-final *da* in conditionals requires logical opposites as alternatives, the *even*-like reading is predicted, as detailed in the account proposed in Guerzoni and Lim (2019) (cf. Faller 2022).

   Guerzoni and Lim (2019) argue that under polarity focus, alternatives are logical opposites: p and $\neg p$. When [if p, q] is asserted and [if $\neg p$, q] is presupposed, we derive entailment of the consequent. This is so because the two alternatives exhaust the logical space, resulting in the factive implication [no matter what, q], as shown in 13 for 12, repeated from 6a.

(12)   [[Yağmur yağ-sa]   **da**], pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
       rain   precipitate-COND TOO picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
       '**Even** if it rains, we will go on a picnic.'   (antecedent-final)

(13) $[\![[[\text{if rainy}]_F \text{ DA }] \text{ picnic}]\!]$:
       Assertion: $[rainy \to picnic]$
       Presupposition: $\exists p' \, [p' \in \{rainy, \neg rainy\} \wedge p' \neq rainy \wedge [p' \to picnic]$

   While Guerzoni and Lim's account derives an even-like reading for the antecedent-final attachment of *da*, it does not extend to the cases where *da* exhibits antecedent-internal attachment. Recall in such cases alternatives are not logical opposites. Hence, our puzzle is how the scalar interpretation arises in cases like 14, repeated from 6b, which we have shown are VP focus rather than polarity focus. The null hypothesis would be that 14 simply asserts 'if rainy, picnic' and semantically requires that there be one more situation p' among the alternatives of rainy situations such that 'if p', picnic' is also true. Hence, it should rather translate as 'If it rains, too, we will go on a picnic.' Yet native speakers report that the sentence has a scalar component, hence justifying the use of *even* in the English translation.

(14)   [[Yağmur] **da** yağ-sa]   pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
       rain   TOO precipitate-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
       '**Even** if it rains, we will go on a picnic.'   (antecedent-internal)

3. Deriving the scalar interpretation of *da*

Zhang and Ling (2016) identify two types of additive particles: one that indicates similarity between distinct propositions, one that requires discourse to be *incremental*, i.e., become more informative from one proposition to the next. Examples for the first type involve English *also*, German *auch*, Mandarin *yě*, and Hungarian *is*, while the representatives of the second type are German *noch*, Mandarin *hái*, and Hungarian *még*. Following Zhang and Ling, we will call the first group AUCH-type and the second group NOCH-type.

In this section, we first discuss these two types of additive particles. Then illustrating that *da* is a NOCH-type particle, we derive the even-like inference associated with antecedent-internal *da* as a scalar implicature.

3.1 Two types of additive particles and discourse incrementalism

To see how AUCH-type and NOCH-type additive particles differ, consider the following examples from German (Zhang and Ling 2016: 3):

(15) a. (Er   hat   ein   Bier getrunken.)   Er
          3SG.M have.3SG.PRS one.ACC.N beer drink.PST.PTCP 3SG.M
          hat   **noch/auch** einen   Wein getrunken.
          have.3SG.PRS NOCH/AUCH one.ACC.M wine drink.PST.PTCP
          '(He had a beer.) He also had a wine.'

   b. Osnabrück liegt   (gerade) **noch/#auch** in Niedersachsen.
          Osnabrück lie.3SG.PRS just   NOCH/AUCH in Lower-Saxony
          Intended: 'Even Osnabrück is in Lower Saxony.'

Both *noch* and *auch* have an additive use, as shown in 15a, while only *noch* has a scalar use, as illustrated by the contrast in 15b (cf. König 1977, Löbner 1989, Krifka 2000, Ippolito 2007, Umbach 2009, Faller 2022.).[2] The scalar use gives rise to the inference that Osnabrück is in Lower Saxony, **not to mention** other (contextually relevant) cities for which it is too evidently true that they are also in Lower Saxony.

Zhang and Ling claim that the additive reading of *auch* in 15a arises becuase *auch* requires the existence of distinct but *parallel* events that share some kind of similarity. That is, the additive reading with the AUCH-type is dependent on parallel propositions that do not entail each other. In contrast, *noch* is sensitive to order among propositions and requires

---

[2]The particle *noch* also has a temporal use ('still') (see König 1977, Löbner 1989, Krifka 2000, Ippolito 2007 for German), which we do not observe with *da*. For this interpretation, Turkish makes use of another particle *daha*, which does not have additive and scalar inferences despite presumably involving *da* in the root:

(i)   Yağmur daha yağ-ıyor.
       rain   still precipitate-IMPRF
       'It is still raining.'

See Zhang and Ling (2016) for how *noch* yields the temporal use under their account, though we do not discuss *daha* in this paper.

that the progress of discourse bring an increase in informativity (see also Mari and Tovena 2006). In other words, NOCH-type particles differ from AUCH-type particles in bearing a built-in Maxim of Quantity *Be Informative* (Grice 1975) in their lexical semantics.

(16) a. $[\![p, \text{AUCH } q]\!]$:
Asserts: $p \wedge q$
Requires: p and q describe distinct events that share some kind of similarity
⤳ **parallelism** between p and q

  b. $[\![p, \text{NOCH } q]\!]$:
Asserts: $p \wedge q$
Requires: q adds new information
⤳ being **incremental** from p to $p \wedge q$: $p \wedge q \subset p$

Zhang and Ling argue that a *noch*-marked sentence is interpreted as a series of conjunctions and the additive presupposition of the *noch*-marked conjunct is satisfied by the preceding conjuncts, which can be explicit or silent (building on Schlenker's 2008 pragmatic view of presuppositions; see also Szabolcsi 2015).[3] These potentially silent conjuncts are restricted by the requirement of *noch* that discourse be more informative from one conjunct to the other, as defined in 17 (Zhang and Ling 2016: 9).

(17) ***Discourse incrementalism***
Discourse D is a sequence of propositions/conjuncts: $p_1, p_2, p_3, ..., p_i, ...$
D is incremental iff for any $i \geq 2, (p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge ... \wedge p_i) \subset (p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge ... \wedge p_{i-1})$.

In a discourse where p (the conjunction of all the previous conjuncts) precedes q, there are two ways for q to make the discourse incremental: (i) if p and q do not entail each other, as shown in 18a and (ii) if q asymmetrically entails p, and as shown in 18b. In case of (i), NOCH-type particles give rise to an additive interpretation, similar to what happens with AUCH-type particles. However, in case of (ii), a scalar inference arises.

(18) a. $p \not\subset q \wedge q \not\subset p$ ⤳ $p \wedge q \subset p$
   b. $q \subset p$ ⤳ $p \wedge q \subset p$

The scalar reading is derived as an implicature through a contextually salient scale formed by the focus alternatives and asymmetric entailment relation among propositions projecting from these alternatives. More precisely, going back to 15b, we have an informativeness order on the issue of being inside Lower Saxony. Osnabrück, being the focused item, denotes sets of alternative cities which are ranked on a scale based on their geographic location in Lower Saxony, and Osnabrück is on the verge of being situated outside the region. Propositions projecting from Alt(Osnabrück) then form a scale of informativeness, where asserting Osnabrück is in Lower Saxony (*noch*-marked conjunct, shown in bold) is

---

[3]As a matter of fact, this should extend to AUCH-type particles as well.

more informative than asserting that the other cities to its left on the scale are also in Lower Saxony (preceding conjuncts p), as shown below:

(19)   ⟦NOCH Osnabrück is in Lower Saxony⟧

    a.   Contextually salient scale based on geographic location (geo) (from inner LS to the border of LS): ... A $\prec_{geo}$ B $\prec_{geo}$ Osnabrück $\prec_{geo}$ C ...

    b.   Scale of informativeness on the issue of being inside LS (from less to more): ... A is in LS $\prec$ B is in LS $\prec$ Osnabrück is in LS $\prec$ C is in LS...

    c.   Discourse ($p \wedge q$): (A is in LS) $\wedge$ (B is in LS) $\wedge$ **Osnabrück is in LS**

    d.   Incrementalism ($q \subset p$): Osnabrück is in LS $\subset$ B is in LS $\subset$ A is in LS

A picture as in 19 provides grounds for scalar implicature computations. According to the Maxim of Quantity, the speaker is expected to convey the strongest (i.e., the most informative) relevant piece of information they believe to be true. Under this assumption, the hearer will assume that an alternative that would be stronger than 'Osnabrück is in Lower Saxony' (e.g., C is in Lower Saxony) is false. This yields the inference that the *noch*-marked sentence is the most informative and hence must be the most worthy of mention.

(20)   *Scalar implicature*:
    $\forall x\, [[x \in \text{Alt(Osnabrück)} \wedge \text{Osnabrück} \prec_{geo} x] \rightarrow \neg \text{ in LS}(x)]$

3.2   *da* as a *noch*-type particle

We are now ready to show that the even-like inferences of antecedent-internal *da* in conditionals are derived as a scalar implicature. To begin with, we take a *da*-marked sentence to be interpreted as part of a series of conjunctions, in the sense of Szabolcsi (2015). Building on Zhang and Ling's account, we also analyze *da* as an instance of NOCH-type additive particles; *da* has a built-in discourse incrementalism requirement in its lexical semantics.

    While the *da*-marked conjunct q is explicitly asserted, the other conjuncts p (i.e., presupposed proposition(s)) can be overtly stated or be silent. When p and q do not entail each other, we get the additive interpretation of *da*, as shown in 21. Here, *da* invokes DP focus and hence the *da*-marked sentence presupposes that at least one more person other than Suzan came as well. This presupposition is satisfied by the preceding conjunct.

(21)   (Can gel-di),   Suzan **da**   gel-di.
    Can come-PST Suzan TOO come-PST
    '(Came came), Suzan too came.'
    Assertion: *came(c)* $\wedge$ ***came(s)*** $p \not\subset q \wedge q \not\subset p$
    Presupposition: $\exists x\, [x \in Alt(s) \wedge x \neq s \wedge came(x)]$

    When q asymmetrically entails p, we get the scalar interpretation of *da*. Take our core example, repeated below in 22. The asserted content is *if it rains, we will go on a picnic*,

while the existence of at least one other p' that is not equal to *it rains* is presupposed such that 'if p', we will go on a picnic'. These alternative p's are derived as a result of VP focus, invoked by *da*, as discussed in Section 2.1.

(22) [[Yağmur] **da** yağ-sa]   pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
      rain   TOO precipitate-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
      'Even if it rains, we will go on a picnic.'
      Assertion: $[rainy \rightarrow picnic]$
      Presupposition: $\exists p' \, [p' \in Alt(rainy) \land p' \neq rainy \land [p' \rightarrow picnic]]$

Weather conditions are most typically ranked based on how favorable they are for going on a picnic. Assume, for example, that rainy situations are less favorable for picnicking than windy and sunny situations but more favorable compared to snowy situations, forming the scale in 23. Assume further that if one goes on a picnic when it is snowy, they also go on a picnic when it is rainy, windy or sunny. Under these background assumptions, the *da*-marked conditional and the alternative conditional statements projecting from Alt(rainy) form a scale of informativeness, shown in 24, where uttering *if it rains, we will go on a picnic* is more informative than uttering the other alternative conditionals on its left:

(23) *Contextually salient scale based on how favorable a weather situation is for picnic (from less to more)*: ... snowy $\prec_{picnic}$ rainy $\prec_{picnic}$ windy $\prec_{picnic}$ sunny ...

(24) *Scale of informativeness on the issue of going on a picnic (from less to more)*:
      ..$[sunny \rightarrow picnic] \prec [windy \rightarrow picnic] \prec [rainy \rightarrow picnic] \prec [snowy \rightarrow picnic]$..

At this point, we adopt a notion of **contextual entailment**, as defined in 25 (Anvari 2018).

(25) S contextually entails S' iff any world w compatible with background assumptions provided by the context is such that if S is true in w then S' is also true in w.

Under this definition and our assumptions above, *if it rains, we will go on a picnic* contextually entails *if it is windy, we will go on a picnic*, which in turn contextually entails *if it is sunny, we will go on a picnic*, as illustrated below.[4] On the other hand, a stronger alternative, which is *if it snows, we will go on a picnic*, contextually entails all the other alternatives on its left, including the *rain* conjunct, but not vice versa.[5]

(26) $[snowy \rightarrow picnic] \subset [rainy \rightarrow picnic] \subset [windy \rightarrow picnic] \subset [sunny \rightarrow picnic]$

Given that a *da*-marked sentence is interpreted as part of a series of conjunctions, we

---

[4]The conditional in 22 is ambiguous in also conveying a pure additive reading without giving rise to a scalar inference. This is possible in the absence of the assumed order among the conjuncts laid out above, in which case the conjuncts would be parallel but not entail each other.

[5]Notice that the entailment relation in 19d is also an example of contextual entailment, holding under the background geographical assumptions.

now have the following discourse for 22. The *da*-marked conditional (in bold) asymmetrically entails the preceding (silent) conjuncts satisfying the additive presupposition of *da*.

(27) $[sunny \rightarrow picnic] \wedge [windy \rightarrow picnic] \wedge [\textbf{rainy} \rightarrow \textbf{picnic}]$ $q \subset p$

Note that the preceding conjuncts have to be the less informative alternatives of the *da*-marked, *rain* conjunct due to the discourse incrementalism requirement of *da*. That is, the snow conjunct, for example, cannot precede the *rain* conjunct.

   That an asymmetric entailment relation holds among the alternative conditional conjuncts is evidenced by the following example. The question that B asks upon A's utterance is felicitous but the question that B' asks is not. This is because whether a proposition that is already entailed is true or not cannot be questioned, resulting in infelicity as below.

(28)   a.   A: Yağmur da   yağ-sa   pikniğ-e   gid-eceğ-iz.
          rain   TOO precipitate-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL
          'Even if it rains, we will go on a picnic.'

       b.   B: Kar yağ-sa,   pikniğ-e   gid-ecek mi-siniz?
          snow precipitate-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT   QUEST-2PL
          'Will you go on a picnic, if it snows?'

       c.   B': #Güneş aç-sa,   pikniğ-e   gid-ecek mi-siniz?
          sun   open-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT   QUEST-2PL
          'Will you go on a picnic, if it is sunny?'

We now have the two ingredients needed for the even-like inference to arise: a contextually supplied scale among weather situations and discourse incrementalism ensured by the asymmetric entailment relation among the conjuncts. Not surprisingly, at this point, the rest is taken care of due to pragmatic reasoning kicking in. In short, the Maxim of Quantity requires the most informative contribution be made to the discourse. If a less favorable situation, e.g., the snowy one, were also fine for going on a picnic, the speaker would have made this more informative statement. Since they did not make this statement, the hearer could plausibly infer that if it is snowy, we will **not** go on a picnic (i.e., $\neg[snowy \rightarrow picnic]$). The utterance of the rain conjunct instead yields the scalar implicature that this situation must be the most informative alternative, and hence, the most worthy of mention.[6]

(29)   *Scalar implicature*:
       $\forall p' \, [[p' \in Alt(rainy) \wedge (p' \prec_{picnic} rainy)] \rightarrow \neg[p' \rightarrow picnic]]$

   Before ending this section, let us briefly provide evidence for the incrementalism requirement of *da*. The order of conjuncts in *da-da* conjunctions must also reflect the order of informativeness. That is, the rightmost *da*-marked conjunct must asymmetrically entail

---

[6]It is worth highlighting that a completely different ranking scenario would predict different order among the conjuncts.

the preceding *da*-marked conjunct(s) and hence be more informative. For example, in 30a, the rightmost conjunct must be the *snow* conjunct due to being more informative than the *rain* conjunct, under the contextual assumptions adopted above. This is evidenced by the infelicity arising when the order of the conjuncts is swapped, as illustrated in 30b.

(30) a. [Yağmur **da** yağsa]   [kar **da** yağsa],   pikniğ-e
          rain   TOO precipitate-COND snow TOO precipitate-COND picnic-DAT
          gid-eceğ-iz.
          go-FUT-1PL
          'We will go on a picnic even if it rains and (we will go on a picnic) even if it
          snows. '

      b. ??[Kar **da** yağsa] [yağmur **da** yağsa], pikniğe gideceğiz.

In sum, the even-like interpretation of conditionals with antecedent-internal *da* is a scalar implicature, derived through the discourse incrementalism requirement of *da*.

4.   Further predictions

Our analysis predicts that scalar inferences of *da* should also be available outside of conditionals. We will now show that this prediction is borne out.

Let us begin with the contrast between *da* and the particle *bile* 'even', as shown below:

(31)   Who came to the party last night?

      a. A: Can gel-di.
          Can come-PST
          'Can came.'

      b. B: Suzan **da** gel-di.   c. B': Suzan **bile** gel-di.
          Suzan TOO COME-PST   Suzan EVEN come-PST
          'Suzan came, too.'   'Even Suzan came!'

The response of B, which involves **da**, only has an additive reading. This contrasts with the response of B' that has **bile** instead, where the scalar inference is arguably due to a presupposition analogous to the case with English *even*. In other words, the particle *bile* forces accommodation even if the scale at issue, where Suzan is the least likely person to come to the party, is not contextually salient.

We do not expect *da* to force accommodation in the absence of a contextually salient scale because even-like inferences conveyed by *da* are not due to presupposition. Even if Suzan is well established in the common ground to be least likely to come to the party, *Suzan **da** came* does not allow a scalar use because it is harder to establish a contextual entailment relation between episodic statements like *Suzan came* and *Can came*. Given that the scalar inference of *da* is an implicature, as argued above, we expect it to arise when a contextually salient scale and an asymmetric entailment relation are both available.

However, there are contexts where both conditions are satisfied, and hence *da* can give rise to an even-like inference. For example, we observe this with gradable adjectives, with which it is easy to establish a contextual entailment relation among alternative propositions. Consider a sitaution where Cem is shorter than Merve, who is shorter than Ali, the tallest among the three (the height of Cem $<$ the height of Merve $<$ the height of Ali). In this situation, the utterance of 32 leads to a scalar inference that Sevgi being taller than Ali is the most worthy of mention, which in return suggests that Ali is probably already very tall.

(32)   Sevgi [Ali'den] **de**   uzun.
        Sevgi Ali-ABL TOO tall
        'Sevgi is even taller than Ali.'

The even-like inference arises because under the given scale of height, the proposition *Sevgi is taller than Ali* contextually entails the alternative propositions projecting from Alt(Ali), resulting in an order of informativeness among the conjuncts ($taller(s,a) \subset taller(s,m) \subset taller(s,c)$). Based on this contextual setup, one could reason that if someone else were taller than Ali but shorter than Sevgi, the speaker would have mentioned Sevgi being taller than this person to emphasize how tall Sevgi is compared to Ali and the others.

Another case where we observe *da* to yield an even-like interpretation is when it takes as its host a numerical expression, as exemplified in 33:

(33)   Bu yemek ([20 kişi-ye]   **de**) [50 kişi-ye]   **de**   yet-er.
        this meal   20   person-ACC TOO 50 person-DAT TOO suffice-AOR
        'This meal is enough for even 50 people (let alone 20).'

As is the case with 32, we have both a scale, supplied by the numerical expressions, and an asymmetric entailment relation among the conjuncts, which is not contextual but logically available this time. More precisely, the utterance of 50 yields the inference that being enough for less number of people is not as worthy of mention, because being enough for 50 entails being enough for any number less than 50. It is worth emphasizing that the order of the conjuncts cannot be changed when both are uttered overtly, as evidenced in 34, demonstrating the sensitivity of *da* to discourse incrementalism once again.

(34)   #Bu yemek [50 kişi-ye] **de** [20 kişiye] **de** yet-er.

5.   Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have investigated scalar inferences associated with the Turkish additive particle *da* arising in conditionals. We have seen that *da* exhibits two attachment sites in a conditional: antecedent-final and antecedent-internal. Having shown that the even-like reading is predicted by Guerzoni and Lim's (2019) account in the case of antecedent-final attachment only, we have taken up the puzzle of how this inference arises when *da* occupies an antecedent-internal position.

Building on Zhang and Ling (2016) and Szabolcsi (2015), we have argued that *da* is

a focus-associated particle that has additivity and discourse incrementalism requirements. We have shown that these characteristics of *da* can lead to scalar inferences surfacing as a pragmatic effect in the presence of a contextually provided scale formed by the alternatives induced by *da* and an asymmetric (contextual) entailment relation among the propositions projecting from these alternatives. We have further seen that the even-like interpretation of *da* is not limited to conditional statements as long as these requirements are both met.

However, there are two remaining issues. First, we have taken the additive requirement of *da* to be a presupposition, but it must in fact be classified as a **postsupposition**. This notion is proposed in Szabolcsi (2015) for Japanese *mo* and the particles alike, to explain how the additivity requirement is satisfied in *mo-mo* conjunctions. Under this view, the additivity requirement of the first instance of *mo* is checked in a delayed way by the host of the second *mo*, and hence the term *post*supposition. Assuming that additivity is similarly ensured in *da-da* conjunctions, this proposal extends to Turkish as well. However, the postsupposition view may be at odds with the claim that *da* is an incremental particle, where incrementalism is checked from left to right (i.e. by the preceding conjuncts).

The second issue is the fact that *da* does not yield a scalar inference in indicative conditionals in contrast to zero-marked conditionals (term due to von Fintel and Iatridou 2023) we have analyzed in this paper. In Turkish, indicative conditionals bear a tense/aspect marker preceding the conditional *-sA* in the antecedent, while in zero-marked conditionals, *-sA* directly attaches to the verb without a tense/aspect marker. For example, the indicative conditional in 35, minimally differs from the zero-marked one in 36, in having the aorist marker intervening between the verb and *-sA*. And yet, while 36 is ambiguous in conveying both an additive and a scalar interpretation, 35 can only have an additive reading.[7]

(35)   Ali de **gel-ir-se**,   pikniğe gideceğiz.
            Ali TOO come-AOR-COND picnic   we.will.go
            ✓'We will go on a picnic if Ali **also** comes.'
            ✗ 'We will go on a picnic **even** if Ali comes.'

(36)   Ali de **gel-se**,   pikniğe gideceğiz.
            Ali TOO come-COND picnic   we.will.go
            ✓ 'We will go on a picnic **even** if Ali comes.'
            ✓ 'We will go on a picnic if Ali **also** comes.'

To conclude, then, whether and how our account can explain the lack of scalar inferences with indicative conditionals awaits future considerations.

References

Anvari, Amir. 2018. Logical integrity. In *Proceedings of SALT 28*.
Bayırlı, İsa Kerem. 2021. Asymmetric coordination in Turkish. *Turkic Languages* 25.

---

[7]Although not shown here, counterfactual conditionals pattern with zero-marked conditionals.

Etxeberria, Urtzi, and Aritz Irurtzun. 2015. The emergence of scalar meanings. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6.

Faller, Martina. 2022. Additive concessive conditionals. *Journal of Pragmatics* 193:235–252.

von Fintel, Kai, and Sabine Iatridou. 2023. If wishes were horses: what do desire ascriptions have to with conditionals? An exploration of Turkish and Hindi. Paper presented at METU Workshop on Conditional and Causal Reasoning.

Göksel, Aslı, and Sumru Özsoy. 2006. dA: A Focus/topic Associated Clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* 113:1143–1167.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and semantics*, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan, volume 3, 41–58.

Guerzoni, Elena, and Dongsik Lim. 2019. Even if, factivity and focus. In *Proceedings of Sinn Und Bedeutung 11*.

Haspelmath, Martin, and Ekkegard König. 1998. Concessive conditionals in the languages in Europe. In *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, ed. by Johan van der Auwera, 563–640. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ippolito, Michela. 2007. On the meaning of some focus-sensitive particles. *Natural Language Semantics* 15:1–34.

Kamali, Beste. 2011. The question particle in Turkish: Consequences for the interfaces. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 28*.

König, E. 1977. Temporal and non-temporal uses of 'noch' and 'schon' in German. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:173–198.

Krifka, Manfred. 2000. Alternatives for aspectual particles: Semantics of *still* and *already*. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Aspect*.

Löbner, Sebastian. 1989. German schon-erst-noch: An integrated analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12:167–212.

Mari, Alda, and Lucia Tovena. 2006. An additive and a scalar particle: the case of the Italian 'neppure' and its French counterparts. In *New Perspectives on Romance Linguistics. Vol. 1: Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics.*, ed. by J.P. Montreuil et C. Nishida, 187–200. John Benjamins.

Rooth, Mats. 1985. Association with focus. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Schlenker, Philippe. 2008. Be articulate: A pragmatic theory of presupposition projection. *Theoretical Linguistics* 34:157–212.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 2015. What do quantifier particles do? *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38:159–204.

Umbach, Carla. 2009. Another additive particle under stress: German additive 'noch'. In *Proceedings of the 10th Symposium on Logic and Language - LOLA 10*.

Zhang, Linmin, and Jia Ling. 2016. Additive particles with a built-in Gricean pragmatics. In *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, volume 1.

Yağmur Sağ, Ömer Demirok
yagmur_sag-parvardeh@fas.harvard.edu, omerfaruk.demirok@boun.edu.tr