

THE SYNTAX OF FOCUS PARTICLES IN TURKISH



UĞURCAN VURGUN

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2019

THE SYNTAX OF FOCUS PARTICLES IN TURKISH

Thesis submitted to

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Linguistics

by

Uğurcan Vurgun

Boğaziçi University


2019

The Syntax of Focus Particles in Turkish

The thesis of Uğurcan Vurgun

has been approved by:

Assoc. Prof. Mine Nakipoğlu
(Thesis Advisor)



Prof. A. Sumru Özsoy
(Thesis Co-Advisor)



Prof. A. Aslı Göksel



Assist. Prof. Serkan Şener
(External Member)




July 2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Uğurcan Vurgun, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....



Date.....

19/08/2019

ABSTRACT

The Syntax of Focus Particles in Turkish

This study aims to answer three main questions on the syntax of focus particles based on the data in Turkish: (i) Where is the exact location in the phrase structure of Turkish that focus particles are generated? (ii) Are there any subsequent movement operations from Surface Structure to Logical Form that would allow the particle take propositional scope, and if yes what are they? (iii) Is it possible for the particles to modify any non-verbal projections? The analysis covers the scalar additive particles *hatta* ‘even’ and *bile* ‘even’, the additive particle *da* ‘also’, and the exclusive particle *sadece* ‘only’. The analysis on the positions and the syntactic domains of the focus particles shows that there are three specific focus projections in the phrase structure of Turkish, and these are phrase-level (vP-internal), clause-level (vP-external) and utterance-level (CP). Negation is assumed to prohibit raising of the focused phrases to clause-level and utterance-level focus projections. Such prohibitions prevent interpretation since all the focused phrases are assumed to be raised to these projections for interpretation. Three specific proposals based on this phrase structure are presented. The first proposal includes the focus particles in the study in affirmative clauses, the second proposal covers the focus particles in negative clauses, and the last proposal presents a syntactic behavior matrix, which includes the scalar additive particles *hatta* ‘even’ and *bile* ‘even’ in Turkish, along with *even*, the scalar additive focus particle in English, and *sogar*, the scalar additive focus particle in German.

ÖZET

Türkçe'deki Odak Parçacıklarının Sözdizimsel Analizi

Bu çalışma odak parçacıklarının sözdizim özellikleri üzerine üç soruyu cevaplamaya çalışmaktadır: (i) Türkçe sözdizim yapısında bu odak parçacıkları tam olarak nerede üretilmektedir? (ii) Yüzey biçimden mantıksal biçime geçiş sürecinde bu parçacıkların önerme seviyesinde etki alanı almasını sağlayan herhangi bir taşıma işlemi var mıdır, varsa bunlar nelerdir? (iii) Bu parçacıkların eylemcil olmayan yansımalarına eklentilenmesi mümkün müdür? Analiz şu odak parçacıklarını içermektedir: dizgeci ekleyici parçacıklar *hatta* ve *bile*, ekleyici parçacık *da* ve dışlayıcı parçacık *sadece*. Parçacıkların cümle içindeki yerleri ve sözdizimsel özellikleri incelendiğinde Türkçe öbek yapısında üç seviyede odaklama yansıması olduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu yansımalar; öbek seviyesinde (eylem öbeği - iç), tümce seviyesinde (eylem öbeği - dış) ve tümleyici öbeği seviyesindedir. Olumsuzluk başlarının engelleme etkisi yaratarak odaklanan öbeğin odaklama yansımalarına taşınmasını engellediği kabul edilmiştir. Tüm odaklanan öbeklerin yorumlama için odaklama yansımalarına taşınması gerektiği kabul edildiğinden, bu engellemelerin odaklanan öbeğin yorumlanmasını engellediği görülmüştür. Bu analiz sonucunda sunulan ilk önermede, çalışmada yer alan parçacıkların olumlu tümcelerdeki sözdizimsel özellikleri, ikinci önermede bu parçacıkların olumsuz cümlelerdeki sözdizimsel özellikleri sunulmuştur. Son önerme, dizgeci ekleyici parçacıklar *hatta* ve *bile* ile birlikte İngilizce'deki parçacık *even* ve Almanca'daki parçacık *sogar*'ı içermektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank the members of my committee: Serkan Şener, Aslı Göksel, Mine Nakipoğlu and A. Sumru Özsoy. Their detailed comments helped me a lot on strengthening my arguments. Aslı Göksel deserves a special comment here, this study would not have been possible without her annotations on the draft. Her books in the department library also proved to be great companions for a study on focus.

My favorite sentence in linguistics was written by Chafe (1976). He described Information Structure with the following sentence:

...have to do primarily with how the message is sent and only secondarily with the message itself, just as the packaging of toothpaste can affect sales in partial independence of the quality of the tooth paste inside. (Chafe, 1976, p. 28)

I found this sentence very interesting because I was *actually* selling many consumer goods, including toothpaste, when I first read the sentence in the beginning of the current study on the role of focus particles in syntax. It was difficult even to imagine that my profession and my hobby would come together in a sentence.

My thesis advisor Mine Nakipoğlu transformed an attentive reader on language to the author of the study. She probably taught me how to *read and write* in linguistics, thanks to the vast amount of time she spent for me. Her smart move in directing the study to the domain of syntax surely helped me a lot on finding the right answers for the questions under discussion. Therefore, I would like to thank her for all her efforts. I also feel privileged for having the opportunity to work with my thesis co-advisor A. Sumru Özsoy. I admire her passion for academic reasoning, she is probably the reason why I decided to pursue an academic career in the field. I am also grateful to Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan, Balkız Öztürk, Didar Akar, Pavel Logačev,

Meltem Kelepir, Kadir Gökgöz, Stefano Canalis, and Elena Guerzoni for the time they spent on my questions. I would also like to thank the wonderful department assistants I have had, Ömer Eren, Duygu Göksu, Hande Sevgi, Utku Türk and Furkan Dikmen for their help.

Last but, of course, not least, I would like to thank my family. In the inner circle, I have Nilay, my wife, and Kerem, Onur, Mert, my lovely sons. I owe them a lot for their understanding for the time I couldn't spend with them. Learning linguistics when you have three infants starting to speak or babble at home is really fascinating, because sometimes I couldn't believe the errors they made, which gave clues about how they acquire the language. In the not-so-outer circle, I have my parents-in-law, Emine and Mehmet, who were very supportive of my dream from the first day on.

I also thank the company I worked for ten years, for all the linguistic input I received during my role in the southeast region of Turkey (which has borders with Syria, Iraq and Iran) in which there is one *official* language, but many *unofficial* languages and dialects. That experience surely increased my awareness and interest for the field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 The syntax of focus particles in Turkish.....	1
1.2 A brief explanation on the semantics of focus particles.....	21
1.3 The outline.....	24
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....	25
2.1 Previous works on the syntax of focus particles.....	26
2.2 Adjunction to an XP or adjoining to the sentence as an adverb?.....	41
2.3 Conclusion.....	64
CHAPTER 3: FOCUS PARTICLES IN TURKISH.....	66
3.1 Positions of focus particles.....	67
3.2 Syntactic domains of focus particles.....	78
3.3 No nominal adjunction arguments tested in Turkish.....	87
3.4 Conclusion.....	90
CHAPTER 4: ASSOCIATION OF FOCUS PARTICLES WITH FOCUS.....	93
4.1 A very brief preview of focus in Turkish.....	93
4.2 Assumptions of this study for association with focus in Turkish.....	97
4.3 Assumptions of this study for the relation between negation and focus particles	105
CHAPTER 5: THE PROPOSALS.....	108
5.1 The Closeness Principle in Turkish.....	108
5.2 Focus particles in affirmative sentences (The first proposal).....	121
5.3 Focus particles in negative sentences (The second proposal)	131

5.3 Scalar additive particles in Turkish, English and German within the matrix perspective (The third proposal).....	140
5.4 Conclusion.....	144
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	147
6.1 Summary of the claims and the findings.....	147
6.2 Contribution to the field.....	149
6.3 Future research.....	153
References.....	154



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Syntactic Behavior of Focus Particles in Affirmative Clauses.....	10
Table 2. The Syntactic Behavior of Focus Particles in Negative Clauses.....	14
Table 3. The Syntactic Behavior of Scalar Additive Focus Particles in Affirmative Clauses.....	16
Table 4. The Syntactic Classification of Scalar Additive Focus Particles in Negative Sentences.....	18
Table 5. The Semantic Properties of Focus Particles.....	24
Table 6. Turkish Focus (rheme) Realization.....	96
Table 7. Idioms with <i>Bile</i> ‘Even’ between the Constituents.....	121

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

ḥattā ‘even’ is a scalar additive particle in Arabic, which is used in many Turkic languages such as Turkish, Azeri, Kumyk, Tatar, Uyghur, and Uzbek, and also in Persian (Gast & van der Auwera, 2013). The term is also related to *hasta* ‘even’ in Spanish, and possibly to *até* ‘even’ in Portuguese.

The famous grammarian al-Farrā expressed his frustration at the complexities of *ḥattā* [even] with the following words: [...] ‘I shall die, while in my soul there is something [obscure] regarding *ḥattā*’ (al-Firūzābādī, 1987 cited in Sadan, 2012, p. 197).

This study has started as an attempt to choose between the alternatives of syntactic frameworks in the literature on focus particles, which are mostly based on the particles in English and German. Confirming al-Farrā’s complaints, *hatta* ‘even’ seemed to be incompatible with all of the current proposals, therefore the author has tried to come up with a new approach which would also cover *hatta* ‘even’. The following section will outline the main proposals on the syntax of focus particles in Turkish. A brief explanation on the semantics of the particles will be given in Section 1.2 and the last section includes the outline of the study.

1.1 The syntax of focus particles in Turkish

This study aims to analyze the syntax of focus particles in Turkish, developing on the previous works on the particles in English and German. The particles I focus on in Turkish are the scalar additive particles *hatta* ‘even’ and *bile* ‘even’, the additive particle *da* ‘also’, and the exclusive particle *sadece* ‘only’.

Focus particles in the generative framework have been analyzed extensively starting with Kuroda (1965), and Fischer (1968). Three main questions on the syntax

of the focus particles emerged in the studies on English and German, and I will use these questions to analyze the particles in Turkish. These questions are as follows: (i) Where is the exact location that these particles are generated? (ii) Are there any subsequent movement operations from Surface Structure to Logical Form that would allow the particle take propositional scope, and if yes what are they? (iii) Is it possible for the particles to modify any non-verbal projections? The first and second proposal of this study aim to answer these questions with respect to Turkish. The third proposal presents an analysis for the scalar additive particles in Turkish, English and German with respect to the framework in the preceding proposals.


There is an additional focus particle in Turkish, the question marker *-mI*, which is excluded from the analysis for a better comparison with the studies on the particles in English and German. Despite not being in the study, I assume that some of the proposals presented for the question particle also apply to the particles in the study, hence revealing a common syntactic pattern for focus particles in Turkish. Su (2012) proposed two types of focus levels in Turkish, *Outer Focus* and *Inner Focus*, to explain the syntax of the question particle, and I will utilize her proposal with some minor revisions. Kahnemuyipour and Kornfilt (2011-K&K henceforth) state that the question marker *-mI* in Turkish, can be merged in the vP and CP domains, and in both cases this focus marker attracts the focalized phrase to its specifier, accompanied by prosodic prominence (K&K, 2011, p. 213). Following Chomsky (2001), vP and CP are assumed as phases in the study. In line with K&K (2011) and also following the suggestion in Kayne (1998) for *only* and *even*, the focus particles in this study are assumed to attract the focused phrases to their specifier positions.

According to the phrase structure representation in (1), there are three levels of focus projections in Turkish. The first level is on the CP level, assuming split-CP

projections in the sense of Rizzi (1997), and this projection is used to modify the utterance. The second projection is on the vP-external level, in line with the *Outer Focus* and *Inner Focus* analysis presented in Su (2012) for Turkish. What Su (2012) suggests as *Outer Focus* will be referred to as ‘Outer Focus I’ in the study, due to the presence of an additional CP level projection. The third projection is on the vP-internal level, and this projection will be referred to as *Inner Focus*, following Su (2012). I suggest that all focused phrases are interpreted on either clause-level (vP-external), or utterance-level (CP). If the phrases cannot be raised to one of these levels, interpretation is impossible.

(1) below summarizes the locations of focus projections in the phrase structure of Turkish. The solid arrows show that there are three possible syntactic movements to focus projections in Turkish.

(1) The phrase structure of focus projections




Let's start with the first proposal of the study. I suggest that, in affirmative sentences, it is possible to generate all of the four particles in Turkish as an adverb, which would enable them to adjoin to verbal projections. In addition to that, it is also possible to generate all the particles as co-constituents to non-verbal projections in phrasal level. Therefore, in affirmative clauses, the focus particles can adjoin to both non-verbal and verbal projections. If the particle adjoins to non-verbal projections, the phrase containing the focused phrase and the particle is raised to the specifier of the focus projection in the vP-external domain in LF. Therefore, focus particles in these instances are not heads of the focus projections and they are adjunctions to the non-verbal projections. When focus particles adjoin to verbal projections, however, they function as focus heads in one of the focus projections, which are phrase-level (vP-internal), clause-level (vP-external), or utterance-level (CP). In these cases, the focused phrase is raised to the specifier of the FocP, in which the particle is the head. A sample syntactic process is shown in (2). The representation shows the phrase structure of Sentence (1). The solid arrows show syntactic movements (pre-Spell Out), and the dotted arrow shows the movement in PF due to the Closeness Principle, which will be explained further in the study.

- 1) Ben sigarayı bile bıraktım hatta
 I smoking-ACC even quit-PAST-1SG even

Interpretation: '(It is even the case that) I even quit smoking.'

(2) The phrase structure of Sentence (1)



In negative clauses, there is only one option since adjunction to non-verbal projections is impossible. All focused phrases are assumed to be raised to either clause-level (vP-external) FocusP, or utterance-level (CP) FocusP for interpretation. The relation between negation and focus particles are assumed to be related to the intervention effects discussed by Rizzi (1990) (cf. Ross, 1983).

Kesen (2010) states that focus particles *sadece* 'only', *bile* 'even', and *da* 'also' create intervention effects in Turkish. The notion of *intervention* is described in Rizzi's (1990) *Relativized Minimality* approach, which is also related to Ross' (1983) idea of *Inner Islands*. Intervention is defined as a potential governor which occurs (or intervenes) between a trace and its actual governor (Rizzi, 1990). *Inner islands* in Ross (1983) are induced by adverbials of a certain type and negation acts as an interfering element in the extraction of adverbial elements. I assume that the focus particles in this study are processed as adverbial elements, since they cannot be extracted when they are c-commanded by negation. This argument is in line with the information structure stated by Gürer (2015), in which it is claimed that focus bearing constituents always take scope over negation.

Following the arguments on intervention, this study suggests that clausemate negation plays a pivotal role in the syntactic behavior of the particles and it is impossible for the particles in the study to be under the c-command of *clausmate* negation. The *clausmate* distinction is particularly important since it is possible to have the exclusive particle *sadece* 'only' under the c-command of clause-external (vP-external) negation. I assume that, following Kelepir (2001), there may be more than one NegP position in the phrase structure of Turkish. Since the head of vP-external NegP and the exclusive particle are not in the same clause, this observation does not interfere with the assumptions in the study.


A sample process is illustrated in (3), which is the phrase structure representation of Sentence (2). The solid arrows show syntactic movements (pre-Spell Out), and the dotted arrow shows the movement in PF due to the Closeness Principle.

2) Ben elma bile yemedim hatta

I (an) apple even eat-NEG-PAST-1SG even

Interpretation: ‘(It is even the case that) I did not even eat [F an apple]’

(3) The phrase structure of Sentence (2)



Therefore, two different tables, one for affirmative and one for negative clauses, are presented. The first proposal in the study is the syntactic behavior matrix of the particles in affirmative clauses, which is presented in Table 1. The letters and numbers on the table have been added to facilitate reference to specific cells. The cells with the plus sign, which are also shaded with gray, denote positive occurrences, and the blank cells denote the absence of such occurrences.

Table 1. The Syntactic Behavior of Focus Particles in Affirmative Clauses

		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain		CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP
Behavior		Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent
Projection		Utterance level FocusP	Clause level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase-level adjunction
Type of the focus on the Input		non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive
		A	B	C	D
<i>bile</i> ‘even’	1		+	+/?	+
<i>dA</i> ‘also’	2		+	+	+
<i>sadece</i> ‘only’	3	+	+		+
<i>hatta</i> ‘even’	4	+	+		+
<i>mI</i> ‘Q. part.’	5	+	+	+	+

As shown in Table 1, focus particles do not demonstrate a uniform behavior in terms of possible syntactic domains. While it is possible for all particles to be located in mid-level (vP-external) projection or adjoin to non-verbal maximal projections as seen in the table, it is only possible for *sadece* ‘only’, *hatta* ‘even’ and *-mI* ‘Q. particle’ to be positioned in the highest-level projection (illustrated in cells 3A, 4A and 5A). This is demonstrated in Sentence (3) below for the scalar additive particle. The first particle in the sentence¹ is on the utterance level, and the second one is on the clause level. The first scalar additive particle is shown in parentheses in the interpretation.

- 3) a. *Hatta* Nilay kızının düğününe katılmadı *bile*
 Even Nilay her daughter’s wedding attend-NEG-PAST.3SG even
 ‘(It is even the case that) Nilay didn’t even attend to her daughter’s wedding.’


Another case illustrating the non-uniform behavior among the particles is the fact that only *da* ‘also’ and *-mI* ‘Q. part.’ can be situated in the lowest-level projection (seen in the cells 2C and 5C). Su (2012) states that the question particle *-mI* can modify a phrase in vP-internal level. The sentence and the corresponding phrase structure representation are shown in Sentence (4a) and (4) below (Su, 2012, p. 127) for the question particle. Sentence (4b) represents a similar case for *-da* ‘also’.

¹ The abbreviations used in the study are as follows: ACC ‘accusative’, COP ‘copula’, DAT ‘dative’, EVID ‘evidential’, FUT ‘future tense’, GEN ‘genitive’, MOD ‘modality’, NEG ‘negation’, NMLZ ‘nominalization’, PASS ‘passive’, PAST ‘past tense’, PL ‘plural’, POSS ‘possessive’, SG ‘singular’.

4) a. *Gid- -ecek -mi ∅ -sınız?*
 GO FUT Q. particle (silent) COPULA AGR.2PL
 ‘Will you go?’

b. *Geledebilir, kaçadabilir.*
 come-NMLZ-also-know.AOR.3SG run.away-NMLZ-also-know.AOR.3SG
 ‘He may (also) surrender, and he may also run away.’ (Interpretation: Both options are possible, it is not certain whether he will surrender or not.)

(4) Phrase structure of Sentence (2) (Su, 2012, p. 127)



In order to be placed in this level, the particle should adjoin to a vP-internal projection, which would require it to be placed below the tense and agreement suffixes in the representation, as seen in (4). Since this is only possible for clitics or

suffixes in Turkish due to the agglutinative character of the language, this projection is unavailable for *sadece* ‘only’ and *hatta* ‘even’. However, while *bile* ‘even’ is defined as a clitic in traditional grammars (Kornfilt, 1997; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005) and there are some instances in which it takes tense and agreement suffixes, the cell representing *bile* ‘even’ in the lowest projection (1C) is presented with +/? mark in the table, since the instances where *bile* ‘even’ is placed below the agreement markers are judged to be marginal or unacceptable for most native speakers. Two sample uses showing the particle placed in the verbal complex are presented below in Sentence (5) and Sentence (6).

- 5) a. Ben mac kullanıp oyun oynayan kimse görmedim, çoğu oyun uyumlu olmayabilebilir.²

‘I haven’t seen anyone playing games on a Mac, it may be the case that it does not *even* support games.’

Context: The speaker expresses his idea on the question whether it makes sense to buy a Mac to play games.

- 6) a. ...mesela bir cam fabrikasına götürebilir ve camın nasıl yapıldığını gözüyle görmesini sağlayabilirsiniz. Belki eline alıp yapa *bile* bilir.³

‘For instance, you may take her to a glass workshop, and let her observe the production process. It may *even* be the case that she would get some hands-on experience on glass.’

² <https://www.eksiduyuru.com/duyuru/407146/macbook-mu-pc-mi>

³ <https://www.bloomberght.com/yorum/mine-uzun/1973413-uc-vakte-kadar-haneden-bir-para-cikisi-goruyorum>

Context: The columnist is giving recommendations to the parents on the child-friendly activities for the incoming semester break.

The second proposal in the study is the syntactic behavior matrix of the particles in negative clauses. As stated above, it is impossible for the focus particles in the study to be under the c-command of clausemate negation in syntactic derivation. This observation leads to the fact that focus particles cannot modify any non-verbal domains in the presence of clausemate negation, which leads to the different table for the particles in negative environments, as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. The Syntactic Behavior of Focus Particles in Negative Clauses

		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain		CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP
Behavior		Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent
Projection		Utterance-level FocusP	Clause-level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase-level adjunction
Type of the focus on the Input		non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive
		A	B	C	D
<i>bile</i> ‘even’	1		+		
<i>dA</i> ‘also’	2		+		
<i>sadece</i> ‘only’	3	+	+		
<i>hatta</i> ‘even’	4	+	+		
<i>mI</i> ‘Q. part.’	5	+	+		

Since it is impossible for the particles in the study to adjoin to the non-verbal projections in negative clauses, the cases where the particles are placed adjacent to the non-verbal domains like a co-constituent are explained with the Closeness Principle, in which Jacobs (1983) states that a focus particle should be located as close as possible to the focused phrase. This principle is assumed to operate on PF, not syntax, for Turkish. Therefore, the particle in Sentence (7) below is shown to be in the vP-external domain, although it is placed adjacent to the nominal phrase in the utterance.

- 7) Ben elma *bile* yemedim
 I apple even eat-NEG-PAST.1SG
 ‘I didn’t even eat (an) apple.’
- a. It is even the case that I didn’t eat (an) apple.
 b. NOT It is not the case that I even ate (an) apple.

This argument is confirmed by the fact that the particle in Sentence (7) takes scope over negation, although it is placed adjacent to the DP, which is below negation. The relation between the scalar additive particles in Turkish and negation seems to be similar in English, as seen in Sentence (8), in which the particle, again, scopes over negation.

- 8) I didn’t even eat the food.
- a. It is even the case that I didn’t eat the food.
 b. NOT It is not the case that I even ate the food.

My third proposal results from the observation in sentence (8). I suggest that the scalar additive particles in Turkish (*hatta* and *bile*), English (*even*), and German (*sogar*) can be presented in a similar table, as shown in Table 3. The following table shows that *hatta* ‘even’ differs from the other scalar additive particles since it can be placed in the highest-level projection, which is presented as Outer Focus II in the study.

Table 3. The Syntactic Behavior of Scalar Additive Focus Particles in Affirmative

Clauses		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain	CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP	
Behavior	Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent	
Projection	Utterance-level FocusP	Clause-level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase-level adjunction	
Type of the focus on the Input	non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	
		A	B	C	D
<i>hatta</i>	1	+	+		+
<i>sogar</i>	2		+		+
<i>even</i>	3		+		+
<i>bile</i>	4		+	+/?	+

This difference is explained by the data presented in Chapter 3, confirming *hatta* ‘even’ can also be used as an utterance modifier which is placed above sentence adverbs in syntactic derivation, and this is a property both *even* and *sogar*

‘even’ in German lack. This may be the reason why a sentence-initial *hatta* ‘even’ can modify any phrase in the sentence, as shown below in Sentence (9). Modifying any phrase other than subject-DP is impossible for sentence-initial *even* or sentence-initial *sogar*.

- 9) a. Hatta NİLAY kızı için bir bisiklet / işini aldı / bıraktı
 Even Nilay for her daughter a bicycle / her job bought / quit
 ‘Even [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter.’
- b. Hatta Nilay KIZI İÇİN bir bisiklet aldı.
 ‘Nilay bought a bicycle even [_F for her daughter].’
- c. Hatta Nilay kızı için bir BİSİKLET aldı.
 ‘Nilay even bought [_F a bicycle] for her daughter.’
- d. Hatta Nilay kızı için İŞİNİ bıraktı.
 ‘Nilay even [_F quit her job] for her daughter.’
- e. Hatta Nilay kızı için işini bıraktı.
 ‘It is even the case that [_F Nilay quit her job for her daughter].’

All of these four particles can modify non-verbal projections in affirmative clauses. Table 4 below represents the syntactic behavior of these scalar additive particles in negative clauses. As the table suggests, adjunction to non-verbal projections is impossible for all of the scalar additive particles in the third proposal. Therefore, all scalar additive particles in negative clauses can only function as adverbials. The cases where particles in English and German seem as co-constituents to non-verbal phrases are explained with the Closeness Principle operating in PF, similar to the case in Turkish.


Table 4. The Syntactic Classification of Scalar Additive Focus Particles in Negative Sentences

		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain		CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP
Behavior		Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent
Projection		Utterance level FocusP	Clause level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase level adjunction
Type of the focus on the Input		non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive
		A	B	C	D
<i>hatta</i>	1	+	+		
<i>sogar</i>	2		+		
<i>even</i>	3		+		
<i>bile</i>	4		+		


As seen above, *hatta* ‘even’ is the only one that can be placed in the specifier of the utterance-level FocusP (seen in 1A). The main benefit of Table 3 and Table 4 is the fact that the tables can explain how *hatta* ‘even’ is different from the others. This study shows that utterance-level FocusP is the only level, in which a focus particle can associate with an utterance which does not have any contrastive focus on one of its constituents, as seen in the row entitled ‘Type of the focus on the Input’.

This difference and the association of focus particles with focus are explained with the charts in (5)⁴, (6) and later with (7).

(5) Association of focus particles with focus in phrase-level FocusP




(6) Association of focus particles with focus in clause-level FocusP



Contrastive focus is obligatory for focus association in (5) and (6). This study assumes that this is the reason why all of the sentences with *even* in English, and with *sogar* in German have contrastive focus on one of the constituents. (7) below shows how it is possible to use *hatta* ‘even’ in a sentence without contrastive focus.

⁴ I would like to thank A. Sumru Özsoy for the idea. Please see Özsoy (2019) for detail.

(7) Association of focus particles with focus in utterance-level FocusP



If none of the constituents have contrastive focus in a sentence with the particle *hatta* ‘even’, then the particle associates with the whole utterance, which is a feature not possible in English and German. The output sentence at the end of this process has contrastive focus on the whole clause. This is illustrated in Sentence (10).

- 10) a. *Hatta biz o gün birlikte yıl kapanış sunumunu hazırlamıştık*
Even we that day together the year-end presentation worked on
‘It is even the case that we worked on the year-end presentation that day.’

Context: Your colleague in the company, with whom you usually prepare presentations, is trying to remember if she has come to work on a specific day in the previous month. You are trying to remind her some instances from that day to help her remember that she *was* at the office.

All of the proposals will be explained in detail in Chapter 5. The next section will provide the assumptions on the semantics of the focus particles.

1.2 A brief explanation on the semantics of focus particles

Since this study focuses on the syntax of the particles, I will not attempt to give an extensive survey on the semantics of the particles. I will only focus on the notion of *conventional implicature* which seems crucial in analyzing the semantic contribution of focus particles to the sentence. I will first refer to Grice (1975), Karttunen and Peters (1979), Potts (2003, 2005) for the conventional implicature analysis of *even*, then focus on Herrmann (2013) for an overview of the semantic properties of focus particles. Following this brief explanation, I will present my assumptions for the semantics of the particles in Turkish.

In his seminal work on the differences between formal devices of language and their counterparts in natural language, Grice (1975) introduces the nouns *implicature* (the act of implying) and *implicature* (the thing that is implied or implicated) as formal components of a conversation. Grice defines discourse as a cooperative effort, in which each participant acknowledges a common purpose, or a mutually accepted direction (Grice, 1975, p. 45). This common purpose is built on the Cooperative Principle, which includes the Gricean maxims, Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. The maxim of Quantity requires that each contribution is informative as is required, the maxim of Quality necessitates that each contribution is true based on what the speaker believes to be true, the maxim of Relation makes sure that the parts of the conversation are relevant to each other, and finally, the maxim of Manner, deals with *how* something is said, rather than *what* is actually said (Grice, 1975). Under the rubric of Manner maxim, Grice states that the conventional meaning of the words used in discourse will specify what is implicated, in addition to dictating what is said (Grice, 1975, p. 44). Grice distinguishes two specific classes of

implicatures, *conventional* and nonconventional, or *conversational*, and I will focus on the former since it is the one that is important with respect to focus particles.

Karttunen and Peters (1979) developed Grice's initial ideas on conventional implicature and tried to differentiate the notion from another specific class of non-at-issue content, *presuppositions*. Conventional implicatures are defined as *detachable*, since it is possible to express what is said without adding the implicature, and *not cancelable*, since adding the element which causes the implicature, and later rejecting it would cause contradiction (Karttunen & Peters, 1979, p. 2 fn2). Conventional implicatures were argued to be associated with many particles, including *also*, *even*, and *only*.

The focus particle in the sentence *Even Bill likes Mary* were found out not to affect truth conditions, since the existence or absence of it have no effect on the at-issue content of the proposition, that is to say the fact that Bill likes Mary. However, the presence of the particle would lead to some additional inferences, such as the existence of other people besides Bill who like Mary, or the perspective that of the people under consideration, Bill is the least likely to like Mary (Karttunen & Peters, 1979, p. 12). Confirming their initial definition for *conventional implicature*, they assert that these additional inferences related to *even* cannot be cancelled or disassociated from the sentence. Therefore, a sentence like *Even Bill likes Mary but no one else does* would lead to a contradiction (Karttunen & Peters, 1979, p. 12).

The implicature associated with *even* is described in two types, existential and scalar. The former includes the information that there are other people under consideration who also like Mary, and the latter leads to the implicature that for all x under consideration besides Bill such that x likes Mary, the likelihood that x likes Mary is greater than the likelihood that Bill likes Mary (Karttunen & Peters, 1979).

The existence of conventional implicatures as a separate class of non-at-issue content has been challenged in many studies, such as Lycan (1991), or Bach (1999). Lycan (1991) discusses *even* as a quantifier, similar to *only*. Lycan states that the distribution of *even* and *only* is similar, therefore *even* should also have a semantic value like *only*. I would refer the interested reader to Francescotti (1995) for the problems with this quantifier account of *even*. Bach (1999), in his paper entitled ‘The Myth of Conventional Implicature’, claims that the propositions that are assumed to be conventional implicatures are aspects of what is said (Bach, 1999, p. 365). Potts (2005) stated that, in addition to Bach (1999), who explicitly denies conventional implicatures, using the term as a synonym for *presupposition*, as seen in Cooper (1983), Heim (1983), Beaver (1997, 2001), Krahmer (1998), Dekker (2002), Gamut (1991), is also a form of implicit denial (Potts, 2005, p. 7). Potts (2003) provides evidence for their existence from various areas of natural language semantics such as supplemental expressions (appositives, parentheticals) and expressives (epithets, honorifics), and argues that these expressions are speaker-oriented entailments and independent of what is said (Potts, 2003, p. 2-3).

Herrmann (2013) provides an extensive study on the semantics of focus particles in spoken languages. She presents seven pieces of semantic criteria for focus particles. These are shown in Table 5 (Herrmann, 2013, p. 186).

Table 5. The Semantic Properties of Focus Particles (Herrmann, 2013, p. 186)

a.	<i>Focus particles are focus sensitive and thus associate and interact with the focus constituent.</i>
b.	<i>Focus particles have semantic scope over an assigned constituent.</i>
c.	<i>Focus particles denote a relation to a set of alternatives.</i>
d.	<i>Focus particles may have an effect on truth conditions.</i>
e.	<i>Some focus particles assign elements a context dependent place on a scale (scalar particles).</i>
f.	<i>Focus particles have homonyms in other word classes or can have different functional variants.</i>

The syntactic analysis put forward in this study is in line with the conventional implicature analysis in Potts (2003, 2005), and the semantic properties stated in the table (Herrmann, 2013, p. 186) above.

1.3 The outline

Chapter 2 introduces the theoretical background of the study, presenting the arguments on the syntax of focus particles in generative grammar. Chapter 3 presents the focus particles in Turkish, demonstrating the positions and syntactic domains they can assume in the sentence. In Chapter 4, the assumptions on focus in Turkish and association of focus particles with focus are presented. Chapter 5 introduces the proposals and the last chapter includes the concluding remarks, along with possible implications of the current proposals for some of the current theories on focus particles.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter is about the previous works on the syntax of focus particles within the generative framework. I will limit my survey on four specific approaches to the syntax of focus particles that have been proposed in the literature. The first approach is the base-generation account by Fischer (1968), in which the focus particle *even* is directly associated with its scope in the underlying structure. The second approach by Anderson (1972) builds on the argument that the particle is generated in the adverbial position and the focused phrase moves to a position where it syntactically becomes a sister of the particle. The third approach is the Association with Focus approach by Rooth (1985), which claims that the focused phrase can be interpreted in the Surface Structure, or LF-movement of the focused phrase to achieve a domain of quantification is carried out through Quantifier Raising (QR) as in May (1977, 1985). The last approach is the overt movement approach by Kayne (1998), which is due to the introduction of Minimalist Program (MP-Chomsky, 1995) which assumes only one computational engine and asserts that syntactic objects cannot be interpreted higher than where they are pronounced, as opposed to the raising in QR.

This chapter continues with the section on the opposing arguments about the existence of focus particles in non-verbal domains, and two main theories on the issue, Adverbial-only and Adverbial & Adnominal accounts, are analyzed in detail. Counter arguments for both theories are presented in the chapter. The last section presents the concluding remarks for the chapter.

2.1 Previous Work on the Syntax of Focus Particles

The scalar focus particles *even* and *also* were first analyzed by Kuroda (1965) in transformational terms (Anderson, 1972). Kuroda (1965, p. 7-8) assumed that the particle may modify the whole sentence (11), the predicate (12), or the object (13).

11) A. The storm destroyed his house.

B. The flood even devastated his farm.

12) A. The storm destroyed his house.

B. It (= the storm) even devastated his farm.

13) A. The storm destroyed his house.

B. It (= the storm) destroyed even his farm.

Kuroda (1965, 1969) also stated that the specific positions of the particles have an effect on the semantic interpretation as illustrated in the sentences below (Anderson, 1972, p. 893).

14) Even the little President eat Skrunkies for breakfast.

15) Little Rollo even enjoys Skrunkies for breakfast.

16) Little Rollo would even eat stale Poppos for breakfast.

17) Little Rollo eats Skrunkies even for supper.

Anderson (1972) states that the difference in meaning of the sentences are due to the different constituents in the sentences selected for the *scope*⁵ of the particle. These scopes are the subject in (14), the verb in (15), the direct object or the adjective in (16), and the prepositional phrase in (17). Fischer (1968) asserted that the scope of the particle is closely associated with the center of the stress contour in the sentence as seen in Sentences (18), (19) and (20) below. Based on Fischer (1968), Anderson stated that the location of the stress contour is the independent variable to determine the scope of the particle, irrespective of the exact location the particle in the sentence (Anderson, 1972, p. 894). The capitals denote intonational stress, or high pitch accent in the whole study.

18) Jones even eats Skrunnies for DINNER.

19) Jones eats Skrunnies even for DINNER.

20) Jones even eats SKRUNNIES for dinner.

Difficulties arise, however, when an attempt is made to explain the scope-taking characteristics of *even* in (19) and two major issues surface at this point. The syntactic domain of *even* in the Surface Structure of (19) is unexpected, since the particle does not c-command a proper domain of quantification (Bayer, 1996; Jacobs, 1983), nor does it occupy an operator position while the particles in (18) and (20) do. Bayer maintains that for semantic reasons the particle must be able to quantify into some domain (Bayer, 1996, p. 39), since the particle operates on proposition level like other quantifiers (Jacobs, 1983; Bayer, 1996). Thus, two important questions

⁵ The terms such as *the syntactic domain*, *scope* and *focus* of the particles seem to be used with various meanings in the literature, therefore I present my assumptions (following Jacobs (1983)) for each term in Subsection 2.2.1.

arise about the syntax of the particles. The first issue is the exact location in which these particles are generated, and the second issue is the subsequent movement operations from Surface Structure to Logical Form that would allow the particle take propositional scope. Various proposals have been made for these two issues in the literature (Anderson, 1972; Bayer, 1996; Fischer, 1968; Kayne, 1998; Rooth, 1985; Sudhoff, 2010; among others). In the following sections, four main proposals are presented with brief descriptions and detailed analyses.

2.1.1 The Particle Moves Up by Fischer (1968)

The first solution to deal with the two issues was proposed by Fischer (1968) who suggested directly associating *even* with its scope in the underlying structure and presenting a system of syntactic transformations in which *even* ends up with the preverbal position it assumes in its Surface Structures of (18) and (20) (Fischer, 1968; Anderson, 1972). An important aspect of this proposal is the assignment of a feature [+Prominent] to any deep-structure constituent (Anderson, 1972, p. 895), since it involves the association of a constituent, rather than the whole sentence, with the focus particle. However, as Anderson (1972) points out, there are three major problems of this proposal: (i) the sentences which the scope of *even* is not a single constituent, (ii) the sentences which the scope of *even* is not present as a constituent in the deep-structure, and (iii) violation of some syntactic rules and principles during the movement of the focus particle. The first problem is illustrated in (21), in which Anderson claims that the scope of the particle cannot form a constituent.

21) Jones claims that he could sell refrigerators to the Eskimos, but in fact he couldn't even sell WHISKEY to the INDIANS. (Anderson, 1972, p. 896)

Anderson assumes that the scope of the particle is all the dependent clause excluding the verb *sell*, therefore the combination of the thing that is sold and the persons to whom it is sold is the part which is associated with particle. Since this combination does not form a constituent, it is impossible to associate the particle with this phrase in deep structure. The second problem with Fischer's proposal surfaces in (22), where the constituent in the scope of *even*, the VP in the last sentence, does not exist in the deep structure since it involves the application of the Passive rule (Anderson, 1972, p. 896).

22) Naked came the stranger was published by a respectable house, it was carried by all the big bookstores, and it was even reviewed seriously by the New York Times. (Anderson, 1972, p. 896)

Associating *even* with a constituent and later raising the particle to the adverbial position in the matrix clause would also be violating rules and principles of syntax, such as complex-NP constraint, or Sentential-Subject Constraint (Ross, 1967; Anderson, 1972). Raising the phrase would violate complex-NP constraint since no movement rule can extract a constituent from a sentence which is directly dominated by an NP with a lexical head as seen in (23) (Anderson, 1972; Ross, 1967).

23) *Who do you dislike [the idea [that e_i is tall for a Watusi]]? (Bayer, 1996, p. 27)

However, it is possible to place *even* in the matrix clause in (24), although the particle takes scope in the complex-NP. Assuming movement from the complex-NP to the matrix clause also violates the Empty Category Principle (Chomsky, 1981).

24) John even has [the idea [that HE is tall for a Watusi]] (Bayer, 1996, p. 27)

It is also impossible to move a constituent out of a sentential subject (Ross, 1967). If Fischer's proposal is taken valid, the scalar particle seems relatively free to move from the sentential subject to the matrix clause as seen in (25).

25) Jones' wife considers him absolutely honest; I even imagine his THINKING such a thing would amaze her. (Anderson, 1972, p. 898)

To account for the movement constraints, Anderson (1972) proposed a different syntactic solution which will be explained in the next section.

2.1.2 Focused Phrase Moves Up by Anderson (1972)

In Anderson's (1972) proposal, *even* is generated in the adverbial position and its association with a constituent is done through the operation of an interpretive principle for the particle. The effect of the interpretive principle is to move the focused phrase to a position where it becomes a sister of the particle in (what was later labelled as) LF. Anderson also stated that the constraints such as complex-NP constraint, or sentential-subject constraint do not seem to hold for the interpretation principles (Anderson, 1972, p. 900). The inherent assumptions of this argument have later been found out to be inconsistent with LF (May, 1977, 1985), since May indicated that both wh-movement operating on Surface Structure and Quantifier Raising (QR) operating on LF are aspects of Move- α (May, 1985, p. 29), therefore similar constraints are in effect in both levels of syntactic representations.

Let's take a look at how Anderson's theory operates. Anderson proposed that *even* is generated in the adverbial position and its association with a constituent is done through the operation of the interpretive principle for *even*, which moves the focused phrase to a place where it becomes a sister of the particle in Deep Structure. In ordinary SOV(PP) sentences, he offered five possibilities for the scope of *even*, and these are shown in (26) (Anderson, 1972).

- 26) a. sentence-initial particle with subject scope:

Even JONES eats Skrunkies for breakfast.

- b. particle between subject and VP with various scope possibilities:

Little Rollo even ENJOYS Skrunkies for breakfast. (V scope)

Little Rollo even enjoys SKRUNKIES for breakfast. (DP scope)

Little Rollo even enjoys Skrunkies for BREAKFAST. (either PP or whole VP scope)

LITTLE ROLLO even enjoys Skrunkies for breakfast. (Subject scope)

- c. particle inside the VP, the scope is only the PP at the end of VP:

John likes Skrunkies even for BREAKFAST.

- d. particle inside the VP, the scope is on the adjacent constituent:

Jones eats even SKRUNKIES for breakfast.

- e. particle after the first auxiliary in the sentence, the scope is the whole sentence:

This has been a strange year: there was a total eclipse of the sun, rivers rose up out of their banks, men bit dogs, and Harvard has even been holding pep rallies.

Anderson rejected the presence of a word final *even* in his idiolect, therefore the possibilities he presented do not include the instances of the word final *even* which are shown in (27).

- 27) a. My hon. Friend would make an admirable mayor of Lincolnshire–
governor of Lincolnshire, even.⁶
- b. Some would say he is a perfectionist or a 'control freak' even.⁷
- c. For me and for many others (and, I would suggest, for the long-term future of both Scotland and the wider British and Irish isles) it was a hugely transformative moment: life changing, even.⁸
- d. There certainly seems no justification for any politician to feel ashamed. Why should they fear it even?⁹

Thus, what Anderson claims is the following. The focus particles in (26) involve instances in which the particle is generated higher in the sentence, namely at the adverbial level, therefore it does not need to be moved out of islands which would cause violation of certain syntactic constraints. The particle is associated with the constituents in its scope by the operation of interpretive principle which depends on the exact location of the contrastive stress in the sentence. Rooth (1985) claims that the scope theory (referring to the argument in Anderson (1972)) contains a restriction which necessitates a structural relation between the focus particle and the

⁶ <http://myparliament.info/Debates/Commons/2015-11-17/12151>

⁷ <http://when2pray.net/2014/10/>

⁸ <http://www.workshop.org.uk/aggregator/sources/1?page=10>

⁹ <http://www.voi.org/opinion/book-reviews/editorial-unable-to-fight-government-compromising-with-corruption>

focused phrase, therefore there is an inherent assumption that the particle interacts with focus, which is rejected by Rooth.

Anderson indicated that there is no particular reason to believe that the constraints for the interpretive principle in LF, are the same for those holding for syntactic processes (Anderson, 1972, p. 900). This point has also been criticized by Rooth (1985), who referred to the subsequent work on the syntax-semantics interface (Rodman, 1976; May, 1977), which argued that semantic variable binding processes are subject to some constraints and these constraints are similar or identical to the syntactic constraints (Rooth, 1985, p. 36). In the next subsection, I will demonstrate how Rooth (1985) presented an innovative way for the association of the particle with its scope without assuming any structural relation in the derivation.


2.1.3 Association with Focus by Rooth (1985)

The characteristics of LF (May, 1977, 1985) have mostly been analyzed after the introduction of Anderson's Scope Theory and Rooth (1985) proposed the Domain Selection Theory to come up with a better solution for the association of the focus particle with its scope. Rooth (1985) questioned the need for syntactic movement for semantic association and assumed that, contrary to what has been suggested by the Scope Theory (Anderson, 1972), it is not necessary for the focus particle be the sister of the focused phrase in LF. Rooth (1985, p. 80) claims that the focused phrase can be interpreted in its Surface Structure position, and the semantic interaction of the focus particles with focus is due to a contribution of focus to the selection of domains of quantification. In addition to the cross-categorial semantics which offers a solution without movement, Rooth also offers another solution in terms of LF-movement of the focused phrases to achieve a domain for quantification which

involves Quantifier Raising (QR) in the sense of May (1977, 1985). Bayer (1996, p. 39) points out that cross-categorial semantics presented by Rooth (1985) should also be constrained in the way syntactic movement is constrained, therefore out of the two solutions Rooth proposed, the second one, which involves QR, seems to be better (Bayer, 1996). QR approach already comes with the syntactic constraints, therefore it is better in offering a domain for quantification for the focus particles (Bayer, 1996).

May (1977) is the first in-depth study of LF as a level of syntactic representation (Bayer, 1996), and in his influential dissertation, May asserts that the rules which map Surface Structure to Logical Form are identical in form and functioning to the rules mapping from Deep to Surface Structure, thus the structures produced by these rules are constrained by the same well-formedness conditions (May, 1977, p. 17). The model of grammar in this view can be represented as (8).

(8) The model of grammar (Bayer, 1996, p. 4)



May (1977, 1985) also introduced an important phenomenon in movement, which he termed as Quantifier Raising (QR), and this notion is important in the interpretation of the focus particles, since they are also quantifiers in the sense that they pick out an entity and relate it to a domain of other entities of the same semantic type (Bayer, 1996, p. 51). QR is a rule to map Surface Structure to Logical Form and it creates logical forms for the sentence with quantifiers and is represented as in (28).

28) Adjoin Q (to S)

QR takes the Noun Phrase (NP) associated with the quantifier and adjoin it to S while leaving a variable behind just like a syntactic trace. The sentence in Surface Structure is seen in (29), the logical form presented by May (1977) is in (30) (Bayer, 1996).

29) [_{Si} Cecile played [_{NP} [Q every] scale]]

30) [_S [_{NP} [Q every] scale]_α [_{Si} Cecile played α]]

QR also allows us to identify logical forms of the sentences that have more than one quantifier as in Sentence (31).

31) Every man loves some woman (May, 1977). (Intended: For each man, there is some woman that he loves.)

Step 1: QR for every man

[_{Sj} [every man]_α [_{Si} α loves [_{NP} [Q some] woman]]]

Step 2: QR for some woman

[_{Si} [every man]_α [_{Sj} [some woman]_β [_{Sk} α loves β]]]

May (1977, p. 22) indicated that there are obligatory conditions for quantifiers in a well-formed logical form: firstly, every argument position of a predicate must either be a referring expression or a properly bound variable, secondly, every variable in an argument position of a variable must be properly bound, thirdly, every Quantifier Phrase (QP) must properly bind a variable, and finally, a binding phrase like QP must c-command every occurrence of a variable to properly bind it. Any deviation from these conditions would lead to an uninterpretable logical form of the sentence. The type of adjunction is also specified as Chomsky-adjunction, and the scope of the quantifier is given as everything it c-commands (May, 1977, p. 25). Focusing on the cases where a QP does not have a proper domain of quantification, Bayer (1996, p. 53) reviews the quantification process in two principles: (i) If a QP in the form of [PRT XP] is governed by a head X whose projection can serve as a domain of quantification, the particle has +*operator* status and QP will be adjoined to the maximal projection of X binding a variable in XP. (ii) If QP fails to be governed by such a head, the particle has -*operator* status and the rule QR may raise QP into the domain of X and adjoin it to XP. Therefore, when the particle has a proper domain of quantification, as in Sentence (32), there are no QR operations involved.

32) John even invited ALCESTE.

However, if the particle lacks such a domain of quantification, as in Sentence (33), QR raises QP into the domain where it can have a domain of quantification.

33) John invited even ALCESTE.

Let's see how QR works with the focus particles like the one in (33). Bayer (1996, p. 52) states that the range of quantification for (33) is the property of being invited by John, therefore a quantified expression like *even Alceste* must be licensed in a way that the operator *even* should be in a position that it can take scope over the range. This is possible through QR and the smallest domain providing such range is VP (Bayer, 1996) as seen in (34).

34) John will [_{VP} even Alceste_i [_{VP} invited e_i]]

To recapitulate, there are two main cases for the position of focus particles in a sentence. In the first one, the particle has already access to a proper domain of quantification, which is the proposition level for the focus particles. Since the particle c-commands VP or higher phrases in the syntactic tree, no QR is needed. In the second one, the particle is in a non-verbal domain, and does not c-command VP, therefore it needs to be raised through QR to reach a proper domain of quantification. The first benefit of this approach is that when the particle c-commands a verbal domain, it can associate with any of the phrases in its c-command domain, because focus association does not necessitate syntactic sisterhood. The second benefit is that when the particle lacks a proper domain of quantification, the QR operation to be involved is perfectly in line with the syntactic rules and principles, therefore no syntactic violations occur for the association.

Since QR is a form of covert movement in LF, its very existence has been questioned with the introduction of the Minimalist Program (MP-Chomsky, 1995).

Thus, Kayne (1998) came up with a new approach which involved overt movements in syntax, instead of covert movements in LF.

2.1.4 Overt movement by Kayne (1998)

QR operates when a syntactic object can be interpreted higher than where it is pronounced, and this is incompatible with MP, which assumes one single computational engine, or one syntax (Koopman, 2018). Kayne (1998, p. 128) suggested that it is possible to dispense with covert movement and replace it with a combination of overt movements of phonetically realized phrases. Kayne introduces Overt Scope Principle which states that a syntactic object cannot be interpreted higher than where it is pronounced in the syntax (Koopman, 2018), revising his own ideas in Kayne (1981).

Although Kayne focuses on English data in his work, he proposes that it is plausible to think that counterparts of *only*, *even*, *too* in other languages always attract phrases to their specifier positions overtly, instead of having a covert movement in LF.

Since Kayne's (1998) work mostly deals with *only*, I will show how he deals with the association of *only* with the focused phrase without any movements in LF. Firstly, he remarks that there are two separate readings, narrow scope and wide scope, of the sentence in (35) which involves negation.

35) She has requested that they read not a single linguistics book.

Narrow scope: The request contained the stipulation that they read not a single linguistics book. (The students must not read.)

Wide scope: There have been no requests by her on linguistics book reading. (The students do not have to read.)

The wide scope reading, as Kayne suggests, is more difficult to get in (36). Therefore, he states that there is subject-object asymmetry similar to overt *wh*-movement (Kayne, 1998, p. 129).

36) She has requested that not a single student read our book.

Narrow scope: The request contained the stipulation that no students read our book. (The students must not read.)

Wide scope: There have been no requests by her on reading of our book. (The students do not have to read.)

Longobardi (1992) presented the fact that this subject-object asymmetry also occurs with the focus particle *only* as seen in (37). The wide scope reading in (37b) is harder to get than the one in (37a).

37) a. She has requested that he read only Aspects.

b. She has requested that only John read it.

Therefore, Kayne (1998) assumes that focus particles are similar to negation in this respect, and since he can explain the different readings in sentences with

negation with overt movement, it seems possible to explain the wide scope reading of (36) with overt movement. The subsequent steps with overt movement are illustrated in (38) (Kayne, 1998, p. 145).

- 38) ...requested that they read not a single linguistics book \rightarrow (negative phrase preposing)
...not a single linguistics book_i requested that he read t_i \rightarrow (VP-preposing)
...[requested that they read t_i]_j not a single linguistics book_i t_j

Kayne (1998) suggests that the focus particle *only* is exclusively adverbial and the ambiguity between wide scope and narrow scope readings is due to the different (merging) points of the particle, instead of QR (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 258), since there is no covert movement. Büring and Hartmann state that Kayne's approach involves excessive amounts of overt movement operations, and they claim that there is a loss of predictive force that comes with these unrestricted movement operations (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 259).

Thus far, this chapter has described methods used to explain two of the three issues in the syntax of the focus particles. Previous research has established that the particles are operators with a function of quantification, and they need a proper range of quantification to gain their operator status. Inspired by the LF-movement account offered in Rooth (1985), Bayer (1996) shows that Domain Selection Theory with the use of Quantifier Raising (QR) is an independently motivated alternative to the Scope Theory (Anderson, 1972), and it is in line with the syntactic constraints. It has been suggested that these operators function at the clause level, and in the case that

they modify a non-verbal domain such as DP or PP, we use Quantifier Raising rule to achieve a proper range of quantification. On the other hand, Kayne (1998) argues that it is not possible to have an interpretation rule post-Spell Out, and QPs have scope positions at one point in the syntactic derivation, but his approach involves numerous unrestricted movement operations which caused a concern for the loss of predictive force that comes with them (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 259).

2.2 Adjunction to an XP or adjoining to the sentence as an adverb?

The third major syntactic issue on focus particles is the domain possibilities of the particles. The arguments in the literature are mostly based on data in German, and the debate on the possible syntactic domains of the focus particles is roughly between an Adverbial camp (Jacobs, 1983; Büring & Hartmann, 2001) and an Adverbial and Adnominal camp (von Stechow, 1991; Bayer, 1996; Reis, 2005; Meyer & Sauerland, 2009; Smeets & Wagner, 2018). Although, I will mainly deal with the particles in Turkish in the subsequent chapters, I assume the intensive argumentation on German helps us observe the distinction better to decide on the nature of the particles in Turkish.

The issue dates back to Jacobs (1983), who claimed that the syntactic domain of the focus particles in German, is limited to verbal projections, such as V, V', VP, or IP (V''' in his terms). Although Kuroda (1965) and Anderson (1972) took it for granted that the particles can have non-verbal projections in their syntactic domains, this view has recently been challenged in many studies (Jacobs, 1983; Büring & Hartmann, 2001). This issue is also related to the preceding issues, because limiting the possible scope possibilities of focus particles only to verbal projections will also obliterate the need for QR. As will be discussed below, recent studies on the nature

of projections in German show that the Adverbial-only account fails to offer an adequate explanation for some of the cases, and it is also based on some incorrect assumptions that violate syntactic and pragmatic constraints. The data presented in Chapter 3 will show that this is also the case for Turkish and the particles *hatta* ‘even’, *bile* ‘even’, *sadece* ‘only’, *da* ‘also’ can have both verbal and non-verbal projections in their syntactic domains.

2.2.1 Adverbial-only account

I will start with Jacobs’ (1983) initial ideas, then move on to the recent revisions to the theory stated in Büring and Hartmann (2001), and to the counter arguments against the theory (von Stechow, 1991; Bayer, 1996; Reis, 2005; Meyer & Sauerland, 2009; Smeets & Wagner, 2018). Sample sentences in the Adverbial and Adnominal account are shown in (39) and (40). The Adverbial-only approach evaluates both uses below as adverbial.

39) Adverbial Projection: Mary used to [_{VP} only [_{VP} pass [_F syntax] exams]] (Smeets & Wagner, 2018)

40) Adnominal Projection: Mary used to pass [_{DP} only [_{DP} [_F syntax] exams]] (Smeets & Wagner, 2018)

Jacobs (1983) proposed a theory of focus within a non-transformational framework, Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, and made some important distinctions in the terminology of focus, which I will also assume. I need to specify three terms distinguished by Jacobs: *scope*, *focus* and *syntactic domain* of the

particle. The *scope* of the focus particles is determined by the logical properties of the particles and these particles always take scope on the proposition level (Rooth, 1985; Bayer, 1996). The *focus* in Jacobs' terms is the material presented as being important for some reason, and it contrasts with the *background* which is the material presented as being less important (Jacobs, 1983, p. 173). Jacobs also defines *syntactic domain* of a focus particle X, as the tree Y with which X forms a constituent (Bayer, 1996, p. 19). The particles are Chomsky-adjoined to their domains, and this domain is limited to V-projections, in a framework that takes the sentence as the highest projection of V (Jackendoff, 1977; Bayer, 1996). This view is best seen in the syntactic composition of (41) (Bayer, 1996, p. 21), which is slightly revised in current formal terms in (42). The capitals denote prosodic prominence.

- 41) dass Luise nur IHREM ARZT ein Auto vermachte
 that Luise only her doctor a car donated
 ‘that Luise donated only to her doctor a car’

- 42) dass [_{IP} Luise [_{VP} nur [_{VP} IHREM ARZT [_{V'} ein Auto vermachte]]]]

Thus, the syntactic domain of the particle is a projection of V and *nur Ihrem Arzt* does not form a constituent (cf. Bayer, 1996), with an insight that the quantifier does not have a proper domain for interpretation if it merges into a domain which is not a projection of V. Thus, Jacobs eliminates the need for QR, since he stipulated that the particles can only adjoin to V-projections. Jacobs also differentiates *free focus* and *bound focus* in the sense that bound focus is coindexed with a *focus inducer* in the sentence which binds focus as seen in (43) and (44) (Jacobs, 1983, p. 175). Focus

particles, which Jacobs refers as *scalar particles*, are evaluated as focus inducers which come together with bound focus. The brackets denote the focused part.

43) Peter traf nur_i [Luises jüngste Schwester]_i
 Peter met only Luise's youngest sister
 'Peter only met Luise's youngest sister'

44) Peter traf nur_i Luises [jüngste]_i Schwester
 Peter met only Luise's youngest sister
 'Peter only met Luise's youngest sister.'

If there is no focus inducing operator in the sentence to coindex with the prosodically prominent phrase, then we have free focus (Jacobs, 1983). Jacobs' notion of bound focus contains an assumption of a structural relation between focus and the focus particles, an argument which was rejected by Rooth (1985) as stated in Subsection 2.1.3. A surprising aspect of the Adverbial-only theory in Jacobs (1983) is the proposal of *ad-predicative* (45) and *ad-article* (46) uses of focus particles (Bayer, 1996, p. 23), which presents divergence from the core of the theory, as the theory assumes adjunction of focus particles only to verbal domains.

45) Peter gilt als nur MÄSSIG intelligent
 Peter counts as only moderately intelligent
 'Peter is considered as only moderately intelligent'

- 46) Die Polizei geht von nur EINEM bewaffneten aus
 Täter
 The Police assume that only one armed was
 criminal involved
 ‘The police assume that only one armed criminal was involved’

Bayer argues that in Jacobs’ theory, the focused constituents with the *ad-predicative* and *ad-article* uses of the particles are quantificational, the predicate in Sentence (45) is interpreted on a scalar context, and adverbs with absolute values cannot be used with *nur* (Bayer, 1996). The interpretation of Sentence (46) is also quantificational, since the determiner here is understood as a numeral, not as an indefinite (Bayer, 1996). In Jacobs’ theory, these two uses are not reflected in syntax. Bayer claims that introducing descriptive notions without identifying them in syntax makes syntax ad hoc like a system invoking new rules for new phenomena (Bayer, 1996, p. 24).

Following the initial arguments against the Adverbial-only account in Jacobs (1983), Buring and Hartmann (2001, p. 266) proposed a new set of conditions for the focus particles in German, as seen in (47) and (48).

- 47) *The Particle Theory* (Buring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 266)
- For any node α marked F in a phrase marker P, let the set of f-nodes of α consist of all nodes β in P such that*
- a. *β is a non-argument*
 - b. *β is a maximal projection*
 - c. *β dominates α or is identical to α*

- d. *there is no Extended Projection (EP) β' of the same head that β is an EP of such that β dominates β' and β' meets (47b) and (47c).*

- 48) *A focused phrase (FP) must be left-adjoined to an f-node of its focus.*

Reis (2005, p. 459) states that the main syntactic claim of Büring and Hartmann (2001) is that focus particles always adjoin to VPs, IPs, APs and root CPs, but they never adjoin to argument DPs, PPs, or CPs. This revision resolved some of the criticisms against it, however there are still major issues against the theory which are described below.

2.2.1.1 Counter Arguments for the Adverbial-only account

I will focus on three objections to the Adverbial-only account: The Verb Second constraint (Bayer, 1996 a.o.), the scope ambiguity argument (Taglicht, 1984; von Stechow, 1991; Meyer & Sauerland, 2009 a.o.), and obligatory adjunction to the subject argument.

2.2.1.2 The Verb Second Constraint (The constituency Argument)

The first objection to the Adverbial-only account, the Verb Second (V2-henceforth) argument, is based on a strong syntactic constraint in German which stipulates that the phrase preceding the finite verb in German must be a constituent, and any type of conjunction to CP is impossible due to the fact that verb is always at the second position (Reis, 2005). Thus, the proponents of the Adverbial and Adnominal account (Clement & Thümmel, 1975; Altmann, 1976; Bayer, 1996; Reis & Rosengren, 1997; Meyer & Sauerland, 2009; Smeets & Wagner, 2018 among others) claim that the

[PRT DP] preceding the verb in Sentence (49) should be a constituent, placing the verb into its usual, V2 location.

- 49) Sogar RUFUS hat dem Mädchen Blumen geschenkt.
 even Rufus has the-DAT girl flowers given
 ‘Even RUFUS gave flowers to the girl.’

However, the Adverbial-only account states that [FP DP] cannot be a constituent since the DP is not a projection of V, and the particle here is adjoined to the sentence, CP. The syntactic representation of Sentence (49) is shown in (50), and FP becomes an adjunct to the root clause, CP, which is prohibited by the V2 constraint.

- 50) [CP FP [CP DP_F C...]]

In (51) below, Reis (2005, p. 463) presents the potential adjunction sites resulting from the restrictions stated in the preliminary version of the Particle Theory, which is the revised version of the Adverbial-only theory, in Büring and Hartmann (2001).

- 51) [CP XP [C' V [TP...[VP...[VP...[VP...]]]]]]

Thus, German is claimed to differ from English, which allows adjunction to non-verbal XPs. The difference between can be seen in (52) for German, and (53) for English (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 247).

52) German: [EVP^o FP [EVP [XP...]_F ... V]]

53) English: [EVP [XP^o FP [XP ...]_F]... V]

To reiterate, the sentence-initial particle is assumed not to modify CP since it violates V2 constraint, and the phrase preceding the finite verb is evaluated as a constituent. However, this constituency argument also has some specific problems originally raised by Jacobs (1983). Jacobs pointed out many cases in German that the [FP DP] cannot be a constituent. I assume that the cases Jacobs raised are important because Turkish illustrates a stark contrast with German in this respect as will be shown in Chapter 3. The cases that Jacobs presented for the non-constituency argument are the following: The focus particle (FP) cannot form a constituent as [FP DP], or [FP CP] when (i) the DP is inside a PP as in (54b), (ii) the DP is inside a complex DP as in (55b), (iii) or the particle adjoins to a CP which is extraposed as in (56c). Square brackets denote the focused phrase.

54) a. dass sie nur mit dem OPA plaudert (Bayer, 1996, p. 18)

that she only with the grandfather chats

‘that she chats only with grandfather’

b. * dass sie mit nur dem Opa plaudert

55) a. Luise hat sogar das Haus des NACHbarn gekauft (Reis,
2005, p. 464)

Luise has even the house the-GEN neighbor bought

‘Luise even bought the neighbor’s house.’

b. * Luise hat das Haus sogar des Nachbarn gekauft.

- 56) a. dass Hans nur gesagt hat [DASS DER KANZLER IST ZU
DICK SEI] (Bayer, 1996, p. 17)
that Hans only said that the chancellor too fat is
'that Hans only said that the chancellor is too fat'
- b. Nur [DASS DER KANZLER ZU DICK SEI] hat Hans gesagt
- c. * dass Hans gesagt hat nur [DASS KANZLER ZU DICK SEI]'

For Jacobs' first point, Bayer (1996) states that while it is possible in English for the focus particle to modify a DP in PP as in (57), it is not possible in German, as in (58).

- 57) a. John would even talk to ALCESTE (Bayer, 1996, p. 18)
b. John would talk even to ALCESTE
c. John would talk to even ALCESTE¹⁰
- 58) a. dass sie sogar von der KÖNIGIN träumt (Bayer, 1996, p. 18)
that she even of the queen dreams
'that she dreams even of the queen'
- b. * dass sie von sogar der Königin träumt

¹⁰ Bayer (1996, p. 40 fn15) notes that this construction is claimed to be ungrammatical in Taglicht (1984). Bayer prefers to call it *marked*. Ross and Cooper (1979) presents similar sentences in which the focus particle is adjoined to DP in PP as grammatical. Such uses are grammatical also in Turkish as will be shown in Chapter 3.

Bayer refers to the fact that the languages differ in terms of preposition stranding, therefore a language without overt P-stranding, like German, must not strand the preposition in syntax or in LF (Bayer, 1996, p. 7). Therefore, the fact that focus particles cannot modify a DP in PP may be related to the difference between English and German in terms of the existence of P-stranding. Bayer (1996) explains this difference with Koster's (1987) Condition of Global Harmony (CGH), which requires that all the governors in a sequence point in the same direction to enable extraction. Since verb phrases and prepositional phrases are head-initial in English, it is possible for the focus particle to modify a DP in a PP, whereas prepositional phrases in German is an island for extraction since they are head-initial, as opposed to the head-final verb phrases.

The second point, the one about the particle modifying DP in a complex DP, is somewhat puzzling due to the different grammaticality judgments of German speakers. While Bayer presents (59b) with ?* mark, other scholars present similar sentences as grammatical as in (60) (Kleemann, 2006, p. 105) and (61) (Sudhoff, 2010, p. 66).

59) a. dass sie sogar nur den Sohn des liebt (Bayer, 1996,
Grafen p. 18)

that she even only the son the dreams
count-GEN

that she loves nobody's son except the son of the count

b. ?* dass sie den Sohn nur DES GRAFEN liebt

60) a. die Absage nur des FRÜHEN Termins
the cancellation only the-GEN early-GEN appointment
intended: the cancellation of (only) the early appointment

61) a. der Tod nur des ANFÜHRERS
the death only the-GEN leader-GEN
intended: the death of (only) the leader

I will proceed with Kleemann's (2006) and Sudhoff's (2010) views and assume that these are acceptable sentences in German. Therefore, Jacobs' second point, on the particle not being able to modify a DP in a complex DP, is not a valid argument against the constituency of the phrase involving the focused phrase and the particle.

For the third point, which a focus particle adjoining to an extraposed CP, Bayer first refers to the GB (Chomsky, 1981) assumption that the extraposed CP adjoins to IP, therefore it moves to a position where the focus particle no longer c-commands CP (Bayer, 1996, p. 40 fn.14). His second explanation for the issue involves a distinction between head-final and head-initial languages on the movement of CP to the right of V (Bayer, 1996, p. 209). He refers to the fact that the sentences in (62) are acceptable in English.

- 62) a. John would ask me [whether the library was closed] (Bayer, 1996, p. 207)
b. He asked [only [what John ate]] (Iatridou & Kroch, 1992)
c. He said [only [that John is sick]] (Iatridou & Kroch, 1992)

These sentences led him to assert that the quantified CP is canonically selected by the verb and the matrix VP is not a barrier for movement of CP in head-initial languages (Bayer, 1996, p. 207). However, in German, a head-final language, a quantified CP cannot move to the right of V since VP is a barrier for CP as illustrated in (63c) (repeated). Therefore, the extraposition argument against the constituency of [FP CP] is not well founded.

- 63) a. dass Hans nur gesagt hat [DASS DER KANZLER IST ZU DICK SEI] (Bayer, 1996, p. 17)
 that Hans only said that the chancellor too fat is
 ‘that Hans only said that the chancellor is too fat’
 b. Nur [DASS DER KANZLER ZU DICK SEI] hat Hans gesagt
 c. * dass Hans gesagt hat nur [DASS KANZLER ZU DICK SEI]’

Two important themes emerge from the studies discussed so far. Adverbial-only account accepts violation of V2 constraint (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 235), and defends its case with the arguments for the non-constituency of [FP DP] or [FP CP], referring to the cases where the focus particle cannot form a constituent with the focused phrase. As I have stated above, these cases have been shown to result from other syntactic stipulations such as the existence of P-stranding, or the head-final character of the language. One of the arguments against non-constituency, the one which claims that the particle is unable to modify a DP in a complex DP in German, has been shown to be nonexistent due to the different judgments of the speakers.

2.2.1.3 The Scope Ambiguity Argument

The second argument against the Adverbial-only account is the scope ambiguity argument originally raised by Taglicht (1984). Taglicht presented the cases in (64a) and (65a) to argue for the fact that if a focused phrase is attached to a nominal phrase, it will undergo Quantifier Raising with the phrase, and this raising creates an additional interpretation and causes ambiguity. When the focused phrase is attached to a verbal projection, as in (64b) and (65b), no QR will take place, therefore, no ambiguity is expected.

- 64) a. They were advised to learn only Spanish.

Interpretation 1: They were not advised to learn any language other than Spanish.

Interpretation 2: They were advised not to learn any language other than Spanish.

- b. They were only advised to learn Spanish.

Interpretation: They were not advised to learn any language other than Spanish

- 65) a. We are required to study only syntax.

Interpretation 1: We are required not to study any subject other than syntax.

Interpretation 2: We are not required to study any subject other than syntax.

- b. We are required to only study syntax.

Interpretation: We are required not to study any subject other than syntax.

Büring and Hartmann (2001) deal with the scope ambiguity argument by rejecting the application of QR to [FP DP] phrase, since moving the phrase would mean that the phrase is a constituent. They claim that QR does not exist in German (citing the arguments in Frey (1993) and Zimmermann (1997)), therefore an alternative to QR, in situ interpretation of the FP, should be considered in its place. The in-situ interpretation is illustrated with the sentence in (66) (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 252). The wide scope interpretation in (66) seems not to exist in (67) where the CP is extraposed (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 252).

66) (weil) ich nur Gerda geküsst zu haben bereue
because I only Gerda kissed to have regret

- a. I regret to have kissed nobody but Gerda.
- b. Gerda is the only person I regret to have kissed.

67) (weil) ich es _{CP} bereue [_{CP} nur GERDA_F geküsst zu haben]
because I only Gerda kissed to have

- a. I regret to have kissed nobody but Gerda.
- b. *Gerda is the only person I regret to have kissed.

Von Stechow (1991) explains the difference with QR and claims that the unavailable reading in (67b) is due to the fact that the extraposed infinitival clause is an island for movement of the phrase [FP DP]. Büring and Hartmann, however,

argue that the absence of the reading in (67b) is due to the different adjunction sites of the focus particle as seen in (68). The focus particle adjoins to the matrix VP in (67a) and the embedded VP in (68b) (Büring & Hartmann, 2001, p. 253 ff.).

- 68) a. ich [VP nur [VP [CP PRO GERDA geküsst zu haben] bereue]]
 I regret to have kissed nobody but Gerda.
- b. ich [VP [CP PRO [VP nur [VP GERDA geküsst zu haben]]] bereue]
 Gerda is the only person I regret to have kissed.

Since it is beyond the scope of this study, I will not discuss the existence or absence of QR in German and refer the interested reader to Sæbø (1997), or Sauerland (2001) (cf. Reis, 2005, p. 477 ff.; Sudhoff, 2010, p. 166 for arguments against no-reconstruction). I would rather focus on one specific sentence in Büring and Hartmann (2001, p. 260), seen in (69) below, in which the authors argue that a FP adjacent to DP cannot undergo reconstruction at LF, as seen in the unavailable reading in (69b).

- 69) Nur Maria liebt jeder t_{object}
 only Mary loves everyone-NOM
- a. Only Mary is loved by everyone.
- b. NOT: Everyone loves only Mary.

Büring and Hartmann (2001) uses the sentence as a proof for the argument that the focus particle cannot have scope below the subject quantifier since the particle cannot reconstruct together with a DP, and the particle should be attached to the root

CP instead. Meyer and Sauerland (2009) present a serious weakness of this argument and propose that the main assumption that the sentence in (69) has only one interpretation is seriously flawed. They claim that the unavailable reading is a direct result of a pragmatic constraint on our judgment ability which they refer as *Truth Dominance* (Meyer & Sauerland, 2009, p.140).

70) *Truth Dominance: Whenever an ambiguous sentence S is true in a situation on its most accessible reading, we must judge sentence S to be true in that situation.*

Therefore, the argument in Buring and Hartmann (2001), which claims that the scope ambiguity does not exist in German since [FP DP] does not form a constituent, fails. Let's move on to the third argument against the Adverbial-only theory.

2.2.1.4 Obligatory Association with the Subject-DP in Sentence Initial Position

Jacobs (1983) stated that the focus particle may appear in various places in the sentence as shown in (71a), and this strengthens the argument that they behave like sentence adverbials. Curly brackets denote possibilities.

- 71) a. dass {sogar} er {sogar} ihr {sogar} das Buch {sogar} empfiehlt. (Jacobs, 1983, p. 181)
- b. 'that {even} he {even} recommended {even} that book {even} to her'

If the focus particles are like adverbials which only attach to verbal projections, we would expect that a sentence-initial particle which attaches to the highest projection of V, the sentence, could have scope over any constituent in the

sentence. However, it is not the case. Jackendoff (1972) stated that a sentence initial *even* can only associate with the subject-DP, and it cannot associate any of the constituents in the VP as seen in (72) (Jackendoff, 1972, p. 248).

- 72) a. Even JOHN gave his daughter a new bicycle.
b. * Even John GAVE his daughter a new bicycle.
c. * Even John gave HIS daughter a new bicycle.
d. * Even John gave his DAUGHTER a new bicycle.
e. * Even John gave his daughter a NEW bicycle.
f. * Even John gave his daughter a new BICYCLE.

The same condition applies to German as well, as illustrated in (73) (Bayer, 1996, p. 22).

- 73) a. Sogar HANS gab seine Tochter ein neues Fahrrad.
b. * Sogar Hans GAB seine Tochter ein neues Fahrrad.
c. * Sogar Hans gab SEINE Tochter ein neues Fahrrad.
d. * Sogar Hans gab seine TOCHTER ein neues Fahrrad.
e. * Sogar Hans gab seine Tochter ein NEUES Fahrrad.
f. * Sogar Hans gab seine Tochter ein neues FAHRRAD.

Although the fact that the particle can be placed in different locations in the sentence reinforces the adverbial argument, Jacobs' theory does not explain why the sentence-initial particle only associates with the subject-DP. Bayer (1996, p. 22)

asserts that in Jacobs' theory, it is an accident that *sogar* 'even' associates with subject-DP.

I will now move on to the opposing account, Adverbial and Adnominal theory, which has attracted much attention since Buring and Hartmann (2001) proposed the revised version of the Adverbial-only theory.

2.2.2 Adverbial and Adnominal Account

Contrary to Jacobs (1983) and Buring and Hartmann (2001), the proponents of this account (Bayer, 1996; Reis & Rosengren, 1997; Reis, 2005; Meyer & Sauerland, 2009; Sudhoff, 2010; Smeets & Wagner, 2018) assume that it is possible for focus particles to adjoin phrases other than verbal projections, and they evaluate the particles as cross-categorial operators. The arguments of this account were first proposed in Rooth (1985) who showed that DP adjunction is possible, then continued with Barbiers (1995) who claimed that focus particles can adjoin to any syntactic category. Bayer (1996) discussed both approaches in his book and based his claims on directionality, as a counter hypothesis to Antisymmetry of Syntax (Kayne, 1994), with the assumption that focus particles can adjoin to DP, PP, AP and CP. Bayer (1996) also argued that focus particles are Minor Functional Heads (MFH) in the sense of Rothstein (1991), which means they do not project categorial features and they do not have θ -grids. Bayer (1996) asserts that this definition is similar to the syncategorematic expressions in Montague tradition and he proposes that the particle is a modifier, which means it makes a semantic contribution while it does not change the phrasal category of the phrase it attaches to. The semantic contribution of PRT, which he calls as *q*, is percolated to the node that immediately dominates it.

Therefore, the phrase modified by PRT would be as in (9).

(9) Percolation of the semantic content associated with the particle (Bayer, 1996, p. 15)



Building on the focus association without movement approach by Rooth (1985), Bayer stated that when the particle lacks a proper domain of quantification, involving the cases where the particle does not c-command any verbal projections, the phrase is moved in LF (QR) to the location that it can be assigned propositional scope. Therefore, QR approach makes it possible for the focus particles to adjoin non-verbal domains. As I have explained in the previous section, Adverbial and Adnominal account have put well founded arguments against the Adverbial-only account, such as the Verb-Second constraint, the scope ambiguity, or obligatory adjunction to the subject arguments.

Before starting with the objections against this approach, it is important to note that both Adverbial-only and Adverbial and Adnominal accounts share the following assumptions as observed by Reis (2005, p. 460): (i) A focus particle is always in construction with a co-constituent K it c-commands, (ii) K is a maximal projection, (iii) K contains the focus, or as an alternative, the focus particle c-commands the focus. Reis (2005) also mentions about certain cases that both Adverbial-only and Adverbial & Adnominal theories seem to ignore, in which the focus particle itself is focused, instead of the focused phrase, as in Sentence (74).

74) weil Peter AUCH kooperierte
because Peter also cooperated
'because Peter ALSO cooperated'

Now, let's move on to the arguments against the Adverbial and Adnominal account.

2.2.2.1 Counter Arguments for the Adverbial and Adnominal Account

There are two main arguments against the account: the multiple foci argument (Anderson, 1972; Rooth, 1985; von Stechow, 1991; Tancredi, 1990; Bayer, 1996) and the cases in which canonically prepositional focus particles are placed postpositionally with respect to their domain.

2.2.2.2 Multiple Foci Argument

As briefly described in Section 2.1.1, Anderson claimed that it is possible for focus particles to be associated with multiple focus constituents, as seen in Sentence (75) (repeated).

75) Jones claims that he could sell refrigerators to the Eskimos, but in fact he couldn't even sell WHISKEY to the INDIANS (Anderson, 1972, p. 896).

Anderson based his claim against the raising of the focus particle to adverbial position, on the assumption that *even* in (75) is associated with both *whiskey* and *Indians*. This assumption is also a threat for association with focus approach in Adverbial and Adnominal account, because if it is the case that *even* is generated in

the adverbial position and associated with the focused constituent without movement, how would it be associated with multiple phrases? A proposal against this assumption has been raised by Tancredi (1990), who states that association with multiple foci is, in fact, impossible. He refers to the sentence in (76) which shows that the focus particle can only be associated with one of the alternatives, and the interpretation which would necessitate association with multiple foci, as in (76c), is ungrammatical.

- 76) I only_i invited Ann_i to the party because she is a linguist_i. (Tancredi, 1990, p. 4)
- a. = Only Ann is a person who I invited to the party because she is a linguist.
 - b. = As for Ann, the only property she has for which I invited her to the party is the property of being a linguist.
 - c. ≠ The only pair x, y such that I invited x to the party because x is y is the pair *Ann, linguist*.

Tancredi (1990) also states that the sentence in (75) that Anderson gave as an example of association with multiple foci involves focus on objects in a double object construction. He refers to Kayne (1987) and Larson (1988) who argued that these constructions involve raising V out of VP, therefore the remaining objects may be a part of a constituent which excludes the verb (Tancredi, 1990, p. 4). Therefore, the first argument against the Adverbial and Adnominal account can be overcome with a different perspective on the syntax of double-object constructions as stated by Tancredi (1990). Thus, Anderson's assumption on the focus particles being associated with multiple foci is non-substantial.

2.2.2.3 Canonically prepositional particles following their domains

Some focus particles such as *even*, *only*, *auch*, or *sogar* can be associated with the preceding phrases although they canonically precede their domains. König (1991) suggested that a any part of a sentence except the auxiliary verb can be associated with a sentence-final focus particle as in (77). It is important to repeat that some scholars like Anderson (1972) find this use unacceptable, although such uses were presented from corpora in Subsection 2.1.2.

- 77) a. Your SUGGESTING it to Doris was stupid, even. (König, 1991, p. 21)
b. Your suggesting it to DORIS was stupid, even.
c. FRED could have bought a bike, even. (König, 1991, p. 21)
d. Fred could have BOUGHT a bike, even.

It is also possible for the focus particle in other locations to be associated with preceding phrases as in (78).

- 78) a. FRED may even have given presents to Mary (König, 1991, p. 21)
b. FRED, even, may have given presents to Mary.
c. TEN WORKERS only reported sick today.

It is interesting to see that similar sentences cause confusions about their acceptability also in German literature. Büring and Hartmann (2001, p. 240) refer to the sentences in (79) and (80) as ungrammatical based on their own judgment as native speakers, although they state that the source of the sentences refers the use as

rare, sporadic and limited (Helbig, 1988, p. 193/218), which means they *are* acceptable in some contexts.

79) Seine SCHWESTER nur überlebte den Unfall
His sister only survived the accident
'Only his SISTER survived the accident.'

80) Für die ZUSCHAUER sogar war das Spiel unerfreulich
for the spectators even was the game unpleasant
'Even the crowd considered the game unpleasant.'

However, Buring and Hartmann do not intend their theory to account for such cases. I assume that the presence of similar sentences in both languages necessitates a syntactic model that can also cover these uses, independent from the fact that they have low frequency, or they are unacceptable for some native speakers.

In his extensive study about the syntax of focus particles in German, Sudhoff (2010) presents ten different patterns on how focus particles may surface in the sentence. Four patterns out of ten (Patterns 3, 4, 6, and 8) illustrate cases where the focus particles follow their domains. Some example sentences from his work are shown in (81), (82) and (83).

81) Felix hat AUCH Sushi gegessen (Sudhoff, 2010, p. 63)
Felix had also sushi eaten
'FELIX, too, has eaten sushi'

82) SUSHI hat Maja sogar gegessen (Sudhoff, 2010, p. 62)

Sushi had Maja even eaten

‘Maja has even eaten SUSHI’

83) Maja KÜSSTE Felix sogar (Sudhoff, 2010, p. 62)

Maja kissed Felix even

‘Maja even KISSED Felix’

The problem with these uses in both languages for the Adverbial and Adnominal account is the fact that the particle does not c-command the phrases it is associated with. The relatively free placement of the focus particle in these sentences strengthens the Adverbial-only account since it positions the particle as adverbials, which can be placed in various locations in the sentence.

2.3 Conclusion

The theoretical implications of these findings are clear. Firstly, the studies on the location of generation for the focus particles and their subsequent movement to their places in surface structures span from the base-generation accounts in Fischer (1968) to adverbial generation account in Kayne (1998). The Scope Theory (Anderson, 1972) seemed to be more explanatory than base-generation in Fischer (1968), although it violated many syntactic constraints. Rooth (1985) came up with a new solution which uses the advantages of the Scope Theory, while conforming to the rules and principles of syntax due to association of the focused phrase with the focus particle without being sisters in the syntactic tree. Kayne (1998) tried to apply MP (Chomsky, 1995) on the problem and rejected defining LF as a post-Spell Out level

of syntactic representation, while assuming numerous steps of unconstrained overt movements.

In addition to that, the domain possibilities for the focus particles, Adverbial-only or Adverbial and Adnominal accounts, have also been examined in the literature, mostly with the arguments based on the studies on German. The limitations for the constituency are the main pieces of evidence for the no nominal adjunction argument in Jacobs (1983) and Buring and Hartmann (2001), whereas Verb-Second constraint, the scope ambiguity and obligatory association with the subject-DP arguments support the Adverbial and Adnominal account. As I have stated above, the main counter argument of the Adverbial-only account against the opposing arguments was the limitations on the constituency of [FP DP], or [FP CP]. Bayer (1996) effectively showed that these cases may have been affected from other syntactic constraints, which are unrelated to the current discussion. Two main counter arguments against the Adverbial and Adnominal account have also been presented: the multiple foci argument and the argument which covered the cases in which canonically prepositional particles follow their domains. Although the former has been shown to be possibly based on an incorrect assumption, the latter seems to continue being a threat for the account.

In Chapter 3, I will show that Turkish illustrates a case where adjunction to non-verbal projections is possible, thus giving the impression that Turkish supports the Adverbial and Adnominal account.

CHAPTER 3

FOCUS PARTICLES IN TURKISH

This chapter presents how focus particles in Turkish surface in sentences. The main questions on the syntax of focus particles are as follows: i) Where is the exact location that these particles are generated? (ii) Are there any subsequent movement operations from Surface Structure to Logical Form that would allow the particle take propositional scope, and if yes what are they? (iii) Is it possible for the particles to modify any non-verbal projections? This chapter attempts to give answers for each question in detail. In addition to that, the relation between negation and the particles is analyzed, and possible consequences of this relation for the syntax of the particles are presented.

This study focuses on the syntactic nature of four focus particles in Turkish: *bile* ‘even’, *da* ‘also’, *sadece* ‘only’, and *hatta* ‘even’. The first three particles are similar to their counterparts in English, while the last one needs some extra explanation. As stated in the introduction part of the first chapter, *hattā* ‘even’ is a scalar additive particle in Arabic, which is used in many Turkic languages such as Turkish, Azeri, Kumyk, Tatar, Uyghur, and Uzbek, with the forms *hatta*, *hetta*, or *hatto*. Its near synonyms¹¹ in Turkish may be given as *üstelik* ‘and on top of that’, or *dahası* ‘even, or indeed’ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005). I assume the lexical information encoded on *hatta* ‘even’ covers more than the scalar additive meaning, since it can also be translated as ‘moreover’ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005). However, following Gast and van der Auwera (2013), I would translate the phrase as *even*.

¹¹ Thanks to Aslı Göksel for the suggestion.

The next section will illustrate where the particles in Turkish surface in the sentences.

3.1 Positions of focus particles

The particles in Turkish can assume various positions in the sentence. Canonically, *bile* ‘even’ and *da* ‘also’ are placed in positions following the phrases they are associated with, while *sadece* ‘only’ and *hatta* ‘even’ are placed in positions where they precede the focus phrases. It is also possible to use *sadece* ‘only’ and *hatta* ‘even’ in sentence-final positions, where they follow the focused phrases. In the next subsections, possible positions for each particle in the study are presented, together with an additional subsection which covers co-occurrences of scalar additive *hatta* ‘even’ with other particles.

3.1.1 The scalar additive particle *bile* ‘even’

(84) illustrates *bile* ‘even’ in various positions, each associated with different phrases in the sense of Jackendoff (1972), or Rooth (1985, 1992, 1996). Capitals denote prosodic prominence.

- 84) a. KEREM *bile* kızını için bir bisiklet / aldı / bıraktı
sigarayı
Kerem even his for a bicycle / bought / quit
daughter smoking
‘Even [_F Kerem] bought a bicycle for his daughter.’
- b. Kerem KIZI İÇİN *bile* bir bisiklet aldı.
‘Kerem bought a bicycle even [_F for his daughter].’

- c. Kerem kızını için bir BİSİKLET *bile* aldı.
 ‘Kerem even bought [_F a bicycle] for his daughter.’
- d. Kerem kızını için SİGARAYI *bile* bıraktı.
 ‘Kerem even [_F quit smoking] for his daughter.’

It is possible to associate the subject (84a), the postpositional phrase (84b), the direct object (84c), or the verb phrase (84d) with *bile* ‘even’. The possibilities exclude the instances where a sentence-final *bile* ‘even’ cliticizes to the predicate, since it would possibly yield a different interpretation, i.e. a temporal one meaning *already*, as seen in (85).

- 85) Kerem kızını için bir bisiklet ALDI *bile*
 Kerem his daughter for a bicycle bought already
 ‘Kerem has *already* bought a bicycle for his daughter.’

It is possible to dispense with the *already* interpretation¹² by specifying the context, as seen below.

- 86) O beni partide gördü *bile* ama yanıma gelmedi.
 She me at the party saw even but he didn’t come
 over.
 ‘She even [_F saw me] at the party, but he didn’t come over.’

¹² Since this study focuses on the scalar additive, additive and exclusive focus particles, temporal interpretation of *bile* will not be discussed here.

3.1.2 The additive particle *da* ‘also’

The second particle, *da*, has many functions. It can be used as a focalizer, a topicalizer, an additive, or an intensifier meaning *even*, *and*, or *also* as illustrated in Göksel and Özsoy (2003), in which they present an analysis that unifies these different uses. Due to the limited scope of this study, I will only focus on the sentences in which *da* is cliticized to the focused constituents in the sentence as shown in (87).

- 87) a. MERT *de* kızını için bir bisiklet / aldı / bıraktı
sigarayı
Mert also his daughter for a bicycle / bought / quit
smoking
‘[F Mert], too, bought a bicycle for his daughter.’
- b. Mert KIZI İÇİN *de* bir bisiklet aldı.
‘Mert bought a bicycle also [F for his daughter].’
- c. Mert kızını için bir BİSİKLET *de* aldı.
‘Mert also bought [F a bicycle] for his daughter.’
- d. Mert kızını için SIGARAYI *da* bıraktı.
‘Mert also [F quit smoking] for his daughter.’

As seen above, *da* ‘also’ is a clitic that can attach to the subject (87a), the postpositional phrase (87b), the direct object (87c), and the verb phrase in (87d). Placing the particle sentence-finally has various interpretations (Göksel and Özsoy, 2003, p. 1148 fn6), however, I will illustrate one of them in which it is still interpreted as *also* in (88).

88) Mert kızı için bisikleti aldı da ama uçak
çoktan
kalkmıştı.

Mert his daughter for the bicycle bought also but the plane
had already
left.

‘It was also the case that [F Mert bought the bicycle for his daughter], but
the plane had already left.’

3.1.3 The exclusive particle *sadece* ‘only’

Similar to the cases with *bile* ‘even’ and *da* ‘also’, *sadece* ‘only’ can also appear in various positions in the sentence, but unlike the others, it precedes the phrase that it takes into its scope. (89) shows the sentences where the particle is associated with the subject (89a), the postpositional phrase (89b), the direct object (89c), or the verb phrase (89d).

89) a. *Sadece* ONUR kızı için bir bisiklet / aldı / bıraktı
smoking

Only Onur his daughter for a bicycle / bought / quit
smoking

‘Only [F Onur] bought a bicycle for his daughter.’

b. Onur *sadece* KIZI İÇİN bir bisiklet aldı.

‘Onur bought a bicycle only [F for his daughter].’

c. Onur kızı için *sadece* bir BİSİKLET aldı.

‘Onur only bought [F a bicycle] for his daughter.’

- d. Onur kızını için *sadece* SİGARAYI bıraktı, başka bir şey yapmadı.
 ‘Onur only [_F quit smoking] for his daughter, he did not do anything else for her.’

The sentences where *sadece* ‘only’ is placed sentence-initially have different interpretations depending on the scope of contrastive focus, as seen in (90a) and (90b).

- 90) *Sadece* Onur kızını için bir bisiklet aldı
 Only Onur his daughter for a bicycle buy-PAST.3SG
- a. Interpretation 1 with contrastive focus on the subject:
 ‘Only [_F Onur] bought a bicycle for his daughter’ (Other fathers did not)
- b. Interpretation 2 with contrastive focus on the whole clause:
 ‘The only thing that happened is that Onur bought a bike for his daughter.’ (Nothing else happened in the store that day.)

Therefore, sentence-initial *sadece* associates with a focused phrase as in (90a), or it associates with the whole sentence if there is no contrastive focus on any of the constituents in the sentence without the particle, as seen in (90b). Therefore, while the sentence without the focus particle in (90) does not have contrastive focus, the resulting sentence has contrastive focus on the whole clause in (90b), similar to the cases explained in Özsoy (2019).

There are also cases where there is contrastive focus on a constituent not adjacent to the particle and *sadece* associates with the whole sentence, as seen in (91).

- 91) *Sadece* Onur kızını için bir BİSİKLET aldı
Only Onur his daughter for a bicycle bought
Interpretation 3 with contrastive focus on the immediate preverbal position:

‘The only thing I would object to is that Onur bought [_F a bicycle] for his daughter (i.e. not a car, as opposed to the claim in the preceding discourse)

3.1.4 The scalar additive particle *hatta* ‘even’

The last focus particle in the study, *hatta* ‘even’, demonstrates an interesting case in terms of placement in the sentence. I will first show the cases where it is placed sentence-initially and can be associated with various phrases in the sentence. The sentence-initial particle can be associated with the subject (92a), the postpositional phrase (92b), the direct object (92c), or the verb phrase (92d).

- 92) a. *Hatta* NİLAY kızını için bir bisiklet aldı / bıraktı
/ sigarayı
Even Nilay her daughter for a bicycle bought / quit
‘It is even the case that [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter.’
- b. *Hatta* Nilay KIZI İÇİN bir bisiklet aldı.
‘It is even the case that Nilay bought a bicycle [_F for her daughter].’
- c. *Hatta* Nilay kızını için bir BİSİKLET aldı.
‘It is even the case that Nilay bought [_F a bicycle] for her daughter.’
- d. *Hatta* Nilay kızını için SİGARAYI bıraktı.

‘It is even the case that Nilay [_F quit smoking] for her daughter.’

It is also possible for *hatta* ‘even’ to precede the phrase it is associated with, as seen in (93).

- 93) a. *Hatta* NİLAY kızı için bir bisiklet / aldı / bıraktı
sigarayı
Even Nilay her daughter for a bicycle bought / quit
‘Even [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter.’
- b. Nilay *hatta* KIZI İÇİN bir bisiklet aldı.
‘Nilay bought a bicycle even [_F for her daughter].’
- c. Nilay kızı için *hatta* bir BİSİKLET aldı.
‘Nilay even bought [_F a bicycle] for her daughter.’
- d. Nilay kızı için *hatta* SİGARAYI bıraktı.
‘Nilay even [_F quit smoking] for her daughter.’

Similar to *sadece* ‘only’, sentence-initial *hatta* can have diverse interpretations depending on the position of contrastive focus in the sentence, as illustrated in (94).

- 94) *Hatta* Nilay kızı için bir bisiklet aldı
Even Nilay her daughter for a bicycle bought
- a. Interpretation 1 with contrastive focus on the subject:
‘Even [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter’

- b. Interpretation 2 with contrastive focus on the whole clause:
‘It is even the case that [_F Nilay bought a bike for her daughter]’
- c. Interpretation 3 with contrastive focus on the immediate preverbal position:
‘It is even the case that Nilay bought [_F a bike] for her daughter.’

It is important to note that for the interpretation in (94b), the initial sentence (Input) should not have contrastive focus on any of the constituents before merging with the focus particle. Due to the insertion of the particle, the final sentence (Output) has contrastive focus on the whole clause. This Input-Output mechanism will be explained in detail in Chapter 4.

It is also possible to place *hatta* ‘even’ sentence-finally with the possibility of associating it with various phrases in the sentence, as seen in Sentence (95), similar to the case with sentence-initial *hatta* ‘even’.

- 95) a. NİLAY kızı için bir bisiklet / aldı / *hatta*
smoking bıraktı
Nilay her daughter for a bicycle / bought / even
smoking quit

‘It is even the case that [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter’

- b. Nilay KIZI İÇİN bir bisiklet aldı *hatta*.
‘It is even the case that Nilay bought a bicycle [_F for her daughter]’
- c. Nilay kızı için bir BİSİKLET aldı *hatta*.
‘It is even the case that Nilay bought [_F a bicycle] for her daughter’
- d. Nilay kızı için bir SİGARAYI bıraktı *hatta*.

‘It is even the case that Nilay [_F quit smoking] for her daughter’

Parallel to the sentence-initial cases, the interpretation of a sentence with a sentence-final *hatta* ‘even’ depends on the position of contrastive focus. While contrastive focus on certain constituents causes the particle to be associated with the focused phrase as in (96a) and (96b), the absence of contrastive focus in the part excluding the particle leads to the interpretation in (96c), where the particle modifies the whole sentence which gains contrastive focus due to merging with particle.

96) Nilay kızı için bir bisiklet aldı *hatta*
Nilay her daughter for a bicycle bought even

a. Interpretation 1 with contrastive focus on the subject:

‘It is even the case that [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter’

b. Interpretation 2 with contrastive focus on the immediate preverbal position:

‘It is even the case that Nilay bought [_F a bike] for her daughter’

c. Interpretation 3 with contrastive focus on the whole clause:

‘It is even the case that [_F Nilay bought a bike for her daughter]’

Thus, sentence-initial or sentence-final *hatta* can associate with a specific constituent, or the whole clause. However, this is not possible with the cases where the particle appears in other positions, i.e. the cases presented in (97) (repeated). It is impossible for the particle to associate with the whole sentence in (97b), (97c), and

(97d). (97e) illustrates an ungrammatical case where the particle, which is neither sentence-initial, nor sentence-final, is associated with the subject-DP.

97) a. *Hatta* NİLAY kızı için bir bisiklet / aldı / bıraktı
sigarayı

Even Nilay her daughter for a bicycle / buy/quit-
smoking PAST.3SG

‘Even [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter’

b. Nilay *hatta* KIZI İÇİN bir bisiklet aldı.

‘Nilay bought a bicycle even [_F for her daughter]’

c. Nilay kızı için *hatta* bir BİSİKLET aldı.

‘Nilay even bought [_F a bicycle] for her daughter’

d. Nilay kızı için *hatta* SİGARAYI bıraktı.

‘Nilay even [_F bought a bicycle] for her daughter’

e. *NİLAY kızı için *hatta* bir bisiklet aldı.

Intended: ‘[_F NİLAY] even bought a bicycle for her daughter.’

3.1.5 Cooccurrences of *hatta* ‘even’ with other particles

An interesting feature of the scalar additive particle *hatta* ‘even’ is the occurrences where it surfaces with other focus particles. These co-occurrences are illustrated in the examples below¹³.

¹³ It is also possible for *sadece* ‘only’ to occur with other focus particles. I will only analyze *hatta* ‘even’ as the cases are similar.

98) Hatta sadece Nilay bir bisiklet aldı
Even only Nilay a bicycle bought
It is even the case that only [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle.

99) Hatta Nilay bile bir bisiklet aldı
Even Nilay even a bicycle bought
It is even the case that even [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle.

100) Hatta Nilay da bir bisiklet aldı
Even Nilay also a bicycle bought
It is even the case that [_F Nilay], too, bought a bicycle.

Two main observations surface with these co-occurrences. The first one is the fact that *hatta* ‘even’ always outscopes other particles, as seen in the interpretations. The second one is the interesting detail that although there are two scalar additive particles in Sentence (99), they seem to be on different syntactic levels. Sentence (101) shows that sentence adverbs are syntactically placed lower than the particle *hatta* ‘even’, while they are higher than the other scalar additive particle *bile* ‘even’. This is confirmed by the fact that the sentence becomes ungrammatical when the sentence adverb precedes *hatta* ‘even’, as seen in (101b).

- 101) Hatta muhtemelen Nilay bile sigarayı bırakmadı
 Even probably Nilay even smoking-ACC didn't quit
- a. It is even the case that probably even Nilay didn't quit smoking.
 hatta [sentence adverb [bile [NEG PHRASE]]]
- b. *Muhtemelen hatta Nilay bile sigarayı bırakmadı.

Therefore, the syntactic model that will be offered the particles in Turkish should also be compatible with these observations.

3.2 Syntactic domains of focus particles

In this section, I will demonstrate the possible syntactic domains for the particles in Turkish and show that Turkish illustrates a case where both adverbial and adnominal adjunction is possible. As seen in the previous subsection, the particle *hatta* 'even' will be analyzed separately due to the instances of co-occurrences.

3.2.1 Adjunction to verbal domains for *bile* 'even', *da* 'also', and *sadece* 'only'

As seen in the sentence below, *sadece* 'only' can adjoin to root clauses. Incorrect associations with the particle are also shown with (x) marks, correct association is indicated with (✓) mark.

Context for (102): Your colleague has an appointment with the doctor, so she asked you to keep an eye on her desk in case a manager checks for her. When she returns, she asks you if anything happened, and you reply as in Sentence (102).

102) *Sadece* Nilay seni sordu, başka bir şey olmadı
 only Nilay you- ask- else nothing happen-NEG-
 ACC PAST.3SG PAST.3SG

‘The only thing that happened was that Nilay asked for you, nothing else happened.’

x Only [_F Nilay] asked for you.

x Nilay only [_F asked] for you.

x Nilay asked only [_F for you].

√ It is only the case that [_F Nilay asked for you].

All the particles in the study can adjoin to verbal projections as seen in Sentences (103), (104), and (105).

103) Okula kaydoldum, kimliğimi *de* aldım
 school-DAT register-PAST- my ID- also receive-PAST-
 1SG ACC 1SG

‘I registered for school and also received my ID.’ (These are the two actions that I did.)

104) *Sadece* okula kaydoldum
 Only school-DAT register-PAST-1SG

‘I only registered for school.’ (This is the only action I did.)

105) Okula kaydoldum, kimliğimi *bile* aldım
 school-DAT register- my ID-ACC even receive-
 PAST.1SG PAST.1SG

‘I registered for school and even received my ID.’ (There are the two actions that I did, and the second one was unexpected.)

Thus, the particles are shown to modify verbal domains without exception. Adjunction to root clauses is possible for *sadece* ‘only’, while it is not possible for *da* ‘also’ and *bile* ‘even’.

3.2.2 Adjunction to non-verbal domains for *bile* ‘even’, *da* ‘also’, and *sadece* ‘only’

In Chapter 2, various arguments about the adnominal adjunction of the focus particles in German were analyzed. I will now demonstrate how the particles in Turkish adjoin to non-verbal projections.

All particles in the study can adjoin to non-verbal projections such as postpositional phrases, determiner phrases, or noun phrases. Let’s start with *da* ‘also’. Adjunction to bare NP (106), DP (107), and PP (108) are shown below.

106) ELMA da yedim
 apple also eat-PAST.1SG

‘I also ate [_F (an) apple].’ (in addition to a banana)

107) BU SENE de ödül aldım.
this year also award receive-PAST.1SG
'I received an award [_F this year], too.' (in addition to the award I received last year.)

108) SENİN için de elma aldım
for you also apple buy-PAST.1SG
'I bought an apple also [_F for you].' (in addition to the one I bought for myself)

It is also possible to *modify* the head or the modifier of a possessive construction, as shown in (109) and (110). However, it is important to note that these instances are assumed not to be syntactic in this study, since I assume that adjunction of the focus phrases is only possible for maximal projections. Since the modifier or the head of a possessive construction are not maximal projections, these instantiations are seen as occurrences of the Closeness Principle (Jacobs, 1983), in which the focus particle gets as close as possible to the focus. Therefore, the focus particle syntactically adjoins to the maximal DP in the Sentences (109) and (110). The version of the Closeness Principle I assume in this study will be explained further in Section 5.1.

109) Ayşe'nin KARDEŞİ de geldi
Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG also come-PAST.1SG
'Ayşe's [_F sister] has come, too.' (in addition to Ayşe's mother)

- 110) AYŞE'nin de kardeşi geldi
 Ayşe-POSS.3SG also sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
 '[_F Ayşe's] sister has come, too.' (in addition to someone else's sister)

Sadece 'only' can also adjoin to non-verbal projections. The particle adjoins to bare NP (111), DP (112), and PP (113) as illustrated below.

- 111) Sadece ELMA yedim.
 only apple eat-PAST.1SG
 'I only ate [_F (an) apple]'

- 112) Sadece BU SENE ödül aldım
 only this year award receive-PAST.1SG
 'I received an award only [_F this year]'

- 113) Sadece SENİN için elma aldım
 only for you apple buy-PAST.1SG
 'I bought an apple only [_F for you]'

Similar to the case with *da* 'also', *sadece* 'only' can modify the head and the modifier of a possessive construction. The cases in (114) and (115) are assumed to be due to the Closeness Principle, since in both cases the focus particle is assumed syntactically adjoin to the whole genitive phrase, instead of the head or the modifier of the construction. Therefore, the phrase structure representation of (114), (115) and (116) are the same.

114) Sadece AYŞE'nin kardeşi geldi
 only Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
 'Only [_F Ayşe's] sister has come' (Other friends' sisters have not come)

115) Ayşe'nin sadece KARDEŞİ geldi
 Ayşe-POSS.3SG only sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
 Interpretation: 'Only Ayşe's [_F sister] has come' (Ayşe's mother and Ayşe's brother have not come)

116) Sadece Ayşe'nin kardeşi geldi
 only Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
 '[_F Ayşe's sister] was the only one who has come' (No one else has come)

The same pattern also applies for *bile* 'even'. The particle adjoins to bare NP in (117), DP in (118), and PP in (119).

117) ELMA bile yedim
 apple even eat-PAST.1SG
 'I even ate [_F (an) apple].

118) BU SENE bile ödül aldım.
this year even award receive-PAST.1SG
'I received an award even [_F this year]'

119) AYŞE için bile elma aldım
for Ayşe also apple buy-PAST.1SG
'I bought an apple even [_F for Ayşe]'

The instances where the particle modifies the modifier of a possessive construction (120), or the head of a possessive construction (121) are shown below. Both instances in (120) and (121) are evaluated within the same syntactic phrase structure, in which the particle syntactically adjoins to the whole genitive phrase. This is also the case for Sentence (122) where the particle modifies the whole possessive construction.

120) AYŞE'nin bile kardeşi geldi
Ayşe-POSS.3SG even sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
'Even [_F Ayşe's] sister came' (in addition to Ali's and Ahmet's sisters)

121) Ayşe'nin KARDEŞİ bile geldi
Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG even come-PAST.1SG
'Even Ayşe's [_F sister] came' (in addition to Ayşe's mother)

- 122) Ayşe'nin kardeşi bile geldi
 Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG even come-PAST.1SG
 'Even [_F Ayşe's sister] came' (in addition to someone else)

The next subsection will focus on the scalar additive particle *hatta* 'even'.

3.2.3 Adjunction to verbal and non-verbal domains for *hatta* 'even'

The scalar additive particle *hatta* 'even' can modify verbal projections. Sentences below illustrate how the particle syntactically adjoins to the whole clause as in (123), or to the verbal phrase as in (124).

Context for (123): Your friend has asked if you came to work last Monday.

You are sure that you were in the office that day, but he insists that you were on leave. Therefore, you reply as in (123) to make sure that he remembers.

- 123) *Hatta* o gün yeni müdürümüzle tanışmıştık
 even that day with our new manager meet-EVID-PAST-2PL
 'It was even the case that we met with our new manager that day.'

- 124) Okula kaydoldum, hatta kimliğimi aldım
 school- register- even my ID- receive-PAST.1SG
 DAT PAST.1SG ACC
 'I registered for school and even received my ID.' (There are two actions that I did, and the second one was unexpected.)

The particle can also modify non-verbal projections. It is possible to have the sentence-initial *hatta* associate with the non-verbal projections in the sentence through stress. The particle syntactically adjoins to bare NP (125), DP (126), and PP (127) as illustrated below.

125) Hatta ELMA yedim.
 even apple come-PAST.1SG
 ‘I even ate [_F (an) apple].’

126) Hatta BU SENE ödül aldım
 even this year award receive-PAST.1SG
 ‘I received an award even [_F this year].’

127) Hatta AYŞE için elma aldım
 even for Ayşe apple buy-PAST.1SG
 ‘I bought an apple even [_F for Ayşe].’

The distinction between syntactic adjunction and semantic association also applies for *hatta* ‘even’. *hatta* ‘even’ can associate with (but not syntactically adjoin to) the head or the modifier of a possessive construction. I assume Sentences (128) and (129) have the same phrase structure with Sentence (130), where the particle adjoins to the whole genitive construction, although their semantic interpretations are different due to different positions of stress.

128) Hatta AYŞE'nin kardeşi geldi
 even Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
 'Even [_F Ayşe's] sister came' (in addition to Ahmet's sister)

129) Hatta Ayşe'nin KARDEŞİ geldi
 even Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
 Interpretation: 'Even Ayşe's [_F sister] came' (in addition to Ayşe's mother)

130) Hatta Ayşe'nin kardeşi geldi
 even Ayşe-POSS.3SG sister-GEN.3SG come-PAST.1SG
 'Even [_F Ayşe's sister] came' (in addition to someone else)

Thus, all the particles in the study have been shown to adjoin to non-verbal domains, confirming the arguments in Adverbial & Adnominal account. The instances where particles modify submaximal projections have also been shown, but these cases are seen as the direct results of the Closeness Principle operating in PF. This principle is assumed to have no effect in the phrase structure in Turkish, since the semantic association it creates is assumed not to be represented in syntax (pre-Spell Out).

3.3 No nominal adjunction arguments tested in Turkish

As stated in Chapter 2, there are various arguments for and against an Adverbial-only theory and in this section, I will try to evaluate the arguments with respect to data in

Turkish. Let's see Sentence (131) presented by Taglicht (1984) in Turkish to check for the possible ambiguity caused by [FP DP] constituents.

131) a. They were advised to learn only Spanish.

Interpretation 1: They were not advised to learn any language other than Spanish.

Interpretation 2: They were advised not to learn any language other than Spanish.

b. They were only advised to learn Spanish.

Interpretation: They were not advised to learn any language other than Spanish.

The ambiguity argument also applies for Turkish, as seen in (132), and the different interpretations stated in (131) are shown in (132a) and (132b). In addition to that, the sentence in Turkish seems to have three more interpretations. The additional interpretations in (132c), (132d), and (132e) illustrate the cases the sentence-initial particle adjoins to the higher phrases in the phrase structure representation.

132) Sadece İspanyolca konuşmaları tavsiye edildi
only Spanish speak-NMLZ- advise-PASS-PAST.SG
GEN.3SG

a. Interpretation 1: They were not advised to speak any language other than Spanish.

b. Interpretation 2: They were advised not to speak any language other than Spanish.

- c. Interpretation 3: They were not advised to do anything other than speaking Spanish. (They don't have to do anything else.)
- d. Interpretation 4: They were advised not to do anything other than speaking Spanish. (They must not do anything else.)
- e. Interpretation 5: The only thing that happened was that they were advised to speak Spanish.

Therefore, the scope ambiguity argument also confirms that adnominal adjunction is possible in Turkish. However, the third argument against the Adverbial-only theory, i.e. the sentence-initial particle obligatorily attaches to the subject-DP, reveals that Turkish may demonstrate a case in which a different approach is needed. As Jackendoff (1972, p. 248) shows in (133) (repeated), sentence-initial particle in English can only be associated with the subject, as opposed to lower phrases in the phrase structure, and this is a counter argument for the Adverbial-only theory.

- 133) a. Even JOHN gave his daughter a new bicycle.
- b. * Even John GAVE his daughter a new bicycle.
 - c. * Even John gave HIS daughter a new bicycle.
 - d. * Even John gave his DAUGHTER a new bicycle.
 - e. * Even John gave his daughter a NEW bicycle.
 - f. * Even John gave his daughter a new BICYCLE.

However, *hatta* 'even' shows that there are particles which can be placed sentence-initially and be associated with the subject-DP, the PP, the object-DP, the

VP, or the whole clause as in (134). Therefore, the existence of a particle like *hatta* ‘even’, refutes the claim against the Adverbial-only theory on the obligatory association to subject-DP, and shows that there are particles which behave similar to adverbials, as seen in (134).

- 134) a. Hatta NİLAY kızını için bir bisiklet / aldı /
 sigarayı bıraktı
 Even Nilay her daughter for a bicycle / bought /
 smoking quit
 ‘Even [_F Nilay] bought a bicycle for her daughter.’
- b. Hatta Nilay KIZI İÇİN bir bisiklet aldı.
 ‘Nilay bought a bicycle even [_F for her daughter].’
- c. Hatta Nilay kızını için bir BİSİKLET aldı.
 ‘Nilay even bought [_F a bicycle] for her daughter.’
- d. Hatta Nilay kızını için SİGARAYI bıraktı.
 ‘Nilay even [_F quit smoking] for her daughter.’

3.4 Conclusion

To recapitulate, the particles in Turkish present a different case with respect to word order possibilities. In contrast to the particles in English and German which mostly license two positions for the particles - the sentence-initial and preverbal -, the ones in Turkish can be placed in various positions. Sentence-initial *sadece* ‘only’ can associate with both the subject and the whole sentence depending on the position of contrastive focus in the sentence. Sentence-initial *hatta* ‘even’ can associate with

various constituents with contrastive focus in the sentence, and it can associate with the whole sentence if the sentence excluding the particle has no contrastive focus.

These associations are in line with the association with focus approach in Rooth (1985, 1992, 1996). Rooth (1985, p. 80-81) argues that the semantic interaction of *only* and *even* with focus is due to the contribution of focus to the selected domain of quantification, and there are no syntactic bound variables. Therefore, Rooth claims this relation between the particles and the phrases are not restricted with the syntactic constraints. I assume that Rooth's model correctly predicts the focus associations in Turkish, since a sentence-final, or sentence-initial particle like *hatta* 'even' can associate with most of the phrases in the sentence without being subject to any syntactic stipulations such as islands. I assume that the cases in which the particles are associated with submaximal projections, although they are syntactically adjoined to maximal projections, also confirms the validity of Rooth's approach in Turkish.

While it is possible for the particles in Turkish to adjoin to non-verbal projections in line with the Adverbial & Adnominal Theory, *hatta* 'even' illustrates a case where it functions as an adverbial confirming the counter theory. Since the sentence-initial *hatta* 'even' can associate with other phrases down in the phrase structure, the argument stated in Section 2.2.1.4 against the Adverbial-only theory, the obligatory adjunction to subject-DP argument, fails. Therefore, the assumed dichotomy between and Adverbial-only and Adverbial & Adnominal approaches seems to be inconsistent with Turkish, since some aspects of *hatta* 'even' supports the former, while non-verbal adjunction of all of the particles supports the latter.

As Reis (2005, p. 482) puts it, it may be the case that *a new comprehensive attempt at [German] focus particle syntax is needed*.

The next chapter will develop on the relation between prosodic prominence and focus particles in Turkish, before the proposal of the new syntactic model for the syntax of focus particles in Chapter 5.



CHAPTER 4

ASSOCIATION OF FOCUS PARTICLES WITH FOCUS

In this chapter, I suggest that focus particles and focus associated with the particles are separate but connected phenomena. As shown in the previous sections, the semantic contribution of the particles is mostly correlated with contrastive focus in the sentence. Focus particles are known to induce focus (Jacobs, 1983), and they were shown to be sensitive to their semantic domain in Domain Selection Theory by Rooth (1985). Before showing how focus particles and focus are separate but related, I will first try to show how focus works in Turkish.

4.1 A very brief preview of focus in Turkish

I will very briefly present the current focus literature on Turkish to illustrate the assumptions of the analysis that will be put forward for focus particles.

Göksel & Özsoy (2000) notice a similarity between focused phrases and wh-phrases and state that both phrases encode non-recoverable information. They assert that focus is signaled by high pitch accent in Turkish, and a focused phrase, or a wh-phrase may both remain in-situ, as well as appear in any preverbal position. Post-verbal area is assumed not to host stress; therefore, these phrases may not appear post-verbally. They claim that stress is the only indicator of focus, and the surface syntax of Turkish does not have specific place for focus, contrary to the claims raised by Erkü (1983), Erguvanlı (1984), Hoffman (1995), Kılıçaslan (1994), Kennelly (1997), and Kornfilt (1997) who argue for the preverbal position to be the focus position in the language. The idea that the preverbal position is the sole location of focus would place Turkish close to Hungarian in terms of information structure

strategy, since the ground-focus realization in this language is based on syntax (Vallduví & Engdahl, 1996, p. 485), as opposed to English, in which focus is associated with nuclear stress (Vallduví & Engdahl, 1996, p. 472). Horvath (1986, p. 91-92) states that focal prominence is not enough for focus in Hungarian, and the focused constituent should be placed in preverbal position for focus, as illustrated in (135).

- 135) *Attila félt a FÖLDRENGÉSTÖL
 Attila feared the earthquake.from
 Attila a FÖLDRENGÉSTÖL félt
 ‘Attila feared the EARTHQUAKE’

In English, on the other hand, the focused constituent remains in situ and focus is expressed by shifting the position of nuclear stress as stated in (136) below (Vallduví & Engdahl, 1996, p. 472).

- 136) a. The pipes are [_F RUSTY]. (Vallduví and Engdahl, 1996, p. 472)
 b. The pipes [_F are RUSTY].
 c. [_F The PIPES are rusty].
 d. [_F The PIPES] are rusty.
 e. The pipes [_F ARE] rusty.

In Göksel and Özsoy’s (2000) model, Turkish is placed closer to English, focus is claimed to be neither a feature, nor a phrasal projection. They base their

argument on the fact that post-verbal area cannot host focused constituents and some linear order constraints which prohibit focused phrases from appearing in positions following wh-phrases in the preverbal area. They also argue for the distinctness of sentential stress and focus stress and claim that sentential stress is the one that appears in the immediate preverbal position in the canonical SOV word order (Erguvanlı, 1984; Kural, 1994), and focal stress appears in what they call as *focus field*. Focus field is defined as the area between the position of the primary stress and position of the verb and its suffixes. They argue that presentational focus and contrastive focus are not semantically distinct in Turkish. Both types of focus are claimed to be instantiations of the same phenomenon, since they both involve lambda extraction and carry the same type of presuppositions (Göksel, p.c.). If the stressed constituent in the immediate preverbal position projects focus, it is presentational focus, and if there is no focus projection to sentence level, what we have is the contrastive focus (Göksel & Özsoy, 2000).

Özge and Bozşahin (2010) takes a different approach and claim that word order, information structure and intonation coordinate with each other, instead of one side determining the other. Although they also claim that Turkish does not have a focus position, in line with Göksel and Özsoy (2000), they propose that focus is a prosodic phrase overlaid by an H*L-contour (Özge & Bozşahin, 2010, p. 22). They illustrate the focus realizations as the table below, in which material between vertical lines shows focus and V denotes the verb. The last one is ungrammatical since they assume that focus cannot be in the postverbal area in Turkish.

Table 6. Turkish Focus (rheme) Realization (Özge & Bozşahin, 2010, p. 22)

a.	... XV ...
b.	... X V...
c.	... X ...V...
d.	... V ...
e.	*...V... X

They claim that tunes, boundary tones and pitch accents have compositional semantics that have an effect on truth conditions and information structure, and accenting implies theme, rheme or contrast (Özge & Bozşahin, 2010, p. 41). While preverbal and prerheme placement indicate accenting, right displacement denotes backgrounding, and backgrounding and deaccenting imply each other (Özge & Bozşahin, 2010, p. 41). This study is important since it claims that prosody is the only strategy for focus marking in Turkish. However, Gürer (2015, p. 112) claims that this study is not a strictly controlled one since presentational focus and contrastive focus do not appear on the same constituent in the same environment, therefore she felt the need to reexamine some of the findings.

Gürer (2015) sets up controlled experiments to answer the basic questions about the information structure in Turkish. As suggested by the results of the experiments, she claims that both contrastive focus and discourse new constituents choose an alternative from a set of other alternatives, therefore the ‘contrast’ in contrastive focus is claimed to be misleading (Gürer, 2015). She states that contrastive focus is semantically different from the discourse new focus since only the former includes exhaustive identification. She claims that neither contrastive

focus nor discourse new focus in Turkish is limited to the immediately preverbal position, thus confirms the focus field approach in Göksel and Özsoy (2000). The analyses in her study also reveal that contrastive focus and discourse new phrases cannot be distinguished in terms of f0 and duration measurements (Gürer, 2015, p. 319). The fourth chapter in her study includes some findings that will also be assumed in this study. Following Şener (2010), she claims that ‘free’ word order in Turkish is not ‘free’ since all movement operations are elicited by discourse interpretational purposes and syntax encodes information structure with clause internal and clause external projections (Gürer, 2015). She also finds out that focus bearing constituents always take scope over negation and states that when the verb is focused all the constituents are within the scope of negation, which would lead to a projection for Neg^o over vP, in line with Keleş (2001). Both of these findings are consistent with the proposals in this study.

One of her proposals, which indicates that there is no need for a higher focus projection for multiple focus constructions, will not be assumed in this study, since I assume that multiple use of focus particles in a sentence, as illustrated in the previous chapter, confirms the fact that there should be more than one level of focus projection in the phrase structure of Turkish.

4.2 Assumptions of this study for association with focus in Turkish


As stated earlier, Gürer (2015) states that contrastive focus phrases lead to exhaustive identification, and that is the difference between contrastive focus and discourse new focus. This also leads to the fact that an answer to the question like ‘What happened?’, which we would expect to contain discourse new information, would not contain focus particles (Şener, p.c.). Therefore, focus particles are

expected to only associate with contrastive focus. However, I have shown in the previous chapter that focus particles can also associate with sentences which do not have contrastive focus on any of its constituents, and the resulting sentence with the focus particle contains contrastive focus. In this study, I will refer to the sentence without the focus particle as *Input*, and the resulting sentence with the focus particle as the *Output*¹⁴. I assume that while the Output always contains contrastive focus in line with expectations, it is not obligatory for the Input to have contrastive focus. Therefore, I will not limit the focus association of focus particles to contrastive focus.

Before dealing with the discourse new content, let's first see how the particles associate with contrastive focus. I assume that there are three levels of focus projections in Turkish, and these are vP-internal FocusP, vP-external FocusP and CP-level FocusP. The projections are assumed to be Phrase-level, Clause-level and Utterance-level respectively. The phrase structure representation which illustrates these projections is presented in (10). Focused phrases are assumed to be raised to Clause-level (vP-external) and Utterance-level (CP) focus projections for interpretation, otherwise they cannot be interpreted.


¹⁴ The Input-Output relation has been suggested to me by A. Sumru Özsoy (p.c.).

(10) The phrase structure representation of focus projections



Following Kayne (1998), I assume that focus heads attract the focused phrases to their specifier positions. I also assume that this assumption explains only a part of the whole picture, since this is only the case when the focus particles syntactically adjoin to verbal projections. For the cases where the focus particles adjoin to non-verbal projections in affirmative clauses, I suggest the phrase which contains the focused phrase and the particle is raised to the specifier of the Clause-level focus projection (vP-external level), and the focus head in these instances is not the focus particle since the particle becomes an adjunction in the specifier. The specifier positions in the representation are highlighted with rectangular boxes in (10). The focus attraction process for the lowest level, which is referred as Inner Focus, is presented in (11).

(11) Association of focus particles with focus in phrase-level FocusP




Attraction to the lowest level necessitates the focus particle take tense and agreement markers, therefore this level is mostly used by the question particle *-mI*, as seen in Sentence (137), and in the phrase structure representation in (12).

137) a. *Gid- -ecek -mi ∅ -sınız?*
 GO FUT Q. particle (silent) COPULA AGR.2PL
 ‘Will you go?’

138) a. *Geledebilir, kaçadabilir.*
 come-NMLZ-also-know.AOR.3SG run.away-NMLZ-also-know.AOR.3SG
 ‘He may also surrender, and he may also run away.’ (Interpretation: Both options are on the table, it is not certain whether he will surrender or not.)

(12) The phrase structure of Sentence (137) (Su, 2012, p. 127)



I will focus on the Clause-level (vP-external) and the Utterance-level (CP) focus projections for the focus particles in the study, since all focused phrases are assumed to be raised to these levels for interpretation. As introduced in the first

chapter, there are instances where *bile* ‘even’ in a position similar to the question particle, but these instances, which are illustrated in Sentences (139) and (140), are found as marginal or unacceptable for most native speakers.

- 139) a. Ben mac kullanıp oyun oynayan kimse görmedim, çoğu oyun uyumlu olmayabilebilir.¹⁵

‘I haven’t seen anyone playing games on a Mac, it may be the case that it does not *even* support games.’

Context: The speaker expresses his idea on the question whether it makes sense to buy a Mac to play games.

- 140) a. ...mesela bir cam fabrikasına götürebilir ve camın nasıl yapıldığını gözüyle görmesini sağlayabilirsiniz. Belki eline alıp yapa *bile* bilir.¹⁶

‘For instance, you may take her to a glass workshop, and let her observe the production process. It may *even* be the case that she would get some hands-on experience on glass.’

Context: The columnist is giving recommendations to the parents on the child-friendly activities for the incoming semester break.


If the focus particles do not take the agreement markers, as it is the case for most instances, then the focus projection is on the clause or utterance level. All the

¹⁵ <https://www.eksiduyuru.com/duyuru/407146/macbook-mu-pc-mi>

¹⁶ <https://www.bloomberght.com/yorum/mine-uzun/1973413-uc-vakte-kadar-haneden-bir-para-cikisi-goruyorum>

focus particles in the study can attract focused phrases to their specifier positions on the Clause-level FocusP. The association process is shown in (13).

(13) Association of focus particles with focus in clause-level FocusP



Sample sentences that show Clause-level (vP-external) FocusP are presented below.

141) ELMA bile / dA yedim
apple even eat-PAST-1SG
'I even /also ate [_F (an) apple].

142) Sadece / hatta elma yedim
only / even apple eat-PAST-1SG
'I only / even ate [_F (an) apple].


143) Uçacağım bile / hatta / dA
fly-FUT-1SG even / also
'I will even / also [_F fly].

144) Sadece / hatta uçacağım
 only / even fly-PAST-1SG
 ‘I will only/even [_F fly].

145) Elma bile / dA yemedim
 apple even / also eat-NEG-PAST-1SG
 ‘I will even / also [_F eat (an) apple].

Finally, the highest level is the Utterance-level FocusP and *hatta* ‘even’ is the only focus particle that can be placed on this level (excluding the question particle - *mI* which is not included in the study). The process for association with focus on Utterance-level FocusP is shown below in (14).

(14) Association of focus particles with focus in utterance-level FocusP



Since the sentence excluding the particle does not have contrastive focus on any of its constituents, the particle associates with the sentence, as seen in (146).

146) a. Evet, *hatta* Nilay kızı için bir bebek aldı
Yes, even Nilay her daughter for a baby doll bought
'Yes, it was even the case that [_F Nilay bought a baby doll for her daughter].'

Context: The speaker asks the hearer if there was enough time to do some shopping before the flight at the airport.

Thus, the particle *hatta* 'even' can associate with the sentence, also in the case that there is no contrastive focus in the sentence.

4.3 Assumptions of this study for the relation between negation and focus

As introduced in the previous section, Gürer (2015, p. 320) states that focus bearing constituents and contrastive topics always take scope over negation. Before discussing her work, I will present some additional sources which also deal with the relation between negation and focus.

In her study on intervention effects in simple wh-questions, Kesen (2010) finds out that negative polarity items and focus particles *sadece* 'only', *bile* 'even', and *da* 'also' (which she calls as lexically marked focus phrases), create intervention effects in Turkish, while quantifier phrases and phonologically marked focus phrases do not create these effects. The term *intervention* was introduced by Rizzi (1990) in his study *Relativized Minimality*, and intervention is defined as a potential governor which occurs (or intervenes) between a trace and its actual governor. This idea is also related to Ross (1983), where he noticed some syntactic processes which are interfered by negation as seen below (Ross, 1983, p. 1).

- 147) a. This mist can't last, which Morpho and Hoppy (don't) realize.
b. This mist can't last, as Morpho and Hoppy (*don't) realize.

Ross (1983) introduced the notion of *Inner Islands* which are induced by adverbials of a certain type and negation acts as an interfering element in the extraction of adverbial elements, while it doesn't interfere in the extraction of arguments. This argument is clearer with Sentence (148) below. When an instrumental adverb (with) is extracted, the sentence becomes ungrammatical due to the interference of implicit negation in the extraction (cleft) process.

- 148) a. It was this stiletto that they (never) stabbed the lasagna with.
b. It was this stiletto that they (*never) stabbed the lasagna with.

I assume that due to this interference/intervention effect of negation, it is impossible to raise the focused phrases with focus particles (in clauses which contain clausemate negation) to any of the focus projections in vP-external, or CP levels. Since the focused phrases need to be raised to these focus projections for interpretation, adjunction to non-verbal domains is impossible for focus particles in negative clauses.

This is also supported with data in Gürer (2015, p. 176), which states that focus phrases take negation under their scope and if it is the verb that has the focus, negation takes scope over all constituents, confirming the arguments in Keleşir (2001) on the presence of multiple projections for negation in Turkish. Therefore, I assume that none of the particles are under the c-command of clausemate negation in Sentences (149), (150), (151) and (152). In Sentence (152), negation is on a vP-

external NegP projection, therefore this sentence is also compatible with the interference / intervention assumption in the study.

149) Elma bile / dA yemedim
apple even / also eat-NEG-PAST-1SG
'It is even / also the case that I didn't eat an apple.'

150) Hatta elma yemedim
even apple eat-PAST-1SG
'It is even the case that I didn't eat an apple.'

151) Sadece elma yemedim
only / even apple eat-PAST-1SG
'The only thing I didn't eat was an apple.' (I ate all but an apple.)

152) Sadece elma yemedim, portakal da yedim
only apple eat-NEG-PAST-1SG orange also eat-PAST-1SG
'It is not the case that I only ate an apple, I also ate an orange.'

This chapter has attempted to clarify the relation between focus and focus particles in Turkish. The next chapter would present the proposals on the syntax of focus particles in Turkish, while answering the three main questions stated in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 5

THE PROPOSALS

The following questions have been raised for focus particles in English and German.

(i) Where is the exact location that these particles are generated? (ii) Are there any subsequent movement operations from Surface Structure to Logical Form that would allow the particle take propositional scope, and if yes what are they? (iii) Is it possible for the particles to modify any non-verbal projections? I will now present two proposals that would answer these three questions, along with a third proposal on the crosslinguistic validity of the framework offered in the preceding proposals. Before discussing the proposals, I will first introduce my assumptions on the Closeness Principle in Turkish.


5.1 The Closeness Principle in Turkish

This principle is based on the '*Prinzip der Maximalen Spätstellung*' idea developed by Jacobs (1983) (cf. also König, 1991; Büring & Hartmann, 2001). In a more recent interpretation of the principle, Sudhoff (2010, p. 77) states that a focus particle should be located as close as possible to its domain in the initial *Principle of Maximal Closeness to the Focus* (*Prinzip der Maximalen Fokusnähe, PMF*) by Jacobs (1983, p. 86). Then, this principle is revised to the Principle of Latest Possible Positioning (*Prinzip der Maximalen Spätstellung, PMS*), in which it is claimed that a focus particle must occur as late as possible in the sentence (Jacobs, 1983, p. 113). Büring and Hartmann (2001, p. 237) presented their own version of the Closeness Principle and stated that focus particles adjoin as close as to the focus as possible. I assume that the principle offered by Büring and Hartmann (2001) gives right

predictions also in Turkish. However, I also assume that the Closeness Principle in Turkish only operates in PF and these operations, which cause the focus particles to occur adjacent to focus, are not syntactic movements. I will present three cases which show that the new positions assumed by the particles cannot be their syntactic positions due to independent syntactic constraints. Let's start with the first case. As stated earlier, focus particles cannot be under c-command of clausemate negation, because being c-commanded by the Neg head would prevent them from raising to the focus projections in vP-external or CP-levels. If the particles cannot be raised to these focus projections, they cannot be interpreted. Sentence (153) illustrates a case with the scalar additive particle *hatta* 'even' where the particle in vP-external projection is placed adjacent to the focused phrase. Since it is impossible for the particle to be under the c-command of clausemate negation, the new position it assumes cannot be syntactic, which is also obvious from the incorrect interpretation in (153b). When negation c-commands the particle, the sentence cannot be interpreted as seen in (153b). The phrase structure of Sentence (153) is illustrated in (15). The dotted line shows how the particle moves to an adjunction position in PF, and the solid line indicates the syntactic movement.

- 153) Nilay hatta EKMEK yemedi
 Nilay even bread eat-NEG-PAST.3SG
 'Nilay didn't even eat (a piece of) bread '
- a. It is even the case that Nilay didn't eat [_F bread].
- b. NOT It is not the case that Nilay even ate [_F bread].

(15) The phrase structure of Sentence (153)




It is the same case with *da* ‘also’ as seen in Sentence (154). Negation commanding the particle would lead to incorrect interpretation in (154b). The phrase structure of Sentence (154) is given in (16). The dotted line represents movements in PF due to the Closeness Principle and the solid line shows the syntactic movement (pre-Spell Out).

154) Nilay EKMEK de yemedi
I bread also eat-NEG-PAST.3SG

‘Nilay also didn’t eat (a piece of) bread’

- a. It is also the case that Nilay didn’t eat [_F bread].
- b. NOT It is not the case that Nilay also ate [_F bread].

(16) The phrase structure of Sentence (154)



As stated earlier, the exclusive particle *sadece* ‘only’ illustrates a different case due to the presence of NegP alternatives in the structure in line with the argument in Kelepir (2001) for the presence of multiple NegP projections in the phrase structure of Turkish. The phrase structures of the sentences in (155a) and (155b) are given in (17) and (18) respectively. The dotted line represents movements in PF and the solid line shows the syntactic movement (pre-Spell Out). In (18), it is important to note that the vP-external negation also moves to the vP-internal Neg position in PF, since negation is a suffix in Turkish, which should be placed below T/Agr markers in the utterance. The same sentence can be formed with sentential negation marker *değil* ‘It is not the case that’ in Turkish, which the marker takes scope over the whole sentence, as seen in (155c).

155) Nilay sadece ekmek yemedi
 Nilay only bread eat-NEG-PAST.3SG

a. Interpretation 1

Bread is the only thing she did not eat; she ate all but bread.

vP-internal NegP

b. Interpretation 2

It is not the case that Nilay only ate bread. (Nilay also ate some cheese in addition to bread.) vP-external NegP

c. (155b) with sentential negation marker:


[Nilay sadece ekmek yemiş] değil.

(17) The phrase structure of Sentence (155a)

Outer Focus
II
CP

Outer Focus
I
vP-external

Inner Focus
vP-internal




(18) The phrase structure of Sentence (155b)

Outer Focus II
CP

Outer Focus I
vP-external

Inner Focus
vP-internal



As seen in the dotted lines in (17) and (18), the Closeness Principle allows the focus particles to move as close as possible to the focus in PF, while the particle is syntactically adjoined to vP and never c-commanded by clausemate negation. The negation in (18) is vP-external negation, therefore this negation and the focus particle is not in the same clause, as also seen in (155c) with sentential negation marker *değil* ‘It is not the case that’.

Our second confirming case for the Closeness Principle operating in PF is the cases where the particle can be placed in various positions in the sentence although it is syntactically in the vP-external domain in all cases due to the fact that focus particles can only adjoin to *maximal* projections and they can never be c-commanded by clausemate negation. The phrase structure of the sentences between (156) and (162) are the same although the positions of the dotted lines which show the movement of the particle in PF would be different. The sample phrase structure can be seen in (19). Please note the different positions of contrastive focus in the sentences which lead to the different positions of the focus particle *bile* ‘even’. Prosodic prominence is denoted with square brackets and subscript F in the interpretations.

- 156) Benim defterimin kapağının üstünde *bile* leke görmedi
 My notebook cover on *even* stain see-NEG-
 PAST.3SG

‘She didn’t even see a stain [_F on the cover of my notebook]’ (Context: This is surprising since it is generally the case that there are dirty marks on the cover of my notebooks.)

157) Benim *bile* defterimin kapağının üstünde leke görmedi
my *even* notebook cover on stain see-NEG-
PAST.3SG

‘She didn’t even see a stain on the cover of [_F my] notebook’ (Context:
This is surprising since I am the most reckless student in the class.)

158) Benim defterimin *bile* kapağının üstünde leke görmedi
my notebook *even* cover on stain see-NEG-
PAST.3SG

‘She didn’t even see a stain on the cover of [_F my notebook]’ (Context:
This is surprising since my notebooks and my books generally have dirty
marks, and my notebooks are more likely to be marked than my books.)

159) Benim defterimin kapağının *bile* üstünde leke görmedi
my notebook cover *even* on stain see-NEG-
PAST.3SG

‘She didn’t even see a stain on [_F the cover] of my notebook’ (Context:
This is surprising because covers are more likely to be marked than the
inner pages.)

160) Benim defterimin kapağının *bile* üstünde leke görmedi
my notebook cover *even* on stain see-NEG-
PAST.3SG

‘She didn’t even see a stain on [_F the cover of my notebook]’ (Context:
This is surprising because we generally expect dirty marks on my

notebooks and my books, and the cover of notebooks are more likely to be marked than the cover of my books.)

- 161) Benim defterimin kapağının üstünde *bile* leke görmedi
my notebook cover on *even* stain see-NEG-
PAST.3SG

‘She didn’t even see a stain [_F on] the cover of my notebook’ (Context: The part that most easily gets dirty marks is the upper face of the cover of my notebook and it is surprising not to see any marks *on* the cover of my notebook.)

- 162) Benim defterimin kapağının üstünde leke *bile* görmedi
my notebook cover on stain *even* see-NEG-
PAST.3SG


‘She didn’t even see [_F a stain] on the cover of my notebook’ (Context: The parts that most easily get dirty marks are the covers of my notebook and it is surprising not to see any marks *on* the cover of my notebook.)

(19) The phrase structure of Sentence (156)

Outer Focus
II
CP

Outer Focus
I
vP-external

Inner Focus
vP-internal



The third confirming case for the Closeness Principle operating in PF is the cases where scalar additive focus particle *bile* ‘even’ is placed between the constituents phrasal verbs which are idioms. I present one of the idioms in Sentence (163).

163)	O	durumun	FARKINA	<i>bile</i>	varmadan	teklifi
		ciddiyetinin				kabul etti
	She	the seriousness	the difference-	even	arrive.at.NEG.	took the
		of the situation	DAT (IDIOM		ABL (IDIOM	offer
			PART 1)		PART 2)	

‘She took the offer without even [_F noticing] the seriousness of the situation.’

(The particle moves to the position between the constituents of the idiomatic verb *farkına var-* ‘to realise, notice’ in PF (Literal meaning of the idiom: *arrive at the difference*). The ablative case on the idiom is interpreted as *without*.)

Other sample idioms, in which the focus particle *bile* ‘even’ can be placed between the parts, are presented in Table 7. The particle syntactically c-commands these verb phrases in all instances.

Table 7. Idioms with *Bile* ‘Even’ between the Constituents

	IDIOM PART 1	<i>bile</i> ‘even’	IDIOM PART 2	Interpretation
1	söz konusu under discussion	<i>bile</i> even	olamaz be-MOD-NEG- AOR.3SG	It cannot even be discussed.
2	işten errand-ABL	<i>bile</i> even	değil not	It is even as easy as pie.
3	gerek necessity	<i>bile</i> even	yok exist.NEG	It is not even necessary.
4	aklının ucundan corner of her mind- ABL	<i>bile</i> even	geçmez cross-NEG- AOR.3SG	It (even) never crosses her mind.
5	umrunda be concerned	<i>bile</i> even	değil not	She does not even care.
6	haberi news	<i>bile</i> even	yok exist.NEG	She does not even know.

Therefore, these three arguments confirm that focus particles get as close as possible to focus and these movements are operations in PF, since the phrase structure does not change during the operations.

Finally, let’s move on to the proposals of the study.

5.2 Focus particles in affirmative sentences (The first proposal)

Chapter 3, which discusses word order and syntactic domain possibilities of the particles, has shown that their syntactic behavior is not uniform. Although they are both defined as the scalar additive focus particles, *hatta* ‘even’ and *bile* ‘even’ have been shown to behave differently under identical truth conditions as also shown

below. In (164), *hatta* ‘even’ is generated like an adverbial, and the association is done through contrastive focus on the object-DP. However, in (165) *bile* ‘even’ follows the focused constituent, like a co-constituent.

164) Hatta ben ELMA yedim
 Even I (an) apple eat-PAST.1SG
 ‘I even ate [_F an apple]’

165) Ben ELMA bile yedim
 Even (an) apple even eat-PAST-1SG
 ‘I even ate [_F an apple]’

Thus, I assume that each particle has its distinct syntactic structure, and all of them have the potential to behave as an adverbial, or a co-constituent, in affirmative clauses. The structure for affirmative clauses can be seen in Table 1 (repeated).

Table 1. The Syntactic Behavior of Focus Particles in Affirmative Clauses

		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain		CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP
Behavior		Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent
Projection		Utterance-level FocusP	Clause-level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase-level adjunction
Type of the focus on the Input		non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive
		A	B	C	D
<i>bile</i> ‘even’	1		+	+/?	+
<i>dA</i> ‘also’	2		+	+	+
<i>sadece</i> ‘only’	3	+	+		+
<i>hatta</i> ‘even’	4	+	+		+
<i>mI</i> ‘Q. part.’	5	+	+	+	+

I suggest that it is possible to generate all particles as adverbials, which would allow them to modify verbal projections. It is also possible, in affirmative sentences, to generate the particles as co-constituents in the phrasal level and adjoin them to non-verbal projections. Each gray cell, which denotes the positive occurrences, are represented below.

The instances with the scalar additive particle *bile* ‘even’ are presented in Sentences (166) and (167). As mentioned in Chapter 3, the +/? mark in the cell (1C) denotes instances where the focus particle *bile* ‘even’ takes tense and agreement

markers, and these uses are evaluated as marginal or unacceptable for most native speakers, although they exist in the sources stated in Chapter 3.

166) ELMA bile yedim
apple even eat-PAST.1SG

‘I even ate [_F (an) apple].’

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 1D

The focus particle is an adjunction to DP.

167) SIGARAYI bile bıraktım
smoking even quit-PAST.1SG

‘I even [_F quit smoking].’

Adjunction to verbal projection – The focused phrase is raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in syntax (pre-Spell Out)- 1B

The focus particle is the head of Clause-level FocusP.


The phrase structure of (166) is given in (20). The focus particle *bile* ‘even’ in this sentence adjoins to a nominal projection [even (an) apple] in an affirmative clause. I assume that in this case the phrase containing the focused phrase and the particle is raised to the clause-level (ν P-external) focus projection in LF for interpretation. Since the particle in this sentence does not adjoin to the verbal

projections, it is a not head in clause-level (vP-external), or utterance-level (CP) focus projections where the focused phrase is raised for interpretation.


However, in (167) the particle adjoins to a verbal projection, and it is the focus head in the vP-external focus projection. Therefore, the whole TopicP is raised to the specifier of vP-external focus projection in syntax (pre-Spell Out). The solid lines show syntactic movements, and the dotted lines show the movements in LF or PF, which occur later (post-Spell Out).



(20) The phrase structure of Sentence (167)



(21) The phrase structure of Sentence (167)



Sentences that correspond to each gray cell in the matrix are presented below.

168) KİMLİĞİMİ de kaybettim.

my ID also lose-PAST.1SG

‘I also lost [_F my ID].’

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle

are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 2D

169) SİGARAYI da bıraktım.

smoking also quit-PAST.1SG

‘I also [_F quit smoking].’

Adjunction to verbal projection – The focused phrase is raised to the

specifier of Clause-level FocusP in syntax (pre-Spell Out)- 2B

170) Sigarayı bırakadabilir

smoking quit-NMLZ-ALSO-KNOW.3SG

‘He may also quit smoking.’ (Literally: He also knows how to quit smoking.)

Phrase-level (vP-internal) FocusP - 2C

The focused phrase and the particle as an adjunct are raised to the specifier of clause-level (vP-external) FocP for interpretation

171) Sadece, Ahmet geldi
only Ahmet come-PAST.3SG
Interpretation: The only thing that happened was that Ahmet came.
Utterance-level (CP) FocusP - 3A

172) Sadece AHMET geldi
only Ahmet come-PAST.3SG
'Only [_F Ahmet] came.'
Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle
are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 3D

173) Ahmet sadece sigarayı bıraktı
Ahmet only quit smoking
'Ahmet only quit smoking.' (He didn't do anything else in the treatment.)
Adjunction to verbal projection – The focused phrase is raised to the
specifier of Clause-level FocusP in syntax (pre-Spell Out)- 3B

174) Hatta, o gün Ahmet gelmişti
Even that day Ahmet come-EVID-PAST.3PL
Interpretation: It was even the case that Ahmet came on that day.
Utterance-level (CP) FocusP - 4A

175) Hatta AHMET geldi
even Ahmet come-PAST.3SG
'Even [_F Ahmet] came.'

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 4D

176) Ahmet hatta SİGARAYI bıraktı

Ahmet even quit smoking

‘Ahmet even [_F quit smoking].’

Adjunction to verbal projection – The focused phrase is raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in syntax (pre-Spell Out)- 4B

177) ELMA mı yedin?

apple Q. part. eat-PAST.2SG

‘Did you eat [_F an apple]?’

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 5D

178) SİGARAYI mı bıraktın?

smoking Q. part quit-PAST.2SG

‘Did you [_F quit smoking]?’

Adjunction to verbal projection – The focused phrase is raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in syntax (pre-Spell Out)- 5B

179) SİGARAYI bile bırakmış mıydın?

smoking even quit-NMLZ Q.part-COP-PAST.2SG

‘Was it even the case that you [_F quit smoking]?’ (Literally: Were you someone who even quit smoking?)

Question Particle: Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 5D

Scalar additive: In dependent clause – Clause-level (vP-external) FocusP – 1B

180) SİGARAYI bile bıraktın mı?
smoking even quit-PAST.2SG Q.part
'Did you even [_F quit smoking]?'
X

Question Particle: Utterance-level (CP) FocusP – 5A

Scalar Additive: Clause-level (vP-external) FocusP – 1B

Therefore, in affirmative sentences, the focus particles may be adjunctions to non-verbal projections, and they can also be focus heads in CP, or vP-external levels. The presence of these three different levels makes it possible to have sentences like (179) and (180), in which different focus particles co-occur in the same sentence.

5.3 Focus particles in negative sentences (The second proposal)

In line with the arguments about the relation between the focus particles and negation stated in Section 4.3, the syntactic behavior matrix is completely different when there is clausemate negation in the sentence. The syntactic possibilities in negative sentences is shown in Table 2 (repeated).

Table 2. The Syntactic Behavior of Focus Particles in Negative Clauses

		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain		CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP
Behavior		Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent
Projection		Utterance-level FocusP	Clause-level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase-level adjunction
Type of the focus on the Input		non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive
		A	B	C	D
<i>bile</i> ‘even’	1		+		
<i>dA</i> ‘also’	2		+		
<i>sadece</i> ‘only’	3	+	+		
<i>hatta</i> ‘even’	4	+	+		
<i>mI</i> ‘Q. part.’	5	+	+		

I argue that, in negative clauses, the particles always function as adverbials, since adjunction to non-verbal projections is impossible due to the interference / intervention effect of negation against raising of the focused phrases to the focus projections above, as also explained in Section 4.3. Sentence (181) and Sentence (182) show instances which both particles are heads of the clause-level focus projections (vP-external), as seen in (22) and (23) respectively. Since the particles cannot be under c-command of clausemate negation, adjunction to non-verbal

projections is impossible. The solid lines show syntactic movements and the dotted line shows movement in LF or PF, which occur after the syntactic movements.

181) Ben ELMA yemedim hatta

I apple eat-NEG-PAST.1SG even

‘I didn’t even eat [_F an apple]’

Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 4B


182) Ben ELMA bile yemedim

I apple even eat-NEG-PAST.1SG


‘I didn’t even eat [_F an apple]’

Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 1B

(22) The phrase structure of Sentence (181)



(23) The phrase structure of Sentence (182)



Sentences which correspond to each gray cell in the matrix are presented below.

- 183) Kimliğimi de almadım.
My ID also receive-NEG-PAST.1SG
'I also didn't receive [_F my ID].'
Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 2B

- 184) Sigarayı da bırakmadım.
Smoking also quit-NEG-PAST.1SG
'I also didn't [_F quit smoking].'
Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 2B

- 185) Sadece, Ahmet gelmedi
only Ahmet come-NEG-PAST.3SG
Interpretation: The only thing that I would object to is that Ahmet did not come. (as opposed to the preceding claim in the context)
Utterance-level (CP) FocusP – 3A

- 186) Sadece Ahmet gelmedi
only Ahmet come-NEG-PAST.3SG
'Only [_F Ahmet] did not come.'
Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 3B

187) Ahmet sadece sigarayı bırakmadı, geri kalanları yaptı.
 Ahmet only didn't quit smoking, he did the rest.
 'Quitting smoking is the only action he did not take, he did everything else
 (for his treatment).'

Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 3B (Focus particle c-commands
 negation)

188) Ahmet sadece sigarayı bırakmadı, spora da başladı
 Ahmet only not quit smoking, he also started to exercise.
 'Ahmet not only quit smoking, but also started to exercise.'

Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 3B
 vP-external NegP (Negation c-commands the focus particle, but they are
 not in the same clause.)

189) Hatta, o gün Ahmet işe gelmemişti
 Even on that day Ahmet come.to.work-NEG-EVID-PAST.3SG
 Interpretation: It was even the case that Ahmet did not come to work on
 that day.

Utterance-level FocusP (CP-level) – 4A

190) Hatta Ahmet gelmedi
 Even Ahmet come-NEG-PAST.3SG
 'Even [_F Ahmet] did not come.'

Clause-level (vP-external) FocusP - 4B

191) Ahmet hatta sigarayı bırakmadı
Ahmet even did not quit smoking
'Ahmet did not even [_F quit smoking].'
Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 4B

192) Elma mı yemedin?
apple Q. part. Eat-NEG-PAST.2SG
'Was it [_F an apple] that you did not eat?'
Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 5B

193) Sigarayı mı bırakmadın?
smoking Q. part quit-NEG-PAST.2SG
'Is the action you did not do quitting smoking?'
Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 5B

194) Sigarayı bırakmadın mı?
smoking quit-NEG-PAST.2SG Q. part
'Didn't you quit smoking?'
Utterance-level FocusP (CP) – 5A

195) Sigarayı bile bırakmadın mı?
smoking even quit-PAST.2SG Q.part
'Didn't you even quit smoking?'
Utterance-level FocusP (CP-level) – 5A
Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 1B

196) a. *Hatta* muhtemelen elma bile / dA yemedi
 even probably (an) apple even / eat-NEG-PAST-1SG
 also

‘(It is even the case that) She probably didn’t even / also eat an apple.’

Utterance-level FocusP (CP-level) – 4A

Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 1B (*bile*) or 2B (*dA*)

b. * Elma yemedi muhtemelen *bile* / *dA*.

197) a. *Hatta* şans eseri bilet bile / dA sormadılar
 even fortunately ticket even / ask.for-NEG-PAST.3PL
 also

‘(It is even the case that) Fortunately, they didn’t even ask for tickets.’

Utterance-level FocusP (CP-level) – 4A

Clause-level FocusP (vP-external) – 1B (*bile*) or 2B (*dA*)

b. * Bilet sormadılar şans eseri *bile*.

Therefore, negation seems to play a major role in the syntactic structure of sentences with focus particles. Similar to the case in affirmative clauses, the existence of three different levels for focus projections makes it possible to have multiple focus particles in a sentence, as illustrated in Sentences (195), (196a), and (197a). It is also important to note that the fact that focus particle *hatta* ‘even’ can command sentence adverbs, while it is impossible for *bile* ‘even’, as seen in the ungrammatical cases in (196b) and (197b), confirms the validity of the matrix.

I will now move on to the third, and final, proposal on the syntax of scalar additive focus particles in Turkish, English and German.

5.4 Scalar additive particles in Turkish, English and German within the matrix perspective (The third proposal)

Based on the findings in the preceding proposals, I found out that the distinct syntactic behavior of the scalar additive focus particle *hatta* ‘even’ and *bile* ‘even’ can be presented on syntactic matrices. I suggest that the scalar particles *even* in English, and *sogar* ‘even’ in German are also compatible with these matrices. The matrix for the scalar additive particles in these three languages is shown in Table 3 (repeated).

Table 3. The Syntactic Behavior of Scalar Additive Focus Particles in Affirmative Clauses

		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain		CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP
Behavior		Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent
Projection		Utterance-level FocusP	Clause-level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase-level adjunction
Type of the focus on the Input		non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive
		A	B	C	D
<i>hatta</i>	1	+	+		+
<i>sogar</i>	2		+		+
<i>even</i>	3		+		+
<i>bile</i>	4		+	+/?	+

As also shown in the table, I suggest that *even* and *sogar* ‘even’ are parallel with *bile* ‘even’ in terms of syntax, excluding the cases where *bile* takes tense and agreement markers. The other particle, *hatta* ‘even’, is the different one in the group since it can also be the head of the utterance-level (CP) focus projection. All the particles can adjoin to non-verbal projections in affirmative clauses, and in these cases, the phrases containing the focused phrase and the focus particle are raised to the specifier of the clause-level (vP-external) focus projection in LF. As also discussed in the previous section, these movements are not syntactic movements since syntactic movements to focus projections necessitate focus particles which are heads in focus projections.

198) Hatta elma yedim
even apple eat-PAST.1SG

‘I even ate [_F (an) apple].

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 1D

199) Elma bile yedim
apple even eat-PAST.1SG

‘I even ate [_F (an) apple].

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 4D

200) Ich habe sogar einen Apfel gegessen
I have even an apple eaten

‘I even ate [_F (an) apple].

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 2D

201) I even ate an apple.

Adjunction to non-verbal projection – The focused phrase and the particle are raised to the specifier of Clause-level FocusP in LF – 3D

All the particles excluding *hatta* ‘even’ necessitate the presence of contrastive focus in the sentence, and it is impossible for these particles to be raised to the specifier of utterance-level focus projection. On the other hand, *hatta* ‘even’ can also

take a sentence without contrastive focus as the Input and the Output, which contains the Input plus the particle, has contrastive focus on the whole clause. Such an instance is represented in Sentence (202).

- 202) Hatta o gün yağmur yağmıştı
 even that day rain-EVID-PAST.3SG
 ‘It was even the case that it rained that day.’
 Utterance-level (CP) FocusP – 1A

Similar to the case in the preceding section, the matrix in negative clauses is different. The matrix is presented in Table 4 (repeated).

Table 4. The Syntactic Classification of Scalar Additive Focus Particles in Negative Clauses

		Outer Focus II	Outer Focus I	Inner Focus	Adjunction to Non-Verbal Projections
Domain		CP	vP-external	vP-internal	DP, PP
Behavior		Adverbial	Adverbial	Co-Constituent	Co-Constituent
Projection		Utterance-level FocusP	Clause-level FocusP	vP-internal FocusP	Phrase-level adjunction
Type of the focus on the Input		non-contrastive & contrastive	contrastive	contrastive	contrastive
		A	B	C	D
<i>hatta</i>	1	+	+		
<i>sogar</i>	2		+		
<i>even</i>	3		+		
<i>bile</i>	4		+		

The matrix shows that it is impossible for these scalar additive particles to adjoin to non-verbal projections in negative clauses. This is confirmed by the fact that *even* and *sogar* ‘even’ which associate with non-verbal projections in negative clauses take scope over negation in the phrase structure, as shown in (203) and (204).

203) I did not even eat an [_F apple].

It is even the case that I did not eat an apple.

NOT: It is not the case that I even ate an apple.

204) I habe sogar einen [_F Apfel] gegessen.

It is even the case that I did not eat an apple.

NOT: It is not the case that I even ate an apple.

Therefore, I assume that the interference / intervention effect of negation against raising of focus particles to focus projections is also observed in English and German. I suggest that also the scalar additive particles in English and German cannot be under the c-command of clausemate negation, due to the fact that focused phrases cannot be interpreted when placed below negation.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to answer three questions on the syntax of focus particles with respect to Turkish. As stated earlier, these questions are as follows: i) Where is the exact location that these particles are generated? (ii) Are there any subsequent movement operations from Surface Structure to Logical Form that would allow the particle take propositional scope, and if yes what are they? (iii) Is it possible for the particles to modify any non-verbal projections? Showing the various locations that the particles can assume in the sentence, this study has shown that the particles in Turkish are more flexible with respect to location compared to their counterparts in English and German.

I have shown that, in affirmative sentences, it is possible for the particles to be base generated in phrase level or generated like an adverb which adjoins to verbal projections. Therefore, there are cases where the same particle can be evaluated both as an adverbial and a syncategorematic function word which attaches the maximal phrase as a co-constituent. However, in negative sentences, negation has an

interference / intervention effect against the raising of focused phrases to the specifier of focus projections.

The cases in negative sentences where we see the particles adjacent to the phrases below Neg Phrase are due to the *Closeness Principle*, which is operational in PF in Turkish. Therefore, adjunction to non-verbal projections is impossible with clausemate negation, these particles can never c-command negation, and the particles in clauses with negation are always adverbials.

In affirmative sentences, all particles were shown to be able to adjoin to verbal and non-verbal projections, confirming the Adverbial & Adnominal account. However, the fact that sentence-initial *hatta* ‘even’ can associate with any of the phrases in the sentence, as opposed to *even* and *sogar* obligatorily modifying the subject-DP, supported the Adverbial-only account. I assume this discrepancy confirms that the assumed dichotomy between Adverbial-only and Adverbial & Adnominal approaches do not exist since sentence-initial *hatta* ‘even’ supports the former, whereas non-verbal adjunction of all of the particles supports the latter. Then, I proposed two tables that show the adverbial vs. co-constituent behavior of the particles. The first table represented the cases in affirmative sentences and the second one in negative sentences.

The third proposal in the study suggested the idea that the interference / intervention effect of negation on focus particles also applies for the scalar additive particles in English and German. Corresponding matrices have been presented to show the syntactic behavior of the scalar additive particles in Turkish, English and German, and these matrices have shown that while adjunction to non-verbal projections is possible for all the particles in affirmative clauses, it is impossible for

all of them to adjoin to these projections in negative clauses, hence suggesting the crosslinguistic validity of the interference / intervention argument.

The next chapter will present the conclusions of the study.



CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the summary of the findings and the proposals in the study and provides some possible implications of the current proposals on the current theories on focus particles.

6.1 Summary of the claims and the findings

As stated earlier, this study started as an attempt to choose between the alternatives of syntactic frameworks provided in the literature, which are mostly based on the particles in English and German. The existence of *hatta* ‘even’, as an adverbial which can be placed sentence-initially and associated with any of the phrases in the sentence, necessitated a new approach to study the syntactic behavior of the particles. Before the new proposals, the theoretical background in the generative framework has been analyzed, from Kuroda (1965), Fischer (1968), and Anderson (1972) to Jacobs, (1983), Rooth (1985), Bayer (1996), Kayne (1998).

Three questions emerge in the literature on focus particles: (i) Where is the exact location that these particles are generated? (ii) Are there any subsequent movement operations from Surface Structure to Logical Form that would allow the particle take propositional scope, and if yes what are they? (iii) Is it possible for the particles to modify any non-verbal projections? Four distinct periods have been found in the evolution of the ideas on the syntax of the particles. While Fischer (1968) proposed that particle is base-generated and later moved to the adverbial position, Anderson (1972) claimed that it is the focused phrase that moves up. Rooth (1985) came up with an innovative approach on association with focus and argued

that it is not necessary for the focused phrase to be syntactic sister to the particle in LF. He claimed that the focused phrase can be interpreted in its base position and the semantic interaction of the particles with focus results from a contribution of focus to the selection of domains of quantification. This study has been built on the Association with Focus approach by Rooth (1985), since it was shown to be consistent with the data in Turkish. The fourth approach by Kayne (1998) involves excessive amounts of overt movement operations, and Büring and Hartmann (2001, p. 259) claims that there is a loss of predictive force that comes with these unrestricted movement operations.

This study has two main proposals on the syntax of focus particles in Turkish. Firstly, I showed that, in affirmative clauses, it is possible for focus particles to be base-generated in phrase level, or to be generated in positions c-commanding verbal projections, as an adverb. The fact that *hatta* ‘even’ can be both generated as an adverb which is placed sentence-initially, or as a co-constituent at the phrase level which is attached to maximal projections like a syncategorematic function word, led us to assume that these characteristics are not mutually exclusive for the particles, and each particle can demonstrate both cases. Therefore, syntactic behavior matrices of the particles in affirmative and negative clauses have been presented. Negation was shown to have inference / intervention effect in syntactic derivation, leading to the fact that these particles cannot be generated in positions c-commanded by negation, since this would prevent raising the focused phrase to the specifier of the focus projections. Thus, it is impossible for particles to adjoin to non-verbal domains in the presence of clausemate negation, and this fact causes them to be classified as adverbials in negative sentences. The sentences where particles in negative sentences

appear to be co-constituents were explained by the *Closeness Principle* (Jacobs, 1983; Büring & Hartmann, 2001), which was shown to operate in PF in Turkish.

6.2 Contribution to the field

This section provides possible implications of the study for some of the current theories on syntactic and semantic features of focus particles.

6.2.1 Possible implications for the Adverbial-only vs. Adverbial and Adnominal theories

As explained in Section 2.2, the domain possibilities of the particles have attracted much interest in the literature. The earlier works on the syntax of focus particles, such as Kuroda (1965), and Anderson (1972), assumed that the adjunction of the particles to non-verbal domains was possible. However, Jacobs' (1983) influential work on the particles in German, limited the possible domains only to verbal projections, making the particles adverbials. This account was supported in Büring and Hartmann's (2001) paper with some revisions in the principles. The counter arguments against the Adverbial-only account were raised in many studies (von Stechow, 1991; Bayer, 1996; Reis, 2005; Meyer & Sauerland, 2009; Smeets & Wagner, 2018 among others), and these studies presented claims for the adjunction of the particles to non-verbal domains. Initially, this study also supported the arguments for the Adverbial & Adnominal account, since all the particles have presented instances where they adjoin to non-verbal domains. However, the fact that sentence-initial *hatta* 'even' can associate with any of the phrases in the sentence supported the Adverbial-only account. Therefore, it is impossible to choose between

the alternative theories to explain the data in Turkish. Therefore, a new approach was developed to account for the data.

In the first two proposals of the study, two tables were presented to show the adverbial vs. co-constituent behavior of particles in Turkish in each phrase level. The first table shows that all of the particles have instances where they behave as an adverbial, or as a co-constituent, therefore, the assumed dichotomy between the Adverbial and Adverbial & Adnominal accounts does not exist. The second table showed that the presence of negation in the clause affects the behavior of the particles. Negation is shown to have interference / intervention effect against the raising of focused phrases to focus projections for interpretation, therefore any adjunction below the Neg Phrase is impossible, and this makes the particles in negative sentences act as adverbials. Therefore, Adverbial-only theory gives right predictions for the particles in negative clauses, while Adverbial & Adnominal theory correctly predicts the behavior correctly in affirmative clauses.

6.2.2 Possible implications for the Scope Theory vs. Lexical Ambiguity Theory in Semantics

There is an interesting debate in the semantics literature on the syntax of focus particle *even*. The interference / intervention effect of negation on the movement of the scalar additive focus particle *even* created two camps trying to explain the behavior of the particle. The first one, the Scope Theory, states that *even* in negative¹⁷ sentences has scope over negation by having a covert movement (Karttunen & Peters, 1979; Wilkinson, 1996; Lahiri, 1998; Guerzoni, 2003; Crnič,

¹⁷ Covert movement in LF is not limited to negation. In the Scope Theory, *even* is argued to move over certain sentential operators which are negative polarity triggers in order to take wide scope. However, I prefer to focus on negation, since this study only covers explicit negation.

2011 a.o.), which can violate certain syntactic stipulations, such as island constraints. The second one, the Lexical Ambiguity Theory, (Rooth, 1985; Rullmann, 1997; Giannakidou, 2007 a.o.) supports the idea that there are two different *evens*. Rooth (1985) states that the scalar additive particle in negative sentences is lexically different from the one in positive sentences as it functions as an NPI, licensed under the scope of negation.

This study has shown that these particles cannot be generated in positions c-commanded by clausemate negation, as shown in (205), and (206). If we assume that these particles can be c-commanded by negation, the interpretations would be incorrect, as seen in (205b) and (206b).

- 205) Hatta ben EKMEK yemedim
 Even I bread eat-NEG-PAST.1SG
 ‘I didn’t even eat (a piece of) bread ’
- a. It is even the case that I didn’t eat [_F bread].
 - b. NOT It is not the case that I even ate [_F bread].

- 206) Ben EKMEK bile yemedim
 I bread even eat-NEG-PAST.1SG
 ‘I didn’t even eat (a piece of) bread’
- a. It is even the case that I didn’t eat [_F bread].
 - b. NOT It is not the case that I even ate [_F bread].

Therefore, this study attempts to present a third alternative to the Scope Theory and the Lexical Ambiguity Theory for Turkish. This alternative neither

violates syntactic constraints, nor assumes two lexically different scalar additive particles, one of which is an NPI. The particles in negative clauses are presented as adverbials above negation in syntactic derivation, and the positions they assume in the surface structure is due to the *Closeness Principle* operating in PF in Turkish. Therefore, they do not move to the adverbial positions, violating the syntactic constraints.

The existence of sentence-initial *hatta* ‘even’, along with another scalar additive focus particle *bile* ‘even’, in negative sentences also confirms the incompatibility of both theories with the data in Turkish, as shown in (207).

- 207) *Hatta* muhtemelen elma *bile* yemedi
 even probably (an) apple even eat-NEG-1SG
 ‘(It is even the case that) She probably didn’t even eat an apple.’
 [*hatta* ‘even’ [probably [*bile* ‘even’ [NEG PHRASE]]]]

The first theory would predict that the first particle *hatta* ‘even’ was base-generated in VP, and later moved to the CP level. However, this would lead to the presence of two scalar additive focus particles in the lowest clause before the movement, which is impossible. The second theory would predict that *hatta* ‘even’ is an NPI, but that inference would also be incorrect. Since *hatta* ‘even’ is above negation (and even c-commands the sentence adverb), it cannot be an NPI. Thus, the third alternative works better on the data in Turkish.

6.3 Future research

The crosslinguistic validity of the arguments in the proposals should also be tested in other languages.



REFERENCES

- Altmann, H. (1976). *Die Gradpartikeln im Deutschen. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Anderson, S. R. (1972). How to get even. *Language*, 48, 893-906.
- Bach, K. (1999). The myth of conventional implicature. *Linguistics and philosophy*, 22(4), 327-366.
- Barbiers, S. (1995). *The Syntax of Interpretation*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Bayer, J. (1996). *Directionality and Logical Form: On the Scope of Focusing Particles and Wh-in-situ*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Beaver, D. I. (1997). Presupposition. In Johan van Benthem and Alice ter Meulen (Eds), *Handbook of Logic and Language* (pp. 939–1008). Cambridge, MA and Amsterdam: MIT Press and North-Holland.
- Beaver, D. I. (2001). *Presupposition and Assertion in Dynamic Semantics*. Stanford, MA, CSLI.
- Büring, D., & Hartmann, K. (2001). The syntax and semantics of focus-sensitive particles in German. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 19(2), 229-281.
- Chafe, W. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C. N. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht: Fortis.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (2011). *Current issues in linguistic theory*, 38. Walter de Gruyter.
- Clément, D., & Thümmel, W. (1975). *Gründzüge einer Syntax der deutschen Standardsprache*. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Cooper, R. (1983). *Quantification and Syntactic Theory*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Crnič, L. (2011). *Getting even* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Dekker, P. (2002). *A proper architecture for presupposition and quantification*, Unpublished manuscript, University of Amsterdam.

- Erguvanlı, E. (1984). *The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Erkü, F. (1983). *Discourse Pragmatics and Word Order in Turkish* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). University of Minnesota.
- Fischer, S. (1968). *On cleft sentences and contrastive stress*. Unpublished manuscript, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Francescotti, R. M. (1995). Even: The conventional implicature approach reconsidered. *Linguistics and philosophy*, 18(2), 153-173.
- Frey, W. (1993). *Syntaktische Bedingungen für die semantische Interpretation*. Akademie Verlag.
- Gamut, L. T. F. (1991). *Logic, Language, and Meaning. Introduction to Logic*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gast, V. & van der Auwera, J. (2013). Scalar additive operators in Transeurasian languages - A comparison with Europe, In M. Robbeets & H. Cuyckens (Eds), *Shared Grammaticalization: A special focus on the Transeurasian languages* (pp. 113-146), Amsterdam: Benjamins,
- Giannakidou, A. (2007). The landscape of EVEN. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 25(1), 39-81.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). In *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech arts*, In Cole et al. (Eds), *Logic and conversation*. New York: Academic Press
- Göksel, A., & Kerslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Göksel, A., & Özsoy, A. S. (2000). Is there a focus position in Turkish? *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages*, 219–228.
- Göksel, A., & Sumru Özsoy, A. (2003). *dA*: A focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua*, 113(11), 1143–1167.
- Guerzoni, E. (2003). *Why even ask?: on the pragmatics of questions and the semantics of answers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Gürer, A. (2015). *Semantic, prosodic, and syntactic marking of information structural units in Turkish* (Unpublished doctoral. dissertation). Boğaziçi University.
- Heim, I. (1983). On the projection problem for presuppositions. In M. Barlow, D. P. Flickinger, and M. T. Westcoat (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd West Coast*

- Conference on Formal Linguistics* (pp. 114–125). Stanford: Stanford Linguistics Association.
- Helbig, G. (1988). Zum Verhältnis von Grammatik und Lexikon (aus der Sicht der Sprachwissenschaft und des Fremdsprachen unterrichts). *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 25(3), 160-167.
- Herrmann, A. (2013). *Modal and focus particles in sign languages: A cross-linguistic study*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Hoffman, B. (1995). *The Computational Analysis of the Syntax and Interpretation of 'Free' Word Order in Turkish* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania.
- Horvath, J. (1986). *Focus in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Iatridou, S., & Kroch, A. (1992). The licensing of CP-recursion and its relevance to the Germanic verb-second phenomenon. In *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1972). *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (1977). *X syntax: A study of phrase structure*. MIT Press.
- Jacobs, J. (1983). *Fokus und skalen: Zur Syntax und Semantik der Gradpartikeln im Deutschen*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kahnemuyipour, A., & Kornfilt, J. (2011). The syntax and prosody of Turkish “pre-stressing” suffixes. *Interfaces in linguistics: New research perspectives*, 205-221.
- Karttunen, L., & Peters, S. (1979). Conventional implicature. *Syntax and semantics*, 11, 1-56.
- Kayne, R. S. (1987). *Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing*. Unpublished manuscript, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kayne, R. S. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax* (No. 25). MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. S. (1998). Overt vs. Covert Movements. *Syntax*, 1(2), 128–191.
- Kelepir, M. (2001). *Topics in Turkish syntax: Clausal structure and scope*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kennelly, S.D. (1997). The presentational focus position of nonspecific objects in Turkish. In: I. Mer, K., Uzun, N.E. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the VIIIth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Ankara: Ankara University Press.

- Kesen, Y. (2010). *Intervention effects in simple wh-questions in Turkish* (Unpublished MA thesis). Boğaziçi University.
- Kılıçaslan, Y. (1994). *Information Packaging in Turkish* (Unpublished MSc dissertation). University of Edinburgh.
- Kornfilt, I. (1997). *Turkish (Descriptive Grammar)*. London: Routledge.
- Koopman, H. (2018). *The view from the syntax: on the relation between linear order and hierarchical structure*, Unpublished manuscript, UCLA.
- Koster, J. (1987). *Domains and Dynasties: The Radical Autonomy of Syntax*, Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- König, E. (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Krahmer, E. (1998). *Presupposition and Anaphora*. Stanford, MA: CSLI.
- Kuroda, S. Y. (1965). *Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Kuroda, S. Y. (1969). Remarks on the notion of subject with reference to words like also, even or only. *Annual Bulletin*, 3, 111-129.
- Kural, M. (1994). Postverbal constituents in Turkish. *GLOW Newsletter*, 32, 34-35.
- Lahiri, U. (1998). Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics*, 6(1), 57-123.
- Larson, R. K. (1988). On the double object construction. *Linguistic inquiry*, 19(3), 335-391.
- Longobardi, G. (1992). In defense of the correspondence hypothesis: Island effects and parasitic constructions in logical form. In *Logical structure and linguistic structure* (pp. 149-196). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Lycan, W. G. (1991). Even and even if. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 14(2), 115-150.
- May, R. C. (1977). *The grammar of quantification* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- May, R. C. (1985). *Logical form: Its structure and derivation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Meyer, M. C., & Sauerland, U. (2009). A pragmatic constraint on ambiguity detection. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 27(1), 139-150.

- Özsoy, A. S. (2019) Derivation of Fronting in Turkish. In: Özsoy A. (Ed) *Word Order in Turkish. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. Springer.
- Potts, C. (2003). *The logic of conventional implicatures* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Potts, C. (2005). *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reis, M. (2005). On the syntax of so-called focus particles in German—a reply to Büring and Hartmann 2001. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 23(2), 459-483.
- Reis, M., & Rosengren, I. (1997). A modular approach to the grammar of additive particles: The case of German auch. *Journal of Semantics*, 14(3), 237-309.
- Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge: MIT Press
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed), *Elements of grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rodman, R. (1976). Scope phenomena, “movement transformations,” and relative clauses. In B. Partee (Ed), *Montague grammar* (pp. 165-176). New York: Academic Press.
- Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with focus* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics*, 1 (1), 75-116.
- Rooth, M. (1996). On the interface principles for intonational focus. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, 6, 202-226.
- Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ross, J. R. (1983). *Inner islands*. Unpublished manuscript, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Rothstein, S. (1991). Heads, projections, and category determination. In *Views on phrase structure* (pp. 97-112). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Rullmann, H. (1997). Even, polarity, and scope. *Papers in experimental and theoretical linguistics*, 4, 40-64.
- Sadan, A. (2012). *The subjunctive mood in Arabic grammatical thought*. Brill.

- Sæbø, K. J. (1997). Topic, focus and quantifier raising. In *Proceedings of the 11th Amsterdam Colloquium, Proceedings of the 11th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 67-72.
- Sauerland, U. (2001). *On quantifier raising in German*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Tübingen.
- Smeets, L., & Wagner, M. (2018). Reconstructing the syntax of focus operators. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 11(6), 1.
- Su, Y. Y. J. (2012). *The Syntax of Functional Projections in the vP Periphery* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto.
- Sudhoff, S. (2010). *Focus particles in German: Syntax, prosody, and information structure*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Şener, S. (2010). *(Non-) Peripheral Matters in Turkish Syntax* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Connecticut.
- Taglicht, J. (1984). *Message and emphasis: On focus and scope in English*, 15. London: Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.
- Tancredi, C. (1990). Syntactic association with focus. In *Proceedings of the First Meeting of the Formal Linguistics Society of Midamerica*, 289–303.
- Vallduvi, E., Engdahl, E. (1996). The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics*, 34, 459– 519.
- Von Stechow, A. (1991). Current issues in the theory of focus, In A. v. Stechow, D. Wunderlich (Eds), *Semantik/Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research* (pp. 804-825), Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Wilkinson, K. (1996). The scope of even. *Natural Language Semantics*, 4(3), 193-215.
- Zimmermann, M. (1997). ‘An Empirical Study of Quantifier Scopepe in German’, In W. Abraham (Ed), *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik*, 41 (pp. 205-225). Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen