Ince (to appear) argues, on the basis of examples like (1-2), that Sluicing occurs in Turkish, a WH-in-situ language. The main argument is that, in general, the case of the stranded WH-item is determined by its environment in the sluiced clause, a property that is not shared by predicates in what Ince (erroneously) calls the "Cleft" construction (3).

(1) Hasan biri-ne kitap vermiS, ama kim-e bilmiyorum.
   "Hasan gave a book to someone, but WHO-DAT I don't know."

(2) Hasan biri-nden borç almıS, ama kimden bilmiyorum.
   "Hasan borrowed from someone, but who-from I don't know."

(3) Hasanın borç aldıGı AySe-y-di/ *AySe-den-di
   "The one Hasan borrowed from was AySe."

It is indeed clear that apparent sluiced clauses in Turkish are not related to the construction in (3). That is a predicational sentence with a Free Relative as subject and a predicate nominal (which cannot be anything other than a DP or CP in the nominative case). In this paper we will show that examples such as (1-2) do not involve Sluicing, at least nothing like the phenomenon we call Sluicing in English. Rather, they involve Stripping (Hankamer 1975, Merchant 2004), a process with very different properties from Sluicing.

Sluicing is an ellipsis process that can tolerate some distance and complexity in structure between the antecedent and the ellipsis site (4). Stripping, on the other hand, is extremely local (5). Stripping also does not require a WH-phrase to be stranded, though it permits one. Thus (6) is ambiguous between a Stripping and a Sluicing analysis.

(4) Harvey gave something to Marie, but none of us knows anyone who knows what.
(5) What did Harvey give to Marie? *I don't know anyone who thinks a brick.
(6) Harvey gave something to Marie. -- What?

The test, then, of Ince's hypothesis is whether (a) non-WH elements can be strandees, and (b) the ellipsis site can be in an embedded clause a level or two away from the antecedent. Examples like (7-8) show that the focus of a Yes-no Question (which contains no WH-items) can appear in the same contexts as Ince's (pseudo) Sluicing remnants; examples like (9) show that the ellipsis site cannot be embedded further. Whatever is going on here, it is not Sluicing.

(7) Hasan okul-a gidecekmis, ama gitti mi bilmiyorum.
   "Hasan school-DAT (hearsay) went, but he-went Q I don't know."
"Hasan went (it is said) to the school, but I don't know if he went."

(8) Hasan okula gitti mi? -- Hasan bir yere gitti, ama okula mı bilmiyorum.
    Hasan somewhere went, but school-DAT Q I don't know.
    "Did Hasan go to school? -- Hasan went somewhere, but I don't know if he went to school."

(9) Hasan bir yere gitti, ama (*bizim) nereye bilmemiz imkansız.
    Hasan somewhere went, but (*we-GEN) where-DAT know-INF-3PL impossible.
    "Hasan went somewhere, but where? It is impossible for us to know where."

An apparent challenge to the Stripping analysis is that the ellipsis does appear to occur in an embedded context (examples (1-2). We will argue, however, on the basis of intonational evidence, that there is in fact no embedding in (1-2). Rather, (1) consists of a root question, which has undergone Stripping, followed by the separate assertion bilmiyorum ("I don't know"). Example (9) is particularly instructive, because the presence of the genitive-marked subject makes the context unambiguously embedded, and the sentence ungrammatical. Its absence leaves open the possibility that there is no embedding, and then the sentence is grammatical.

Our conclusion is that there is in fact no Sluicing in Turkish. We conjecture that there is no Sluicing in any WH-in-situ language, i.e. that if there is anything that looks like Sluicing in such a language, it will lack the two signature properties of Sluicing: that the remnant must be a WH-phrase, and the ellipsis site may be unboundedly far from the antecedent.
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