

## Is There a Topic and Focus Position in the DP: Evidence from Turkish

Özlem Ergelen

Boğaziçi University

[ozlem.ergelen@boun.edu.tr](mailto:ozlem.ergelen@boun.edu.tr)

Some researchers argue that similar to the CP, the DP also possesses information structure with layers such as Topic and Focus (Giusti 1996, Aboh 2004, Haegeman 2004, among others), mainly along the lines of Rizzi (1997). I will examine whether one can trace such kind of information structure in Turkish nominal phrases. I will provide further support for the split-DP hypothesis by arguing that Turkish DPs project Topic and Focus phrases by means of moving constituents into these projections.

In this study, I assume that Turkish projects a DP layer, and demonstratives are base generated inside this projection. This is because demonstratives are in close relationship with the accusative case, which licenses definiteness and specificity (Enç 1991, Öztürk 2005), and the absence of the accusative case marking on the object when the object has a demonstrative leads to ungrammaticality.

In Turkish, although demonstratives originate inside the DP, some constituents can appear before demonstratives. In (1) when the order of the genitive-marked DP and the demonstrative is swapped, the interpretations change:

- (1) a. *şu Burak-ın şapka-sı*                      b. *Burak-ın ŞU şapka-sı*  
that Burak-GEN hat-POSS.3SG              Burak-GEN that hat-POSS.3SG  
“that hat of Burak”                              “that hat among Burak’s hats”

(1a) implies that Burak might have only one hat; it has no implication regarding Burak’s possession of other hats. (1b), however, presupposes that Burak has more than one hat. In addition, the demonstrative *şu* “that” receives prosodic focus. Thus, I argue that (1b) is obtained through information structure-related movement. Above the DP layer, there are TopP and FocP projections in this order. The demonstrative *şu* “that” moves into FocP, and the DP *Burak-ın* “Burak-GEN” moves into TopP because this possessor DP must be familiar in the discourse. In (1a), however, the constituents stay in their base positions.

The same interpretation is obtained with respect to the position of an adjectival phrase. Moving an adjective in front of a demonstrative brings along an interpretational difference:

- (2) a. *şu kırmızı şapka*                              b. *kırmızı ŞU şapka*  
that red hat    red that hat  
“that red hat”    “that red hat among red hats”

While (2a) merely points to a red hat, (2b) presupposes that there is more than one red hat and points to a specific one among the set of red hats. The demonstrative *şu* “that” in (2b) must have prosodic focus, and the color of the hat, *kırmızı* “red”, must be familiar in the context. Therefore, *şu* “that” moves into FocP, and the adjective *kırmızı* “red” moves into the TopP above the FocP.

As for the interaction between CP-level and DP-level information structure, both domains project their own topic and focus phrases, as shown in (3):

- (3) *Ben<sub>TOP</sub> [kırmızı<sub>TOP</sub> ŞU<sub>FOC</sub> elbise-yi] ÇOK<sub>FOC</sub> beğen-di-m.*  
I red that dress-ACC a.lot like-PAST-1SG  
“I liked THAT red dress MUCH”

The bracketed DP above hosts its own topic *kırmızı* “red” and focus *şu* “that”, and the CP hosts *ben* “I” in its TopP and *çok* “a lot” in its FocP. Because it is often assumed that the CP and DP comprise phase domains, it is plausible for each of these projections to host their own functional phrases.

Overall, I will show that Turkish nominal phrases bear information structure related functional categories in its left periphery, which is composed of TopP and FocP above the DP. The order alternations result from relevant information structure reflected on surface syntax.

### Selected References

- Aboh, E. 2004. Topic and Focus within D. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 21, 1-12.  
Bošković, Ž., Şener, S. 2014. The Turkish NP. Eds. Hofherr, P. C., Zribi-Hertz, A., *Cross-linguistic Studies on Nominal Reference: With and Without Articles*. Leiden: Brill.  
Enç, M. 1991. The Semantics of Specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 1–25.  
Giusti, G. 1996. Is There a Focus P and a Topic P in the Noun Phrase Structure? *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 6 (2), 105-128.  
Haegeman, L. 2004. DP-Periphery and Clausal Periphery: Possessor Doubling in West Flemish. In Adger, D.,

- Cat, C., de Tsoulas, G. (Eds.), *Peripheries*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 211-240.
- Öztürk, B. 2005. *Case, Referentiality and Phrase Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Haegeman, L. (Ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281-337.