

Furkan Dikmen, Elena Guerzoni and Ömer Demirok

Hani: We argue that Turkish *hani* introduces the expressive presupposition that the speaker and her audience already believe that its prejacent is true. We propose that the lexical contribution of *hani* provided in (2) makes (1c) infelicitous in context (1a), but felicitous in (1a).

- (1) a. Ahmet and Zeynep know that there is a vegan restaurant around. Ahmet says:
b. Ahmet knows that there is a vegan restaurant around, but Zeynep does not. Ahmet says:
c. **Hani** burada vegan bir restoran var-dı (ya). Oraya gid-elim mi?
hani here vegan one restaurant exist-PST (ya) there go-OPT.1.PL Q
'Hani there was a vegan restaurant here. Shall we go there?'
- (2) For any quintuple $\langle w, t, s, a, g \rangle$, $[[\text{hani}]]^{\langle w, t, s, a, g \rangle} = \lambda p_{\langle s, t \rangle}. \lambda w': \forall w'' \text{ s.t. } w'' \text{ is compatible with what } s \text{ and } a \text{ believe in } w \text{ at } t, p(w'')=1 \wedge w' \in \text{dom}(p). p(w')=1$

We claim that the presupposition is expressive as it concerns conversational parameters among which the time of utterance, and that it is encoded in the meaning of *hani* as a definedness condition. According to (2), the assertion is equivalent to the prejacent. Given this, the felicity conditions imposed by *hani* predict (1c) to be *uninformative* in any context where it is felicitous. Contra [6], [7], [8], however, we observe that this does not necessarily lead to unacceptability, when the redundant assertion is pragmatically legitimized. In the particular case of Turkish, we observe that it is *hani* itself that legitimates the assertion of an already believed prejacent. We suggest that the pragmatic effect of its presupposition is to make salient an already shared belief as to indicate its relevance in the current context. Indeed, the *hani*-sentence in (1c) as a whole sets the stages for the subsequent remark: *Shall we go there?* **HANI & Past:** When *hani* carries intonational prominence, its presupposition shifts to a time prior to the utterance time, affecting its felicity conditions. Prominence on *hani* makes the past marker in the main predicate obligatory (3c) and surprisingly the content of the prejacent is not necessarily interpreted as past (4):

- (3) a. Ahmet and Zeynep know that there is a vegan restaurant around. Ahmet says:
b. Ahmet tells Zeynep that there is a vegan restaurant around. Zeynep walks around to find it, but there is none. Zeynep says:
c. **HANI** burada vegan bir restoran var*(-dı)? *felicitous in (3b), not in (3a)*
HANI here vegan one restaurant exist-PST 'HANI there is a vegan restaurant here?'
- (4) a. Zeynep tells Ahmet that Ali has been in Istanbul for three months, and they should see him before he leaves. Ahmet calls Ali to ask when they can meet him, but, Ali says that he is no longer in Istanbul. Ahmet says to Zeynep:
b. HANI Ali üç ay-dır İstanbul-da-*(y-dı)?
HANI Ali three month-for Istanbul-LOC-COP-PST
'HANI Ali has been in Istanbul for three months?'

In addition to this, the assertion and pragmatic function of clauses like (3c) is very different from what we observed for (1c). (3c) does not assert the prejacent, but rather challenges its previously believed truth, in light of current evidence, in a manner similar to English questions with inner negation (c.f. *Was a vegan restaurant not here after all?*)([1]). **Proposal:** We argue that the contribution of *hani* is one and the same in (1) and (3c), and the past shift of its presupposition in (3c) constitutes evidence that *hani* is in the scope of the past morpheme in this sentence. Specifically, we suggest that, the structure of (3c) is (5) rather than (6).

- (5) [**HANI** a vegan restaurant here be]-past. (6) **Hani**[a vegan restaurant here be-past]

There are two main views on the semantics of the past tense: a referential anaphoric view ([4]) and an existential quantification view (involving contextual domain restrictions, [3]). Regardless of the semantics of PAST one adopts, the TC and definedness condition derivation for (6) is straightforward. (A sketchy derivation of its TCs and definedness conditions is provided in (8), where we adopted the referential view merely in the interest of space).

- (7) $\textcircled{2}[\textit{hani} [\textcircled{1}[\text{past}_4 \text{ there be a vegan restaurant }]]]$
- (8) a. $\llbracket \textcircled{1} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} = \lambda w': g(4) < t. \text{ there is a vegan restaurant at } g(4) \text{ in } w'$ (FA)
 b. $\llbracket \textcircled{2} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} = \lambda w': \forall w'' \text{ s.t } w'' \text{ is compatible with what } s \text{ and a believe in } w \text{ at } t, \text{ there is a vegan restaurant at } g(4) \text{ in } w'' \wedge g(4) < t. \text{ there is a vegan restaurant at } g(4) \text{ in } w'$ (FA)

(5), on the contrary, is uninterpretable in a standard semantic model, due to a type mismatch between $\llbracket \text{past} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)}$ and $\llbracket \text{HANI there is a vegan restaurant here} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)}$. The latter denoting a function from worlds to TVs, neither has a referential reading of the past in its domain, nor is in the domain of an existential interpretation of it. We argue that this sentence is interpretable, and its expressive presupposition is shifted to the past, due to the availability in Turkish of the “monstrous” FA application rule (MFA) in ((9)).

- (9) If α is a branching node and $\{\beta, \gamma\}$ the set of its daughters, and for any context $\langle w,t,s,a,g \rangle$, $\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} \in \text{dom}(\lambda t'. \llbracket \beta \rrbracket^{(w,t',s,a,g)})$, then $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} = [\lambda t': \gamma \in \text{dom}(\llbracket \rrbracket^{(w,t',s,a,g)}) \wedge \beta \in \text{dom}(\llbracket \rrbracket^{(w,t',s,a,g)})]$

(9) generates a λ -abstract over the context time, thus generating a semantic object similar to a Kaplan’s character. Where the latter is a function from contexts to intentions, the abstract resulting from our rule is a function from a single contextual parameter (t) to intensions ([5]). Importantly, although PAST takes scope outside the prejacent in (5), the latter is not an untensed proposition. Since the Turkish present tense is unmarked and past morphology undergoes deletions in the scope of other higher operators (see (10)), the tense in the prejacent of (3c) may be present or past itself.

- (10) a. Ali (dün)/(şimdi) gel-iyor(*-du)-muş.
 Ali (yesterday)/(now) come-PROG-(PST)EVID
 Ali was/is coming, I heard.

The second part of our proposal accounts for the observation that (3c) does not amount to an assertion of the prejacent, but expresses the speaker’s current skepticism that the prejacent is true. We take this, to indicate that the denotation of (3c) is actually that of a polar question, whose presuppositions generate the effect of the novel incredulity on the part of the speaker relative to the truth of the prejacent. Given this, the complete structure of (3c) is as given in (11).

- (11) $\textcircled{5}[Q[\textcircled{4}[\text{past}_5[\textcircled{3}[\textit{hani}[\emptyset_{\text{present}_4} \text{ there be a vegan restaurant }]]]]]]$

- (12) a. $\llbracket \textcircled{3} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} = \lambda w': \forall w'' \text{ s.t } w'' \text{ is compatible with what } s \text{ and a believe in } w \text{ at } t, \text{ there is a vegan restaurant at } g(4) \text{ in } w'' \wedge g(4) \circ t. \text{ there is a vegan restaurant at } g(4) \text{ in } w'$ (FA twice)
 b. $\llbracket \textcircled{4} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} = \lambda w': \forall w'' \text{ s.t } w'' \text{ is compatible with what } s \text{ and a believe in } w \text{ at } g(5) \wedge g(5) < t, \text{ there is a vegan restaurant at } g(4) \text{ in } w'' \wedge g(4) \circ g(5). \text{ there is a vegan restaurant at } g(4) \text{ in } w'$ (MFA)
 c. $\llbracket \textcircled{5} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} = \{ \llbracket \textcircled{4} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)}, \neg \llbracket \textcircled{4} \rrbracket^{(w,t,s,a,g)} \}$

The resulting semantics is that of a polar question with the same presuppositions of the argument of the question operator (See [2] for projection) (see (12)). Since the speaker of (3c) asks whether there presently is a vegan restaurant close by and at the same time presupposes that she and the addressee believed in the past that there was one, she conveys that she is now skeptical about what she previously believed. **Conclusions:** We present the first compositional analysis of *hani* which considers that *hani* sentences, although not easily embeddable, may scope under the past tense. Although our analysis comes with the stipulation of a novel semantic rule, it copes better with the scope facts we observed here than potential alternatives that place expressive content on a dimension that is separate from the syntax-semantic interface. One question that we leave open is the exact function of the optional final *ya* compatible with (1c), and the polar question intonation it triggers. According to our informants assertion and felicity conditions of (1c) are unchanged regardless of the presence of *ya*. **References:** [1]Akar, D. & Öztürk, B. (2020). The discourse marker *hani* in Turkish. [2]Guerzoni, E. (2003). *Why even ask?: on the pragmatics of questions and the semantics of answers* [3]Ogihara, T. (1995). Tense and aspect in truth-conditional semantics. [4]Partee, B.H. (1973). Some structural analogies between tenses and pronouns in English [5]Santorio, P. (2010). Modals are monsters: on indexical shift in English. [6]Stalnaker, R. (1978). Assertion. [7]Stalnaker, R. C. (1999). *Context and content*. [8]Stalnaker, R. (2002). Common ground.