
Antipresupposition: Turkish -sA Unified

Ateş İsmail Çalışır

Georg August Universität Göttingen

ates.calisir@uni-goettingen.de

The conditional morpheme in Turkish comes in two varieties, -sA and -(y)sA, for subjunctive (2) and indicative (1) forms respectively (Göksel & Kerslake 2005, Soykan 2021). This creates a problem for the general analysis of subjunctive conditionals since the main argument proposes that the added past morpheme in subjunctive conditionals in many languages like English provides a meaning contribution to change the conditional from indicative to subjunctive. In Turkish, however, the morphologically more complex form is the indicative, assuming that -sA and -(y)sA are not two distinct morphemes. This creates a problem for a unified analysis of conditionals cross-linguistically.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|-----------------|---------|
| (1) | Can | gel- ir-se | Meryem okul-a | gid-er. |
| | John | come-aor-SA | Mary school-dat | go-aor |
| | “If John comes, Mary will go to school.” | | | |
| (2) | Can | gel- se | Meryem okul-a | gid-er. |
| | John | come-SA | Mary school-dat | go-aor |
| | “If John came, Mary would go to school.” | | | |

Here, I will adopt Leahy (2011)’s antipresupposition analysis of indicative conditionals to unify the two morphemes under a single meaning. The analysis proposes that indicative conditionals in English come with a presupposition that the proposition is epistemically possible according to speaker. By assuming that the aorist morpheme in Turkish -Ar carries such a presupposition, it’s possible to unify the two morphemes.

- (3) Presupposition of -Ar: $\Diamond_{\text{epist}} p$

The presupposition eliminates the worlds that the speaker deems epistemically impossible and by virtue of antipresupposition, the bare form lacking the aorist is delegated to the cases where the speaker is not in a position to utter the aorist form. This pragmatically derives the future-less-vivid meaning without proposing any kind of ambiguity wrt. the -sA morpheme.

References: • Leahy, B. (2011). *Presuppositions and Antipresuppositions in Conditionals in Proceedings of SALT 21*. • Göksel, A. & C. Kerslake (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive Grammar*. • Ippolito, M. (2013). *Subjunctive Conditionals: A Linguistic Inquiry*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press. • Percus, O. (2006). Antipresuppositions. In A. Ueyama (ed.), *Theoretical and empirical studies of reference and anaphora*, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science: Report of the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research. (B) • Soykan, B. (2021). *A semantic description of Turkish Conditional sentences*. Masters Thesis, Boğaziçi University.