

## Getting *even* without “even” in Turkish

**Introduction.** In some languages, a lexical item that supports a purely additive construal may also license scalar inferences in certain environments (see Mari and Tovena 2006; Exteberria and Irurtzun 2015, Faller 2022, a.o.). Hoping that it would shed light on this phenomenon cross-linguistically, we undertake a case study on the Turkish additive particle DA, which can be translated into English as *even* in particular contexts. We argue that DA is an additive particle and that the scalar inferences associated with sentences that feature DA surface as a pragmatic effect.

**Puzzle.** DA is a run-of-the-mill additive particle: (1) Who came to the party last night?  
 (1b) entails that Suzan came and presupposes that some other person who is not Suzan came. In the given context, BILE in (1c), on the other hand, additionally yields a scalar inference, i.e., that Suzan was the least likely person to come to the party. DA contrasts with BILE in that it does not license this scalar inference.

- a. A: Can geldi.  
       Can came.  
 b. B: Suzan **da** geldi.  
       ‘Suzan came, too.’  
       #‘Even Suzan came.’  
 c. B’: Suzan **bile** geldi!  
       ‘Even Suzan came!’

However, in conditionals, DA yields an ‘even-like’ interpretation. There are at least two positions where DA can occur: in the antecedent-final and antecedent-internal positions, as shown in (2).

- (2) a. [[Yağmur yağ-sa] **da**], pikniğ-e gid-eceğ-iz.  
       rain percipitate-COND DA picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL  
       ‘Even if it rains, we will go to picnic.’ antecedent-final DA  
 b. [[Yağmur] **da** yağ-sa] pikniğ-e gid-eceğ-iz.  
       ‘Even if it rains, we will go to picnic.’ antecedent-internal DA

We take DA to be a focus-sensitive particle (Rooth 1985) that introduces an additive presupposition (Göksel & Özsoy 2003). Guerzoni & Lim’s (2007) analysis of factive *even if* conditionals successfully accounts for (2a) but does not extend to (2b). In their account, the alternatives evaluated for the additive presupposition are logical opposites:  $p$  and  $\neg p$ . When [if  $p$ ,  $q$ ] is asserted and [if  $\neg p$ ,  $q$ ] is presupposed, the consequent is entailed, for the two alternatives exhaust the logical space. This results in the factive implication [no matter what,  $q$ ], as sketched in (3). The fact that the alternatives can be logical opposites is evidenced by (4) where the other alternative is overt.

- (3) [[[if rainy]<sub>F</sub> DA ] picnic]<sup>w</sup>  
**assertion:** [[if rainy] picnic]<sup>w</sup> = 1  
**add. prs.:**  $\exists q [q \in \{\text{if rainy, picnic, if } \neg\text{rainy, picnic}\} \ \& \ q \neq [\text{if rainy, picnic}] \ \& \ q(w)=1$   
 (4) [[Yağmur yağ-sa] **da**], [[yağ-**ma**-sa] **da**], pikniğ-e gid-eceğ-iz.  
       rain percipitate-COND DA percipitate-NEG-COND DA picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL  
       ‘We will go to picnic whether it rains or not.’

The puzzle is how the scalar interpretation arises in (2b), where DA is antecedent-internal. In this case, the relevant alternatives are propositions that cannot be logical opposites, as evidenced by the contrast in (5). (In Turkish, only clause-final focus particles are compatible with verum focus; see Kamali 2011.)

- (5) a. \*[Yağmur da yağ-sa], [yağmur da yağ-**ma**-sa], pikniğ-e gid-eceğ-iz.  
       rain DA percipitate-COND rain DA percipitate-NEG-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL  
 b. [Yağmur da yağ-sa], [şimşek de çak-sa], pikniğ-e gid-eceğ-iz.  
       rain DA percipitate-COND thunder DA clap-COND picnic-DAT go-FUT-2PL  
       Lit.: ‘whether it rains or thunder claps, we will go to picnic.’

**Proposal.** We argue that the even-like inference with antecedent-internal DA is an implicature arising from Gricean Maxim of Quantity, building on Zhang and Ling (2016). For this, we adopt a notion of *contextual entailment*: 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  $w$  (Anvari 2018). (2b) asserts *if it rains, we will go to picnic* and presupposes that there is a  $p \neq it\ rains$  such that ‘if  $p$ , we will go to picnic’. Which alternatives for  $p$  are considered here? Since rainy situations are less favorable for going to picnic than windy and sunny situations, for example, we consider that the items in  $Alt(rainy)$  form a scale of informativeness in which the rainy situation is the most informative alternative ( $rainy > windy > sunny$ ) for the conditional utterance. Under this background assumption, *if rainy, picnic* **contextually entails** *if windy, picnic*, which in turn contextually entails *if sunny, picnic*.

Zhang & Ling identifies two types of additive particles: (i) one that requires discourse to be incremental, i.e., become more informative from one proposition to the next, e.g. Mandarin *hái*, (ii) one that indicates similarity between distinct propositions, e.g. English *also*. Proposing two parameters modulating discourse structure, *entailment relation* and *order* among propositions, they show that the first type allows both additive and scalar inferences, contrasting with the second type, which only allows additive readings. Adopting their analysis and building on Szabolcsi (2015), we analyze DA as an instance of the first type of additive particles and take the interpretation of a DA-marked sentence to be a series of conjunctions. While the DA-marked conjunct is explicitly asserted, the other conjuncts (i.e., presupposed proposition(s)) can be overt or silent. The additive and scalar interpretations of DA are shown below. The prejacent of DA is marked in bold-face.

- (6) The additive use of DA :  $[[Can\ geldi], Suzan\ da\ geldi]] = came(c) \wedge$  **came(s)**.  
 (7) The scalar use of DA :  $[[2b]] =$  if sunny, picnic  $\wedge$  if windy, picnic  $\wedge$  **if rainy, picnic**  
 rainy  $>$  windy  $>$  sunny: the order of informativeness on the issue of picnicking

In a discourse where  $p$  precedes  $q$ , there are two ways for  $q$  to make the discourse incremental: if  $p$  and  $q$  do not entail each other or if  $q$  asymmetrically entails  $p$ . In (6), *came(c)* and *came(s)* do not entail each other, and hence the assertion of *came(s)* is additive. In (7), *If rainy, picnic* asymmetrically (contextually) entails the preceding (silent) conjuncts. The Maxim of Quantity requires the most informative contribution be made to the discourse. Due to the order among the informativeness of the conjuncts, the utterance of the rain conjunct yields the scalar implicature that this situation is the most informative alternative, and hence, the most worthy of mention, resulting in an even-like interpretation.

**Predictions.** The proposal correctly predicts scalar inferences for DA outside conditionals, as well. (1b) only has an additive reading unlike BILE in (1c), whose scalar inference is arguably a presupposition, and hence forces accommodation if the scale at issue is not readily part of the common ground. Even if Suzan is known to be least likely to come to the party, (1b) does not gain a scalar use because *came(s)* does not entail *came(c)*. This is expected given that the scalar inference of DA is an implicature, which arises only in the presence of a salient scale AND an asymmetric entailment relation. But in case of good contextual support, where both conditions are met, (1b) can gain an even-like reading, see (8). This is possible in a context where Suzan is so unlikely to come to the party that her coming would mean other people’s coming, in which case *came(s)* contextually entails *came(c)* and the other alternatives if any.

- (8) Ece o kadar eğlenceli bir parti düzenledi ki Suzan **da** geldi!  
 ‘Ece threw such a fun party that even Suzan came!’

The scalar use of DA also arises with degree adjectives, via contextual entailment, and numerical scales, via logical entailment. In (9a), the items in  $Alt(a)$  are ranked on the given scale of height, and hence *taller(s,a)* entails *taller(s,m)* and *taller(s,c)*. Asserting *taller(s,a)*, then, yields a ‘not to mention those other people’ inference. In (9b), the utterance of 50 yields the inference that being enough for less number of people is not as worthy of mention, given that being enough for 50 entails being enough for any number less than 50.

- (9) a. On a scale of height: Ali (a)  $>$  Merve (m)  $>$  Cem (c)  
 Sevgi [Ali’den] **de** uzun. = ‘Sevgi (s) is even taller than Ali (a).’  
 b. Bu yemek (yirmi kişiyi geçtim) [elli kişiyeye] **de** yeter.  
 This meal is enough for even 50 people (it will definitely suffice for 20).