Pseudo-sluicing in Turkish: A *pro*-form Analysis

Bilge Palaz[*]

Abstract. This study investigates sluicing-like constructions (a.k.a pseudo-sluicing) in Turkish and argues that they can be best accounted for by a *pro*-form analysis. The explanation rests on the properties of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish such as lack of case connectivity, presence of copula in the pseudo-sluice, lack of island effect and the ungrammaticality with sprouting. All these characteristics significantly challenge a possible elliptical cleft approach, and provide evidence for a *pro*-form analysis where the *wh*-word is preceded by a null e-type pronoun, as originally suggested for sluicing-like constructions in Mandarin Chinese (cf. Adams 2004, Adams and Tomioka 2012).

Keywords. Pseudo-sluicing; *wh*-in-situ; clefts; pro-form; Turkish

1. Introduction. Sluicing is considered to be an elliptical construction that involves a remnant *wh*-phrase and an elided constituent (TP) (Ross 1969; Merchant 2001, 2004).

(1)   a.   Jack bought something, but I don't know what.
         b.   A: Someone called. B: Really? Who?

<div align="right">(Merchant 2004, 664)</div>

The *wh* remnants *what* and *who* in above examples stand for a complete interrogative clause and they have an indefinite correlate such as *something* and *someone* in the antecedent clause. According to the prominent movement and deletion approach to sluicing in the literature (Merchant 2001, 2004; Weir 2014 among several others), the remnant *wh*-word in ellipsis moves to the specifier of CP, and the Ellipsis ([E]) feature on C head licenses the deletion of its complement, TP, at PF.

On the other hand, not all cases that look like sluicing seem amenable to the assumed analysis for sluicing. *Wh*-in-situ languages are mostly argued to lack English-type, genuine sluicing structures (Kizu 1997; Merchant 1998; Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006). Sentence in (2) illustrates a sluicing-like structure in Japanese, which has been labelled as *pseudo-sluicing*.

(2)   Dareka-ga   sono hon-o   yon-da   ga, watashi-wa dare ka wakaranai.
         Someone-NOM that   book-ACC read-PAST but, I-TOP   who Q know.not
         'Someone read that book, but I don't know who.'

<div align="right">(Merchant 1998, 4)</div>

Different from English-type sluicing, pseudo-sluicing in Japanese has been analyzed as elliptical clefts rather than being an instance of TP deletion, mainly because pseudo-sluicing shows the

---

characteristics of cleft constructions in Japanese (Kizu 1997; Merchant 1998; Hiraiwa and Ishihara 2012 among several others)[1].

Turkish is also a *wh*-in-situ language, but it has been shown to exhibit sluicing structures akin to the ones in *wh*-movement languages (cf. İnce 2009; Şener 2013; Palaz to appear)[2]. Sentences in (3) exemplifies such structures in Turkish.

(3)   a.   Cem-Ø   biri-**nden** kaç-ıyor-du   ama KİM-**DEN**(-Ø-di)
           Cem-NOM s.o-**ABL**   escape-PRS-PST.3SG but   who-**ABL**(-COP-PST)
           bil-mi-yor-um.
           know-NEG-PRS-1SG
           'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't know who.'

     b.   Öğretmen-imiz-Ø   dün   bir şey-**e**   çok kız-mış   ama
           Teacher-1PL.POSS-NOM yesterday something-**DAT** a lot get.angry-EV.3SG but
           NEY-**E**(**-**y-miş)   anla-ma-dık.
           what-**DAT**(-COP-EV) understand-NEG-PAST.1PL
           'Our teacher got really angry about something yesterday, but we didn't understand what.'

This paper argues that Turkish also has sluicing-like structures as exemplified in (4). These constructions are notably different from genuine sluicing and are not amenable to the sluicing analysis.

(4)   a.   Cem-Ø   biri-**nden** kaç-ıyor-du   ama KİM-Ø(-di)   bil-mi-yor-um.
           Cem-NOM s.o-ABL   escape-PRS-PST.3SG but   who-COP(-PST) know-NEG-PRS-1SG
           'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't know who (that was).'

     b.   Öğretmen-imiz-Ø   dün   bir şey-**e**   çok kız-mış   ama
           Teacher-1PL.POSS-NOM yesterday something-**DAT** a lot get.angry-EV.3SG but
           NE-Ø[3](-miş)   anla-ma-dık.
           what-COP(-EV) understand-NEG-PAST.1PL
           'Our teacher got really angry about something yesterday, but we didn't understand what (that was).'

For structures as in (3) where *wh*-remnant carries the same case marking as its correlate, I use the label (genuine) sluicing. For structures like in (4) that exhibit lack of case connectivity, I use the label pseudo-sluicing. İnce (2006) examines sluicing-like constructions in Turkish, but he considers examples as in (3) as pseudo-sluicing and suggests a movement + deletion analysis for them without discussing structures like (4). However, I argue that structures where *wh*-remnant carries the same case marking as its correlate should be categorized as genuine sluicing (as in 3), whereas the lack of case connectivity as in (4) is a primary indication of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish and it involves a *pro*-form.

---

[1] See Takashi (1994) for an alternative analysis of sluicing-like structures in Japanese, which is in line with the TP deletion approach as opposed to the cleft analysis.

[2] Discussion of the genuine sluicing as in (3) is beyond the scope of this paper. See İnce (2009), Şener (2013) and Palaz (to appear) for different accounts of sluicing in Turkish.

[3] Copula is pronounced as -*y* when the optional evidential marker is also pronounced. See section 2.2 for the explanation.

This paper focuses on the structure of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish and investigates how such constructions are derived. The organization is as follows. Section 2 discusses the basic properties of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish by comparing it with sluicing when relevant. Section 3 explores the possibility of the clefts as the source of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish and points out the potential problems such an approach would have to face. Section 4 shows that pseudo-sluicing in Turkish is best captured by a *pro*-form analysis as proposed in Adams (2004) and Adams and Tomioka (2012) for Chinese. Section 5 is the conclusion.

2. Basic Properties. Pseudo-sluicing structures in Turkish exhibit certain properties that are fundamentally different from the genuine sluicing constructions as hinted at in the introduction. I will first discuss those properties as it is important to see the differences between sluicing and pseudo-sluicing structures in Turkish before proposing an analysis for the latter.

2.1. LACK OF CASE CONNECTIVITY. The first property of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish, which also distinguishes it from sluicing, is the lack of case connectivity. As Merchant (2001) discusses comprehensively, sluicing structures exhibit case connectivity. Case connectivity means that the case on the remnant *wh*-word has to match with the case on its indefinite correlate in the antecedent clause. Sluicing in Turkish exhibits case connectivity as illustrated in (5-a), whereas pseudo-sluicing structures do not show such connectivity effect as in (5-b).

(5)   a.   *Sluicing*
           Cem-Ø   biri-**ne** kız-mış   ama KİM-**E**   sor-ma-dı-m.
           Cem-NOM s.o-**DAT** get.angry-EV.3SG but   who-**DAT** ask-NEG-PST-1SG
           'Cem got angry at someone, but I didn't ask who.'

        b.   *Pseudo-sluicing*
           Cem-Ø   biri-**ne** kız-mış   ama KİM-Ø   sor-ma-dı-m.
           Cem-NOM s.o-**DAT** get.angry-EV.3SG but   who-COP ask-NEG-PST-1SG
           'Cem got angry at someone, but I didn't ask who (that was).'

Both the indefinite correlate, *someone*, and the *wh*-remnant, *who*, bear dative case in (5-a). Pseudo-sluicing (5-b), on the other hand, lacks case connectivity as the *wh*-remnant is caseless.

    Comparing (a) and (b) sentences in (6) illustrates this difference between the two constructions with the ablative case.

(6)   a.   *Sluicing*
           Cem-Ø   biri-**nden** kaç-ıyor-du   ama KİM-**DEN** bil-mi-yor-um.
           Cem-NOM s.o-**ABL**   escape-PRS-PST.3SG but who-**DAT** know-NEG-PRS-1SG
           'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't know who.'

        b.   *Pseudo-sluicing*
           Cem-Ø   biri-**nden** kaç-ıyor-du   ama KİM-Ø   bil-mi-yor-um.
           Cem-NOM s.o-**ABL**   escape-PRS-PST.3SG but who-COP know-NEG-PRS-1SG
           'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't know who (that is).'

Ablative case is realized both on the indefinite and the *wh*-remnant in (6-a), whereas the *wh*-remnant in pseudo-sluicing (6-b) does not bear the ablative case unlike its correlate.

    Similarly, case connectivity is observed with the genitive case in genuine sluicing (7-a), but not in pseudo-sluicing (7-b).

(7) a. *Sluicing*
     Deniz-Ø   bir ders-**in**   kitab-ın-ı   arı-yor-du   ama HANGİ
     Deniz-NOM a   course-**GEN** book-POSS-ACC search-PRS-PST.3SG but which
     DERS-İN   bil-mi-yor-um.
     course-GEN know-NEG-PRS-1SG
     'Deniz was searching for some course's book, but I don't know which course's.'

   b. *Pseudo-sluicing*
     Deniz-Ø   bir ders-**in**   kitab-ın-ı   arı-yor-Ø-du   ama HANGİ
     Deniz-NOM a   course-**GEN** book-POSS-ACC search-PRS-COP-PST.3SG but which
     DERS-Ø(-ti)   bil-mi-yor-um.
     course-COP(-PAST) know-NEG-PRS-1SG
     'Deniz was searching for some course's book, but I don't know which course (that was).'

Note further that case connectivity in sluicing and its being nonexistent in pseudo-sluicing in Turkish hold for all other cases as well.

2.2. THE PRESENCE OF COPULA. Next property we shall discuss is the existence of copula that attaches to the *wh*-word in pseudo-sluicing structures. In Turkish, copula attaches to the non-verbal predicates and it is realized as either phonologically null, or as *-y* depending on the preceding sound (Kornfilt 1996; Kelepir 2007).

(8) a. Biz genc-**Ø**-iz.
     We young-**COP**-1PL
     'We are young.'

   b. Biz hasta-y-mış-ız.
     We sick-**COP**-EV-1PL
     'Apparently, we are/were sick.'

                                                                    (Kelepir 2007, 40)

Such copular forms are found in pseudo-sluicing constructions too. Copula attaches to the *wh*-word in pseudo-sluicing, indicating that it must be a non-verbal predicate. Sentence in (9-a) illustrates the null copula in pseudo-sluicing, and (9-b) does so the *-y* allomorph.

(9) a. Ece-Ø   birin-den çekin-iyor-du   ama KİM-**Ø**-di   sor-ma-dı-m.
     Ece-NOM s.o-ABL   abstain-PRS-PST.3SG but who-**COP**-PST ask-NEG-PST-1SG
     'Ece was abstaining from someone, but I didn't ask who (that was).'

   b. Ece-Ø   bir şey-den çekin-iyor-du   ama NE-**Y**-di   sor-ma-dı-m.
     Ece-NOM sth-ABL   abstain-PRS-PST.3SG but what-**COP**-PST ask-NEG-PST-1SG
     'Ece was abstaining from something, but I didn't ask what (that was).'

Also, copula can be realized as *-i* in Turkish when it is a bound stem (Kelepir 2007). The sentences in (9) are illustrated with *-i* form in (10) respectively.

(10) a. Ece-Ø   birin-den çekin-iyor-du   ama KİM **i**-di   sor-ma-dı-m.
     Ece-NOM s.o-ABL   abstain-PRS-PST.3SG but who **COP**-PST ask-NEG-PST-1SG
     'Ece was abstaining from someone, but I didn't ask who (that was).'

b. Ece-Ø   bir şey-den çekin-iyor-du   ama NE **i**-di   sor-ma-dı-m.
Ece-NOM sth-ABL   abstain-PRS-PST.3SG but what **COP**-PST ask-NEG-PST-1SG
'Ece was abstaining from something, but I didn't ask what (that was).'

Importantly, this property of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish, namely the presence of copula, is compatible with the characteristics of Japanese and Chinese pseudo-sluicing as discussed in the literature (Kizu 1997; Merchant 1998; Adams 2004; Adams and Tomioka 2012 among several others). Copula in Japanese pseudo-sluicing is generally considered to be optional, and copula always occurs with certain *wh*-words in Chinese. Similar to Japanese and Chinese, it is not unexpected that the *wh*-word in pseudo-sluicing in Turkish co-occurs with the copular form.

2.3. ISLAND INSENSITIVITY. Another characteristic of pseudo-sluicing is its being insensitive to islands in Turkish. It is well-attested in the literature that Turkish is a *wh*-in-situ language (Akar 1990; Özsoy 1996; Arslan 1999; Görgülü 2006). In Turkish, the island effect is observed when a *wh*-word is overtly moved out of an island such as a relative clause (11-a). There is no island effect when a *wh*-word is in-situ (11-b).

(11) a. ***Kim-den**$_i$ Cem-Ø   Ece-ye **t**$_i$ hoşlan-an kız-ı   göster-miş?
Who-ABL Cem-NOM Ece-DAT   like-REL   girl-ACC show-EV.3SG
Int: 'Who$_i$ did Cem show Ece the girl that likes *t*$_i$?'

b. Cem-Ø   Ece-ye **kim-den** hoşlan-an kız-ı   göster-miş?
Cem-NOM Ece-DAT who-ABL like-REL   girl-ACC show-EV.3SG
'Who$_i$ did Cem show Ece the girl that likes *t*$_i$?'

Turning back to pseudo-sluicing, (12) illustrates the lack of the island effect in pseudo-sluicing with a Complex NP island.

(12) *Complex NP island*
Cem-Ø   Pelin-in biri-nden hoşlan-dığ-ı   söylentisi-ni duy-muş   ama KİM-Ø
Cem-NOM Pelin-GEN s.o-ABL   like-NMLZ-POSS rumor-ACC   hear-EV.3SG but who-COP
bil-mi-yor-um.
know-NEG-PRS-1SG
'Cem heard the rumor that Pelin likes someone, but I don't know who (that is).'

The same is true with an adjunct island in (13).

(13) *Adjunct island*
Cem-Ø   birin-e kız-dığ-ı   için kaza   yap-mış   ama KİM-Ø
Cem-NOM s.o.-DAT get.angry-NMLZ-POSS for   accident do-EV.3SG but who-COP
bil-mi-yor-um.
know-NEG-PRS-1SG
'Cem had an accident because he got angry at someone, but I don't know who (that is).'

Pseudo-sluicing is again grammatical with a relative clause island as demonstrated in (14).

(14) *Relative clause island*
Öğretmen-Ø bir ders-ten kal-an öğrenci-yi   sınıf-ta   bırak-mış   ama
Teacher-NOM a   class-ABL fail-REL student-ACC class-LOC leave-EV.3SG but
HANGİ DERS-Ø bil-mi-yor-um.
which   class-COP know-NEG-PRS-1SG

'The teacher did not let a student pass (his/her grade) who failed in a class, but I don't know which class (that is).'

2.4. SPROUTING. Last property we shall discuss is that pseudo-sluicing in Turkish does not allow sprouting. Sprouting is a type of sluicing where there is no overt indefinite correlate in the antecedent clause (Chung et al. 1995). Sentences in (15) illustrate sprouting in English.

(15) a. John is eating, but I don't know what.
      b. Bill was planning to serve the guests, but we didn't know what.

Similarly, sluicing structures allow sprouting in Turkish as in (16a-b).

(16) a. Cem-Ø   tüm gece oda-sın-da   çalış-tı   ama NEY-E
          Cem-NOM all night room-POSS.3SG-LOC study-PST.3SG but what-DAT
          bil-mi-yor-um.
          know-NEG-PRS-1SG
          'Cem studied all night in his room, but I don't know what.'

      b. Ali-Ø   aşık ol-muş   ama Ece-Ø   KİM-E   bil-mi-yor.
          Ali-NOM love be-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM who-DAT know-NEG-PRS.3SG
          'Ali fell in love, but Ece doesn't know with who.'

However, sprouting is ungrammatical with pseudo-sluicing[4].

(17) a. *Cem-Ø   tüm gece oda-sın-da   çalış-tı   ama NE-Ø
          Cem-NOM all night room-POSS.3SG-LOC study-PST.3SG but what-COP
          bil-mi-yor-um.
          know-NEG-PRS-1SG
          Int: 'Cem studied all night in his room, but I don't know what (that is).'

      b. *Ali-Ø   aşık ol-muş   ama Ece-Ø   KİM-Ø   bil-mi-yor.
          Ali-NOM love be-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM who-COP know-NEG-PRS.3SG
          Int: 'Ali fell in love, but Ece doesn't know who (that is).'

Comparing the sentences in (16) and (17) clearly shows that the *wh*-word in pseudo-sluicing requires an overt indefinite correlate, yet a covert antecedent is sufficient for genuine sluicing in Turkish.

Up to this point, we have discussed the characteristics of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish such as the lack of case connectivity, the existence of copula, island insensitivity and the impossibility with sprouting. These all provide evidence for the argument that pseudo-sluicing structures are different from genuine sluicing, and Turkish exhibits both. Next, we shall consider some possible approaches to explain the structure of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish.

3. Pseudo-sluicing ≠ Elliptical Clefts in Turkish. Pseudo-sluicing has been attested in other *wh*-in-situ languages, such as Japanese, which is structurally similar to Turkish. In Japanese,

---

[4] One anonymous reviewer notes that s/he finds sprouting with pseudo-sluicing grammatical in Turkish (as in (17a-b) and all similar cases throughout this paper). The same reviewer also indicates that s/he finds it ungrammatical when there is an overt subject in pseudo-sluicing as in (16-b). The judgments presented in this paper are based on my informants' (N=12) and my own intuitions. If there is a speaker variation as indicated by the reviewer, I suspect that such grammaticality judgments might belong to a different dialect (Dialect B). As I could not access to the speakers of Dialect B, the pro-form analysis as proposed in this paper does not attempt to capture the pseudo-sluicing structures in that dialect.

pseudo-sluicing is considered to be a reduced form of clefts where the subject CP gets elided leaving the *wh*-pivot as the remnant (Kizu 1997; Merchant 1998; Hiraiwa and Ishihara 2012). Sentence in (18) is from Japanese showing how elliptical cleft analysis works.

(18) Dareka-ga   kono hon-o   yon-da   ga, watashi-wa [CP [IP [CP ~~Opᵢ [IP eᵢ kono~~
       Someone-NOM this   book-ACC read-PAST but 1SG-TOP   that   this
       ~~hon-o   yon-da]   noᵢ]~~ wa **dareᵢ (da)**]-ka] wakaranai.
       book-ACC read-PAST NM-TOP who copula-Q   know-NOT
       'Someone read that book, but I don't know **whoᵢ** [IP (it is) [CP ~~that tᵢ read this book~~]].'

Such an approach can easily derive the pseudo-sluicing structures in Japanese because clefts and pseudo-sluicing in Japanese share several properties. The question we shall now address is whether this tempting analysis can be extended to Turkish pseudo-sluicing.

To start with, pivots in cleft constructions are always nominative in Turkish as also discussed in İnce (2006, 2009).

(19) Pelin-in e_1 hediye al-dığ-ı   Ece$_1$-**Ø**-y-di.
       Pelin-GEN   present buy-REL-POSS Ece-**NOM**-COP-PST.3SG
       'That was Ece who Pelin bought a present for.'

Other cases on the pivot cause ungrammaticality.

(20) *Pelin-in e_1 hediye al-dığ-ı   Ece$_1$-**ye**-y-di.
       Pelin-GEN   present buy-REL-POSS Ece-**DAT**-COP-PST.3SG
       Int: 'That was Ece who Pelin bought a present for.'

One might claim that the *wh*-word in pseudo-sluicing also has nominative case as nominative case is not phonologically overt in Turkish, and an elliptical cleft analysis applies to Turkish too since both the pivot in clefts and the *wh*-word in pseudo-sluicing can be followed by a copula and (optional) Tense-Aspect-Modality (TAM) markers. Accordingly, a possible cleft analysis would look like (21).

(21) Cem-Ø   biri-nden kaç-ıyor-du   ama [CP ~~Cem-in e_1 kaç-tığ-ı~~]
       Cem-NOM s.o-ABL   escape-PRS-PST.3SG but
       KİM$_1$-Ø-Ø(-di)   hatırla-mı-yor-um.
       who-NOM-COP(-PST) remember-NEG-PRS-1SG
       'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't remember who (that was).'

However, I argue that pseudo-sluicing cannot be analyzed as reduced clefts in Turkish. Crucially, pseudo-sluicing is not sensitive to islands in Turkish as shown in (12-14) above, whereas clefts are island sensitive (22-24).

(22) *Complex NP island*
        *Cem-in   Pelin-in e_1 hoşlan-dığ-ı   söylentisi-ni duy-duğ-u   KİM$_1$-Ø-Ø?
         Cem-GEN Pelin-GEN like-NMLZ-POSS rumor-ACC hear-REL-POSS who-NOM-COP
         Int: 'Who is it that Cem heard the rumor that Pelin likes?'

(23) *Adjunct island*
        *Cem-in e_1 kız-dığ-ı   için kaza   yap-tığ-ı   KİM$_1$-Ø-Ø?
         Cem-GEN get.angry-NMLZ-POSS for accident do-REL-POSS who-NOM-COP
         Int: 'Who is it that Cem had an accident because he got angry at?'

(24) *Relative clause island*
    *Öğretmen-in e_1 kal-an   öğrenci-yi   sınıf-ta   bırak-tığ-ı   HANGİ DERS$_1$-Ø-Ø?
    Teacher-GEN   fail-REL student-ACC class-LOC leave-REL-POSS which class-NOM-COP
    Int: 'Which class is it that the teacher didn't let a student pass (his/her grade) who failed
    in?'

Having seen that the island effect emerges in Turkish when a *wh*-word is scrambled out of an is-
land construction (as in 11-a), it is not unexpected that cleft constructions yield the island effect
as shown in above examples. Notice that this poses challenges to a reduced cleft analysis of
pseudo-sluicing in Turkish, and an advocate of such an approach must stipulate some island re-
pair strategy in the case of pseudo-sluicing in order to be able to capture such dissimilar behavior
of clefts and pseudo-sluicing with islands.

    Further evidence against an elliptical cleft analysis in Turkish comes from sprouting. It has
been discussed previously in (17-a) and (17-b) (and repeated in (25-a) and (26-a) below respec-
tively), that pseudo-sluicing does not allow sprouting in Turkish. An elliptical cleft analysis,
nevertheless, cannot rule out the impossibility of sprouting with pseudo-sluicing because pro-
nouncing the presuppositional part of a cleft would make sprouting grammatical (25-b, 26-b).

(25) a. *Cem-Ø   tüm gece oda-sın-da   çalış-tı   ama NE-Ø
           Cem-NOM all night room-POSS.3SG-LOC study-PST.3SG but what-COP
           bil-mi-yor-um.
           know-NEG-PRS-1SG
           Int: 'Cem studied all night in his room, but I don't know what (that is).'

      b. Cem-Ø   tüm gece oda-sın-da   çalış-tı   ama [$_{CP}$ Cem-in   tüm gece
           Cem-NOM all night room-POSS.3SG-LOC study-PST.3SG but   Cem-GEN all   night
           oda-sın-da e_1 çalış-tığ-ı]   NE-Ø   bil-mi-yor-um.
           room-POSS.3SG-LOC study-REL-POSS what-COP know-NEG-PRS-1SG
           'Cem studied all night in his room, but I don't know what is it that Cem studied all
           night in his room.'

(26) a. *Ali-Ø   aşık ol-muş   ama Ece-Ø   KİM-Ø   bil-mi-yor.
           Ali-NOM love be-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM who-COP know-NEG-PRS.3SG
           Int: 'Ali fell in love, but Ece doesn't know with who.'

      b. Ali-Ø   aşık ol-muş   ama Ece-Ø [$_{CP}$ Ali-nin e_1 aşık ol-duğ-u]   KİM$_1$-Ø-Ø
           Ali-NOM love be-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM Ali-GEN   love be-REL-POSS who-NOM-COP
           bil-mi-yor.
            know-NEG-PRS.3SG
           'Ali fell in love, but Ece doesn't know who is it that Ali fell in love with.'

Since allegedly non-elided counterparts of pseudo-sluicing, namely clefts, render the sentences
in (25-b) and (26-b) grammatical, there is no principled reason why pseudo-sluicing would disal-
low sprouting if it was derived from the clefts.

    Overall, the reduced cleft approach fails to capture the facts about Turkish pseudo-sluicing
since the clefts exhibit dissimilar behavior to pseudo-sluicing in terms of the island effect and
sprouting in Turkish. The next section presents another approach to pseudo-sluicing construc-
tions which seem to be able to explain the Turkish facts more straightforwardly.

4. Proposal. Having discussed the inadequacy of the elliptical cleft analysis of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish, I propose that the best account to explain these constructions is a *pro*-form analysis as originally suggested in Adams (2004) and Adams and Tomioka (2012) for pseudo-sluicing in Mandarin Chinese. There is no movement or elision involved in this analysis, yet they assume there exists a null pronoun in the pseudo-sluice and this null pronoun is coreferential with the indefinite in the antecedent clause as Chinese example in (27) illustrates.

(27)   Lisi mai le   yiyang dongxi gei Dawu, dan wo bu zhidao [***pro* shi shenme**].
       Lisi buy ASP one-CL thing   give Dawu but 1SG not know   COP what
       'Lisi bought something for Dawu, but I don't know what it/that was.

(Adams and Tomioka 2012: 228)

From a semantic point of view, there is an anaphoric relation between the null pronoun and the indefinite antecedent. Therefore, Adams and Tomioka (2012) suggest that this null pronoun in pseudo-sluicing can be considered as an E-type pronoun (cf. Evans 1977, Heim 1990). They follow Heim and Kratzer (1998) in that they assume this E-type pronoun, namely *pro*, comes with an implicit definite determiner.

    I argue that Turkish facts also follow naturally if we adopt the *pro*-form analysis as opposed to elliptical clefts. First, note that the null pronoun (*pro*) (28-a) can be phonologically realized in pseudo-sluicing in Turkish (28-b).

(28)   a. Cem-Ø   biri-nden$_1$ kaç-ıyor-du   ama [***pro$_1$* KİM-Ø(-di)]**
          Cem-NOM s.o-ABL   escape-PRS-PST.3SG but [who-COP(-PST)]
          bil-mi-yor-um.
          know-NEG-PRS-1SG
          'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't know who (that was).'

       b. Cem-Ø   biri-nden$_1$ kaç-ıyor-du   ama [***o$_1$* KİM-Ø(-di)]**
          Cem-NOM s.o-ABL   escape-PRS-PST.3SG but [that who-COP(-PST)]
          bil-mi-yor-um.
          know-NEG-PRS-1SG
          'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't know who that was.'

Note further that *pro* renders the "uniqueness" interpretation in Turkish pseudo-sluicing as it does in Chinese.

(29)   Cem-Ø   biri-nden$_1$ kaç-ıyor-du   ama [***pro$_1$* KİM-Ø(-di)]**
       Cem-Nom s.o-Abl   escape-Prs-Pst.3sg but [who-Cop(-Pst)]
       bil-mi-yor-um.
       know-Neg-Prs-1sg
       'Cem was escaping from someone, but I don't know who (that unique person Cem was escaping from was).'

Second, island insensitivity of pseudo-sluicing no longer requires assuming extra mechanisms in this approach. Crucially, as opposed to the cleft analysis, no movement is involved in this approach, therefore the lack of the island effect is truly predicted.

(30) Cem-Ø   Pelin-in   biri-nden₁ hoşlan-dığ-ı   söylentisi-ni duy-muş   ama
      Cem-NOM Pelin-GEN s.o-ABL   like-NMLZ-POSS rumor-ACC   hear-EV.3SG but
      [*pro₁* KİM-Ø]
              who-COP
      bil-mi-yor-um.
      know-NEG-PRS-1SG
      'Cem heard the rumor that Pelin likes someone, but I don't know who (that is).'

Third, *pro*-form analysis can account for the ungrammaticality of sprouting as *pro* or an overt pronoun cannot be coreferential with an implicit argument in the previous clause (cf. Adams 2004; Adams and Tomioka 2012). As stated in Heim (1982), unexpressed or implicit arguments are not sufficient to license pronouns in the subsequent discourse. English examples in (31) exemplify this inadequacy with the third person singular pronoun.

(31) a. Arthur married recently. And #she is very rich.
      b. Bertha graduated with a degree in psychology. #It was a prestigious university.
      c. Carla is studying hard, and #it is physics.

                                                    (Adams and Tomioka 2012: 230)

The same observation is true for Turkish as well. Implicit arguments are able to license neither the overt third person singular pronoun *o* 'that', nor the null form, *pro* in Turkish.

(32) a. Ali-Ø   aşık ol-muş.   * O / * *pro* doktor-Ø-muş.
          Ali-NOM love be-EV.3SG   She / pro doctor-COP-EV.3SG
          Int: 'Ali fell in love. She is a doctor.'

      b. Cem-Ø   tüm gece oda-sın-da   çalış-tı.   * O / * *pro*
          Cem-NOM all night room-POSS.3SG-LOC study-PST.3SG. That / pro
          İngilizce-y-di.
          English-COP-PST.3SG
          Int: 'Cem studied all night in his room. That/it was English.'

Hence, it is truly predicted that sprouting will be ungrammatical with pseudo-sluicing as reported before, and repeated in (33) for convenience with *pro* and an overt pronoun.

(33) a. *Cem-Ø   tüm gece oda-sın-da   çalış-tı   ama [*pro* / o   NE-Ø]
          Cem-NOM all night room-POSS.3SG-LOC study-PST.3SG but   that what-COP
          bil-mi-yor-um.
          know-NEG-PRS-1SG
          Int: 'Cem studied all night in his room, but I don't know what that is.'

      b. *Ali-Ø   aşık ol-muş   ama Ece-Ø   [*pro* / o   KİM-Ø]   bil-mi-yor.
          Ali-NOM love be-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM [that who-COP] know-NEG-PRS.3SG
          Int: 'Ali fell in love, but Ece doesn't know who that is.'

5. Conclusion. I have investigated pseudo-sluicing constructions in Turkish in this paper by showing that they are distinct from genuine sluicing constructions. In Turkish pseudo-sluicing, the *wh*-word does not exhibit case connectivity effect with its correlate and sprouting is ungrammatical. It has been further shown that an elliptical cleft analysis cannot capture the Turkish data without stipulation. A pro-form approach is better suited to explain the derivation of pseudo-sluicing in Turkish such as island insensitivity and the ungrammaticality of sprouting. Overall,

Turkish facts as well as Chinese and Japanese suggest that *wh*-in-situ/pro-drop languages can employ different strategies to derive such sluicing-like structures. Further research is called for to see what strategy other languages use, and why different strategies are implemented in such structurally similar languages.

References

Adams, Perng Wang. 2004. The Structure of Sluicing in Mandarin Chinese., *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 1, Article 2.

Adams, Perng Wang & Satoshi Tomioka. 2012. Sluicing in Mandarin Chinese: An instance of pseudo-sluicing. In J. Merchant and A. Simpson (eds.), *Sluicing: Cross-linguistic perspectives*, 219-247.

Akar, Didar. 1990. *Wh-questions in Turkish*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

Arslan, Ceyda. 1999. *Approaches to wh-structures in Turkish*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

Chung, Sandra, Ladusaw A. William & James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3: 239-282.

Craenenbroeck, Jeroen Van & Anikó Lipták. 2006. The cross-linguistic Syntax of Sluicing: Evidence from Hungarian Relatives. *Syntax* 9.3:248-274.

Evans, Gareth. 1977. Pronouns, quantifiers and relative clauses. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 7: 467-536. https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1977.10717030.

Heim, Irene. 1987. *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Heim, Irene and Angelika, Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Malden, MA:Blackwell.

Hiraiwa, Ken & Shinichiro Ishihara. 2012. Syntactic metamorphosis: Clefts, sluicing, and in-situ focus in japanese. *Syntax* 15:142-180. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2011.00164.x.

İnce, Atakan. 2006. Pseudo-sluicing in Turkish, In N. Kazanina, U. Minai, P.J. Monahan and H.L. Taylor (eds.), *University of Maryland Department of Linguistics Working Papers in Linguistics (UMWPiL), Volume 9,* 111-126.

İnce, Atakan. 2009. *Dimensions of Ellipsis: Investigations in Turkish*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Kelepir, Meltem. 2001. *Topics in Turkish Syntax: Clausal Structure and Scope*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT. Distributed by MITWPL, Cambridge, MA.

Kornfilt, Jacklin. 1996. On some copular clitics in Turkish. In A. Alexiadou, N. Fuhrhop, P.Law and S. Loehken (eds.), *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 96-114. Berlin: Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft 6.

Kizu, Mika. 1997. Sluicing in wh-in-situ languages, In K. Singer, R. Eggert, and G. Anderson (eds.), *CLS33:Papers from the Main Session*, 231-44. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Merchant, Jason. 1998. Pseudosluicing: Elliptical clefts in Japanese and English., In A. Alexiadou et al. (eds.), *ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 10, Zentrum fur Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft: Berlin.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661–738. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-005-7378-3.

Palaz, Bilge. to appear. Towards a unified account of clausal ellipsis in Turkish: a non-movement analysis. *Proceedings of the 54th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In Robert I. Binnick, A. Davison, Georgia M. Green, and James L. Morgan (eds), *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252–286. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Şener, Serkan. 2013. 'Sluicing' without movement. *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics*, MIT, Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 311-325.

Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 3*:265-300.