

Towards a Unified Account of Clausal Ellipsis in Turkish: A Non-Movement Analysis

Bilge Palaz

University of Delaware

This study investigates clausal ellipsis (CE) in Turkish; sluicing, stripping and (embedded) fragment answers and argues for a non-movement account that proposes information structure properties should be considered in analyzing CE. Three types of CE examined in this study are illustrated in (1).

1. a. *Sluicing*

Cem-Ø biri-ni ara-mış ama Ece-Ø KİM-İ bil-mi-yor.
Cem-NOM s.o-ACC call-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM who-ACC know-NEG-PRS.3SG
'Cem called someone, but Ece doesn't know who.'

b. *Stripping*

Cem-Ø PELİN-İ ara-mış ama Ece-Ø DENİZ-İ san-ıyor.
Cem-NOM Pelin-ACC call-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM Deniz-ACC think-PRS.3SG
'Cem called PELİN, but Ece thinks DENİZ.'

c. *(Embedded) Fragment Answers*

A: Cem-Ø KİM-İ ara-mış?
Cem-NOM who-ACC call-EV.3SG
'Who did Cem call?'

B: DENİZ-İ.
Deniz-ACC.
'DENİZ.'

B': Ece-Ø DENİZ-İ san-ıyor.
Ece-NOM Deniz-ACC think-PRS.3SG
'Ece thinks DENİZ.'

Previous studies have investigated such constructions by proposing independent accounts. İnce (2009) investigates sluicing and fragment answers in Turkish as in (1a) and (1c-B) and suggests a movement and deletion analysis in the spirit of Merchant (2001) by assuming a FocusP whose specifier hosts remnant(s), and a [+E] feature on F. Contra İnce, Şener (2013) argues for a non-movement analysis for sluicing and 'their non-wh counterparts', which is referred as *stripping* in the current study, as in (1a) and (1b) due to in-situ properties of focus in Turkish. Despite the fundamental differences in the suggested deriving mechanisms, these two proposals both truly argue that sluicing in Turkish cannot be analyzed as reduced clefts. Different from these studies, I will attempt to explain the derivation of clausal ellipsis in Turkish by proposing a unified non-movement account that captures all constructions in (1). I claim that the general mechanisms in Turkish such as wh/focus-in-situ, and empirical facts provided by scope relations favor a non-movement analysis.

Clausal Ellipsis in Turkish. I consider constructions such as sluicing, stripping and (embedded) fragment answers as instances of the same mechanism in Turkish since they display certain similarities. First and foremost, the remnant in all constructions is focused. This is indicated by capital letters in (1). Second, they all are insensitive to islands. Turkish is a wh-in-situ language and island effect is observed when a *wh*-question word is overtly moved out of an island such as a relative clause (2a), yet there is no island effect when *wh*-question word is in-situ (2b).

2. a. *KİM-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 KİM-DEN hoşlan-an kız-ı göster-miş?
Cem-NOM Ece-DAT who-ABL like-REL girl-ACC show-EV.3SG
'Cem showed Ece the girl that likes who?'

Island insensitivity of all types of CE is illustrated in (3).

3. a. *Sluicing*

Cem-Ø biri-nden hoşlan-an kız-ı göster-miş ama KİM-DEN hatırla-mı-yor-um.
Cem-NOM s.o-ABL like-REL girl-ACC show-EV.3SG but who-ABL remember-NEG-PRS-1SG
'Cem showed (me) the girl who likes someone, but I don't remember who.'

b. *Stripping*

Cem-Ø ALİ-DEN hoşlan-an kız-ı göster-miş ama Ece-Ø DENİZ-DEN san-ıyor.
Cem-NOM Ali-ABL like-REL girl-ACC show-EV.3SG but Ece-NOM Deniz-ABL think-PRS.3SG
'Cem showed (Ece) the girl who likes ALİ, but Ece thinks DENİZ.'

c. (Embedded) Fragment Answers

A: Cem-Ø kim-den hoşlan-an kız-1 göster-miş?
 Cem-NOM who-ABL like-REL girl-ACC show-EV.3SG
 ‘Cem showed (Ece) the girl that likes who?’

B: DENİZ-DEN. B’: Ece-Ø DENİZ-DEN san-ıyor.
 Deniz-ABL. Ece-NOM Deniz-ABL think- PRS.3SG
 ‘DENİZ.’ ‘Ece thinks DENİZ.’

Another similarity all types of CE exhibit is the case connectivity. The remnant always has the same case as its antecedent as in (1) and (3)¹. Case connectivity is considered to be evidence for movement in ellipsis in Turkish (İnce, 2009). Yet I argue against a movement approach for Turkish mainly because (i) Turkish does not exhibit *wh* or focus movement in non-elided clauses, (ii) island insensitivity is naturally explained in a non-movement approach (there is no island violation because there is no movement), and (iii) scope ambiguity is retained in CE. Note that scope is ambiguous in Turkish as in (4a) when the universal quantifier is above the acc-marked indefinite, but universal quantifier cannot take scope over the existential when acc-marked indefinite is fronted (4b).

4. a. Her öğrenci-Ø NE-Yİ oku-muş? $\forall > \exists$, $\exists > \forall$
 Every student-NOM what-ACC read-EV.3SG
 ‘What did every student read?’

b. NE-Yİ_i her öğrenci-Ø t_i oku-muş? $*\forall > \exists$, $\exists > \forall$
 what-ACC every student-NOM read-EV.3SG
 ‘What did every student read?’

Scope is ambiguous in all types of CE when the universal quantifier is above the acc-marked indefinite in the antecedent clause. An illustration of this from sluicing is in (5).

5. Her öğrenci-Ø bir şey-i oku-muş ama NE-Yİ bil-mi-yor-um.
 Every student-NOM sth-ACC read-EV.3SG but what-ACC know-NEG-PRS-1SG
 ‘Every student read something, but I don’t know what.’

Both $\forall > \exists$ and $\exists > \forall$ are possible in (5); a follow-up sentence can possibly list different books read by different students as well as the same book read by all. As such, the acc-marked indefinite should not have been moved over the universal quantifier in the ellipsis site, which would yield $*\forall > \exists$.

Analysis. I propose a non-movement analysis which respects in-situ properties of focus in Turkish (Göksel and Özsoy, 2000; Şener, 2010) and *wh*-question words. In the spirit of Merchant (2001), I also argue for a [+E] feature on C head which licenses the deletion. Unlike Merchant, however, I suggest that the application of [+E] follows the assumptions of *Ellipsis Condition*.

6. Ellipsis Condition

In an XP with head X bearing an E(llipsis) feature, leave unpronounced all elements of XP that are not F-marked (focused).

Accordingly, the derivation of CE in Turkish as in (1) should be as follows respectively.

7. a., ama Ece [CP [C' [TP Cem- [KİM-İ]_{F-MARKED} aramış]]] bilmiyor.
 b., ama Ece [CP [C' [TP Cem- [DENİZ-İ]_{F-MARKED} aramış]]] sanıyor.
 c. (Ece) [CP [C' [TP Cem- [DENİZ-İ]_{F-MARKED} aramış]]] (sanıyor).

The remnants are all F-marked elements of CP whose head hosts [+E], therefore everything but F-marked elements are elided within the CP.

Note that such a non-movement approach to ellipsis is not unprecedented cross-linguistically (Bruening, 2015; Griffiths et al., to appear), and it is preferable considering the general properties of Turkish as well as the island insensitivity and the scope relations.

Implications. Current study proposes a unified analysis of CE in Turkish pursuing a non-movement approach. A non-movement analysis is favored in Turkish without stipulation. It is also more feasible and economical as it does not require any movement that is unattested in non-elliptical clauses. *Ellipsis Condition* is ideally expected to apply in other typologically similar (*wh* and/or focus in-situ) as well as distinct languages. Hence, further investigation is required in other languages to see whether its predictions are born out.

Selected References. Bruening, B. (2015) "Non-Constituent Coordination: Prosody, Not Movement," *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*: Vol. 21 : Iss. 1, Article 5., İnce, A. (2009). *Dimensions of Ellipsis: Investigations in Turkish*. PhD Thesis., Merchant, J. (2001). *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. **Keywords:** clausal ellipsis, syntax, Turkish, Altaic, focus in-situ, wh-in-situ.

¹ The remnant can be caseless in sluicing, but I will not consider such cases in this study.