Gapping in Turkish*

Atakan Ince

University of Maryland, College Park

1. Introduction

The aim of this study is to contend an analysis of (forward) Gapping in Turkish in the Minimalist Framework, as in (1) (see also Hankamer 1972, Kornfilt 2000).

(1) Burak kütüphane-ye gitti, Mustafa (da) hastane-ye ~~gitti~~.
library-dat went also hospital-dat went
'Burak went to the library and Mustafa to the hospital.'

I will argue that gapping in Turkish consists of elision of only a matrix Agr_SP. It cannot occur in non-matrix structures because these non-matrix structures lack a C^o with the relevant [+E(LLIPSIS)] feature to license elision of a site within their own projections.

2. Is There Gapping in Turkish?

To see whether there is gapping in Turkish, I will check whether these structures have the properties of gapping in English observed by Johnson (2003). Due to the morphological and syntactic properties of Turkish, only three of these properties are observed for gapping structures in Turkish.

We should keep in mind that although Johnson (2003) contends a ATB analysis of gapping in English, the properties of gapping that he observes are theory-/analysis-independent.

2.1 Gapping is Restricted to Coordinations

* I would like to thank Valentine Hacquard, Howard Lasnik and anonymous NELS reviewers for their invaluable comments.

The first property of gapping is that it occurs in coordination structures (ex. (1) repeated as ex. (2)):

(2) Burak kütüphane-ye gitti, Mustafa (da) hastane-ye ~~gitti~~.
library-dat went also hospital-dat went
'Burak went to the library and Mustafa to the hospital.'

However, gapping does not occur in adjunct/non-coordination structures:

(3) a. Mustafa hastane-ye *~~gittigi~~ için, Burak kütüphane-ye gitti.
hospital-dat went for library-dat went
'*Because Mustafa to the hospital, Burak went to the library.'
b. Mustafa hastane-ye gittigi için, Burak (da) kütüphane-ye *~~gitti~~.
hospital-dat went for also library-dat went
'*Because Mustafa went to the hospital, Burak to the library.'

(4) *Bazilari pasta-dan BUGUN yedi, çünkü digerleri DUN ~~yedi~~.
some cake-abl today ate because others yesterday ate
'*Some ate from the cake TODAY, because others YESTERDAY.'

Ama 'but' cannot occur in gapping, either:

(5) *Ali korku filmlerin-i sever, ama Ayse komedi filmlerin-i ~~sever~~.
horror movies-acc likes but comedy movies-acc likes
'*Ali likes horror movies, but Ayse comedy movies.'

2.2 Scope of the Terms in the Left Conjunct

Johnson (2003) observes that **negation**, for example, has to occur in/take scope over both antecedent and gapped clauses (ex. 6), unlike other elliptical structures where negation takes scope on/occurs in only the first conjunct (ex. 7a-b):

(6) Kim didn't play bingo and Sandy ~~didn't~~ sit at home all evening.
(Johnson 2003: 25, quoting from Oehrle (1987: 205)

(7) a. Kim didn't eat natto and Sandy did ?.
b. Kim didn't eat natto and Sandy did ? rice.
(*ibid*., p. 25)

Example (6) asserts that it is not the case that both Kim played bingo and Sandy sat at home all evening.

Because of the morphological properties of Turkish, bare lexical verbs cannot be contrasted in gapping; in other words, Tense and Negation markers cannot be deleted:

(8) *Ahmet santranç oyna-ma-di, Hasan da pasta ye-~~me-di~~.

chess play-neg-pst also cake eat
'Ahmet didn't play chess, and Hasan eat cake'

However, the following example shows that negation has to occur in/take scope over the gapped structure, too:

(9) Ahmet Tolga-yla konus muyor, Ecem (de) Sena y-la ~~konusmuyor~~.
-comm not.talking also -comm not.talking
'Ahmet is not talking to Tolga, and Ecem to Senay.'

Example (9) asserts that 'it is not the case that both Ahmet talks to Tolga and Ecem talks to Senay'.

2.3 Strings Affected

Johnson (2003: 29) also observes that 'it is possible to Gap the subject of the small clause along with the higher verb':

(10) Some elected the schmucks SENATORS and others ~~elected the schmucks~~ CONGRESSMEN.

The same holds in Turkish, as well:

(11) Ahmet sen-i okul-da saniyor, Meral (de) ev-de ~~seni saniyor~~.
you-acc school-loc assumes also home-loc
'Ahmet consider you at school and Meral at home.'

2.4 Interim Conclusion

Since the structures above display similar properties with gapping structures in English, I conclude that these structures in Turkish are also gapping structures.

3. Analysis of Gapping

I contend the following for gapping in Turkish:

Gapping targets Agr_SP as elision site with movement of the surviving elements to the left periphery of the matrix clause (ex. 12a-b). Though I use Johnson's (2004) criteria for gapping, I assume a deletion analysis of gapping, rather than his ATB analysis because he does not give any account of information-structural ((contrastive) focus) properties of the gapped (ATB-ed) elements.

(12) a. Burak kütüphane-ye gitti , Mustafa (da) hastane-ye ~~gitti~~.
library-dat went also hospital-dat went
'Burak went to the library and Mustafa to the hospital.'
b. . . ., $Mustafa_1$ (da) $hastane\text{-}ye_2$ $[_{AgrSP} \ldots t_1 \ldots t_2 \ldots]$

also hospital-dat

The general mechanism of gapping can be seen in the following:

(13) $[_{CP}\ XP_1\ \ YP_2\ \ [_{\sout{AgrSP}}\ \sout{\ldots t_1 \ldots t_2 \ldots}\ ]$

4. A Puzzle

Interestingly, unlike gapping in English (ex. 14), gapping does not occur in complement clauses in Turkish (ex. 15-16) (Hankamer 1979, Kornfilt 2000) (ex. 15 NCC; ex. 16 FCC):

(14) Johns knows that Mary ate chocolate and Bryan ice-cream.

(15) *Zeynep[1] [[Hasan-in karides-i ye-dig-in-i], [Mehmed-in de
Hasan-gen shrimp-acc eat-fnom-3.sg-acc Mehmed-gen and
istiridye-yi __]] duy-du
oyster-acc hear-past
'ZEYNEP heard that Hasan ate the shrimp, and Mehmet (ate) the oyster.'
(Kornfilt 2000)

(16) *Ahmet [[Hasan karides-i ye-di], [Mehmet te istiridye-yi ___]]
Ahmet Hasan shrimp-acc eat-past Mehmet and oyster-acc
san-iyor.
believe-prpprog
'Ahmet believes Hasan ate the shrimp and Mehmet (ate) the oyster'
(Kornfilt 2000)

Word order of Turkish is SOV. So, the embedded clauses precedes the matrix verb. In Nominalized Complement Clauses (NCC), the Subject bears Genitive Case unless non-specific and the verb bears nominal agreement morphology rather than verbal agreement morphology. In Finite Complement Clauses (FCC), the Subject bears Nominative/Accusative Case and the verb bears verbal agreement.

Kornfilt (2000) notes that when the complement clause follows the matrix verb, the structure is ameliorated:

(17) a. Zeynep duy-du [[Hasan-in karides-i ye-dig-in-i], [Mehmed-in
hear-past Hasan-gen shrimp-acc eat-fnom3.sg-acc Mehmet-gen
de istiridye-yi __]]
and oyster-acc

[1] In Kornfilt (2000), 'Zeynep is in capitals: 'ZEYNEP'. However, it is not clear why she shows it in capitals. Since capitalization is used to show focused words/phrases, I have decapitalized 'Zeynep'.

'Zeynep heard that Hasan ate the shrimp, and Mehmet (ate) the oyster.'
(modified from Kornfilt 2000)

b. $[_{CP}\ [_{CP}\ \ldots\ t_1\ \ldots\ V^o_{matrix}\ ]^{matrix}\ [_{\&P}\ \ldots$ gapped structure $\ldots\ ]_1\ ]^{matrix}$

Kornfilt (2000) claims that only a verb can occur in the rightmost periphery in complement clauses when these clauses are in their canonical position. However, it is not clear why an embedded verb would have to be the rightmost element in the complement clause when the complement clause is in its canonical position. This seems to be a stipulation.

On the other hand, when the whole complement clause is scrambled to the left periphery of the matrix clause, gapping is still bad:

(18) a. *[[Hasan-in karides-i yedigini], [Mehmed-in de istiridye-yi
-gen shrimp-acc ate -gen also oyster-acc
~~yedigini~~]] Zeynep duydu
ate heard
'Zeynep heard that Hasan ate the shrimp, and Mehmet (ate) the oyster.'

b. *$[_{CP}\ [_{\&P}\ \ldots\ ]_1\ [_{AgrSP}$ SUBJECT $\ldots\ t_1\ \ldots\ ]^{matrix\ clause}$

This is a problem for Kornfilt: Since the complement clause is not in its canonical position, gapping would be expected to be grammatical in (18a) because the embedded verb would not have to be the rightmost element in the complement clause itself.

Also, non-occurrence of DP-internal gapping in Turkish (ex. 19) would require a different account in Kornfilt's analysis since there is no embedded verb in those DPs that has to occur in the rightmost position in DPs when they are in their canonical position.

(19) *Ahmet Ali-nin bu teorem-i ispatin-a , Meral-in de
-gen this theorem-acc his.proof-dat -gen also
o teorem-i ~~ispat-in-a~~ hayran kal-di
it theorem-acc her.proof-dat fan stayed
'Ahmet adored Ali's proof of this theorem and Meral's of that theorem.'

4.1 Further Data

Gapping is also grammatical when only the remnants out of the complement clause follow the matrix:

(20) Ahmet [Hasan-in pasta-yi yedigini] biliyor Meral-in (de) dondurma-yi.
-gen cake-acc ate knows -gen also ice.cream-acc
'Ahmet knows that Hasan ate the cake and Meral the ice-cream.'

(21) Ahmet [Hasan karides-i yedi] saniyor , [Mehmet te istiridye-yi ___]
Ahmet Hasan shrimp-acc ate assumes also oyster-acc
'Ahmet believes Hasan ate the shrimp and Mehmet (ate) the oyster'

One could argue that the remnants in gapping structures have to be the rightmost elements linearly, based on the data in ex. (15 *vs.* 17&20). On the assumption that being the rightmost element means right-adjoining to a structure, especially ex. (20-21) would require that gapped remnants right-adjoin to the matrix clause.

However, it is known that gapped remnants bear (contrastive) focus (Pesetsky 1982, Johnson 2003). Focused elements, on the other hand, cannot occur post-verbally in Turkish (ex. 22c). So, this is an argument against rightward-adjunction of remnants in gapping structures.

(22) a. AHMET[2] Ankara-ya gitti.
-dat went
b. Ankara-ya AHMET gitti.
-dat went
c. *Ankara-ya gitti AHMET.
-dat went
'AHMET went to Ankara.'

In a similar way to gapping in complement clauses (ex. 20-21), DP-internal gapping is also grammatical, when the remnants follow the matrix verb:

(23) Ahmet Ali-nin bu teorem-i ispat-in-a hayran kaldi , Meral-in
-gen this theorem-acc his.proof-dat fan stayed -gen
de o teorem-i
also it theorem-acc
'Ahmet adored Ali's proof of this theorem and Meral's of that theorem.'

4.2 Interim Conclusion

In conclusion, gapping out of any domain is possible as long as the remnants follow the matrix clause. Then, an account is required of why gapping cannot occur in complement clauses and DPs when remnants of gapping linearly precede the matrix verb.

5. A Proposal

To explain the data in the previous section, I propose the following:

Only a matrix Agr_SP can be elided because only matrix clauses have the relevant [+E] feature to license elision of Agr_SP in gapping structures. In Merchant's theory (2008), [+E] feature needs to be checked by a +wh, +Q head (i.e., interrogative C^o), and licenses deletion of the complement –IP- of C^o.

[2] In all the three examples, 'AHMET' is focused.

Non-matrix domains are deficient in terms of lacking TP and/or AspP[3]. They also lack a C^{o} with the relevant [+E] feature. In other words, a C^{o} with the relevant [+E] feature does not select deficient domains as complement. Similar phenomenon occurs in other languages, as well. Polinsky (2007), for example, shows that sluicing does not occur in embedded clauses in Aghem and Circassian; Gallego & Uriagereka (2007) also mention defective C/T/v's in a different context.

Yet, there is no (technical) reason/explanation for why/how a C^{o} with the relevant [+E] feature does not occur in/select these defective domains.

As to the [+E] feature in gapping structures, its featural make-up cannot be [~[+wh], ~[+Q]] as Merchant's (2008) [+E] feature which licenses sluicing because *wh*-phrases are not obligatory in gapping structures unlike sluicing. So, **the featural make-up of the [+E] feature in gapping structures is [~[+ContrastiveFocus]]** –in other words, if you have this [+E] feature, you also have to have Contrastive Focus- because the phrases surviving from ellipsis are contrastively focused .

So, we can conclude that Lexicon has different Complementizers, one with [+E] feature and one without [+E] feature licensing Gapping.

As to the deficiency of the non-matrix structures in the study, Nominalized Complement Clauses (NCC) never project Tense Phrase (Ince, 2007). Finite Complement Clauses (FCC) project a TP or AspP but never a TP and AspP together –unlike matrix clauses-. So, these deficient domains –mentioned above- are never selected by a Complementizer head with [+E] feature licensing gapping. In other words, a C^{o} with [+E] feature licensing gapping selects a non-deficient clausal domain as its complement. So, in classical terms, gapping in Turkish is a **root phenomenon** (Emonds, 1976).

5.1 Gapping Targets Only Matrix Clauses

In this section, I will argue that in gapping structures where the remnants from NCC and FCC complement clauses follow the matrix verb (ex. 20-21 repeated as ex. 24&26), the source consists of the conjunction of two matrix clauses rather than of two complement clauses (ex. 25-27, respectively).

(24) Ahmet [Hasan-in pasta-yi yedigini] biliyor , Meral-in (de) dondurma-yi.
-gen cake-acc ate knows -gen also ice.cream-acc
'Ahmet knows that Hasan ate the cake and Meral the ice-cream.'

(25) [[Ahmet [Hasan-in pasta-yi yedigini] biliyor], [Ahmet [Meral-in (de)
-gen cake-acc ate knows -gen also
dondurma-yi yedigini] bil-iyor]].
ice.cream-acc ate knows

[3] Or, even if they select both T^{o} and Asp^{o} for cases I suggest they do not, those T^{o} and Asp^{o} heads themselves are deficient (thanks to V. Hacquard for the relevant discussion).

'Ahmet knows that Hasan ate the cake and Ahmet knows that Meral ate the ice-cream.'

(26) Ahmet [Hasan karides-i yedi] saniyor , [Mehmet te istiridye-yi ___]
shrimp-acc ate believes Mehmet and oyster-acc
'Ahmet believes Hasan ate the shrimp and Mehmet (ate) the oyster.'

(27) [[Ahmet [Hasan karides-i yedi] saniyor], [Ahmet [Mehmet te
shrimp-acc ate believes also
istiridye-yi yedi] saniyor]].
oyster-acc ate believes
'Ahmet believes Hasan ate the shrimp and Ahmet believes Mehmet ate the oyster.'

This is shown below:

(28) $[_{ConjP}$ CP1^{matrix} $[_{Conj'}$ Conj^{0} CP2^{matrix}]]

Remnants move to the left periphery of the second conjunct, followed by the elision of the Agr$_S$P in the second conjunct (ex. 29 as the underlying form for ex. 24), as schematized in (30).

(29) Ahmet [Hasan-in pasta-yi yedigini] biliyor , Meral-in$_1$ (de) dondurma-yi$_2$
-gen cake-acc ate knows -gen also ice.cream-acc
~~Ahmet [t_1 t_2 yedigini] biliyor~~
ate knows
'Ahmet knows that Hasan ate the cake and Meral the ice-cream.'

(30) $[_{ConjP}$ $[_{CP1}$ . . .] $[_{Conj'}$ Conj^{0} $[_{CP2}$ DP$_1$ DP$_2$ . . . C$^{o}_{[+E]}$ $[$~~$_{AgrSP}$ . . . t_1 . . . t_2 . . .~~]]]]

In (29), the matrix C^o in the second conjunct has the [+E] feature to license elision of its complement Agr$_S$P because the matrix clause is not a deficient domain in that it can project both TP and AspP.

When antecedent complement clause as well as the gapped remnants follow the matrix verb, the antecedent complement clause right-adjoins to the first conjunct (ex. 32 as the underlying form for ex. 17a repeated as ex. 31):

(31) Zeynep duy-du [[Hasan-in karides-i ye-dig-in-i], [Mehmed-in
hear-past Hasan-gen shrimp-acc eat-fnom3.sg-acc Mehmet-gen
de istiridye-yi __]]
and oyster-acc
'Zeynep heard that Hasan ate the shrimp, and Mehmet (ate) the oyster.'
(modified from Kornfilt 2000)

(32) Zeynep duydu [[Hasan-in karides-i yedigini], [Mehmed-in$_1$ de

heard -gen shrimp-acc ate -gen and
istiridye-yi$_2$ [~~Zeynep [t_1 t_2 yedigini], duydu~~]]]
oyster-acc ate heard
'Zeynep heard that Hasan ate the shrimp, and (Zeynep heard that) Mehmet (ate) the oyster.'

This is how the ordering where the first complement clause and the remnants of gapping follow the matrix verb (of the first conjunct), as shown below:

(33) [$_{ConjP}$ [$_{CP1}$ [$_{CP1}$ . . . t_2 . . .] $CP_2^{embedded}$] [$_{Conj'}$ $Conj^o$ [$_{CP3}$ DP_1 DP_2 . . . $C^o_{[+E]}$ [~~$_{AgrSP}$ . . . t_1 . . . t_2 . . .~~]]]

Further evidence for the proposal that gapping targets matrix domains comes from **disjunction** structures (ex. 34):

(34) Ahmet [Hasan-in pasta-yi yedigini] biliyor, veya [Meral-in dondurma-yi].
-gen cake-acc ate knows or -gen ice.cream-acc
'Ahmet knows that Hasan ate the cake, or Meral the ice-cream.'
[i.e., 'Either Ahmet knows that Hasan ate the cake, or Ahmet knows that Meral ate the ice-cream.']

In this example, if the elided part is only the complement clause itself, one would expect the reading 'Ahmet knows P or Q'; and, if the elision site is the matrix clause, one would expect the reading 'Ahmet knows P or Ahmet knows Q'.[4]

In the first reading, the speaker would assert Ahmet's knowledge of the disjunction; and, in the second reading, the speaker wouldn't make any assertion regarding Ahmet's knowledge of the disjunction.

In ex. 34, the speaker does not make any assertion about Ahmet's knowledge of the disjunction at all. On the contrary, the reading in ex. 34 is the second one: 'Ahmet knows P or Ahmet knows Q.' So, the elements in the disjunction structure are two matrix clauses, which supports my proposal that the elision site in (ex. 20) is the matrix clause.

In non-elliptical cases, on the other hand, disjunction of embedded clauses gives the first reading: Ahmet knows P or Q. In other words, Ahmet's knowledge of the disjunction is asserted:

(35) Ahmet [[Hasan-in pasta-yi yedigini] veya [Meral-in dondurma-yi
-gen cake-acc ate or -gen ice.cream-acc
yedigini]] biliyor.
ate knows
'Ahmet knows that Hasan ate the cake or Meral ate the ice-cream.'

[4] I am indebted to one reviewer for giving me this idea.

5.1.1 Gapping in DPs

As mentioned previously, Gapping in DPs is ungrammatical, as ex. 19 (repeated as ex. 36) shows:

(36) *Ahmet Ali-nin bu teorem-i ispatin-a , Meral-in de
-gen this theorem-acc his.proof-dat -gen also
o teorem-i ispatin-a hayran kaldi
it theorem-acc her.proof-dat fan stayed
'Ahmet adored Ali's proof of this theorem and Meral's of that theorem.'

However, as in gapping in complement clauses, when the remnants follow the matrix verb, gapping out of DP is grammatical (ex. 23 repeated as ex. 37):

(37) Ahmet Ali-nin bu teorem-i ispat-in-a hayran kaldi,
-gen this theorem-acc his.proof-dat fan stayed
Meral-in de o teorem-i
-gen also it theorem-acc
'Ahmet adored Ali's proof of this theorem and Meral's of that theorem.'

Depending upon the arguments related to gapping in complement clauses, I will assume that in ex. 37 the coordination consists of two clauses rather than two DP (ex. 38), where remnants move to the left periphery of the second clause after which the AgrSP of the second clause is elided (39):

(38) [[Ahmet [Ali-nin bu teorem-i ispat-in]-a hayran kaldi], [Ahmet
-gen this theorem-acc his.proof-dat fan stayed
[Meral-in de o teorem-i ispat-in]-a hayran kaldi]].
-gen also it theorem-acc his.proof-dat fan stayed
'Ahmet adored Ali's proof of this theorem and Ahmet adored Meral's proof of that theorem.'

(39) . . . $[_{DP1}$Meralin de$]_1$ $[_{DP2}$ o teoremi$]_2$ . . . C^o[+E] [~~$_{AgrSP}$ . . . [$_{DP}$ t_1 t_2 . . .~~

5.2 Complement Clauses as Deficient Domains

As Ince (2007) has argued, Nominalized Complement Clauses lack TP layer. As to Finite Complement Clauses (FCC), I will show that, contra Aygen (2002), they do not lack TP layer. However, they cannot project both TP and AspP, as Aygen (2002) showed.

Being deficient in terms of lacking TP projection or not licensing projection of both AspP and TP, these complement clauses cannot select a C^o with the [+E] feature that licenses gapping.

5.2.1 No Asp+TP in Finite Complement Clauses

As Aygen (2002) noticed, both an Aspect and a Tense head cannot project in FCCs:

(40) a. *Ben sen-Ø/i Ankara-ya gid-iyor-du-n sandim.
I you-nom/acc -dat go-prog-pst-2s assumed
'I thought you were going to Ankara'
b. Ben sen-Ø/i Ankara-ya git-ti-n sandim.
I you-nom/acc -dat go-pst-2s assumed
'I thought you went to Ankara'

Depending upon this data, Aygen claims that FCCs are Aspectual Phrases, but not TPs or CPs. However, below I will argue that a Tense Phrase projects in FCCs.

The time adverb within the FCC has to match with the temporal value of the clause. A past/future-time denoting adverb can occur in an FCC with a verb bearing Past/Future Tense marker, respectively:

(41) [Sen-Ø/i Ali-yle dün konustun] san-iyordu/acak-lar.
you-nom/acc -comm yesterday talked assumed/will.assume-3p
'They were thinking/will think you talked to Ali yesterday'

(42) [Sen-Ø/i Ali-yle yarin konusacaksin] san-iyor-(du)-lar.
you-nom/acc -comm tomorrow will.talk assume-prog-pst-3p
'They think/thought you will talk to Ali tomorrow'

In ex. 41, the verb of the FCC bears Past Tense marker *–DI*, and the temporal adverb denotes past-time: *dün* 'yesterday'. The Tense of the matrix clause can be past or future. The fact that the matrix Tense can be future shows that there is tense dependency between the matrix clause and the FCC, and that it is not the matrix tense that licenses the time adverb. In ex. 42, the tense marker in the FCC is future, and the temporal adverb denotes future time; the tense of the matrix clause can be past or present.

The following example shows it much more clearly that FCC's have a Tense projection.

(43) [Let us assume that I make the following statement to a friend on Thursday, where Friday and Saturday are the following consecutive days]:
*[Sen-Ø/i Ali-yle Cuma günü konustun] san-acak-lar Cumartesi.
you-nom/acc -comm Friday day talked will.assume Saturday
'*Saturday they will think you have talked to Ali Friday.'

In ex. 43, the tense value of the FCC and the temporal adverb do not match: the FCC bears past tense marker, the temporal adverb denotes future time; although the tense

of the matrix clause is future, it does not license the temporal adverb. This example also shows that *–DI* cannot be interpreted as **perfective** marker either. The only possible reading with ex. 43 is one in which *Cuma günü* 'Friday' precedes Thursday, i.e. Speech Time.

In the following example, let us assume I make the statement to a friend today, i.e. Tuesday, and Sunday and Monday are the immediately preceding two days:

(44) *[Sen-Ø/i Ali-yle Pazartesi konusacaksin] san-di-lar Pazar günü.
you-nom/acc -comm Monday will.talk assumed sunday day
*'Sunday they thought you will talk to Ali Monday.'

In ex. 44, the tense value of the FCC and the temporal adverb do not match: the FCC bears future tense marker, the temporal adverb denotes past time; although the tense of the matrix clause is past, it does not license the temporal adverb. Again, the only possible reading with ex. 44 is one in which *Pazartesi* 'Monday' follows the Speech Time, i.e. today. To sum, the temporal value of FCCs and temporal adverbs have to match. So, **FCCs project TP.**

FCCs can project only AspP as well (G. Aygen (p.c.)):

(45) Ben sen-Ø/i Ankara-ya gidiyorsun saniyordum.
I you-nom/acc -dat going was.assuming
'I thought you are/were going to Ankara'

However, even matrix clauses can have only an overt Aspectual marker:

(46) Ben Ankara-ya gidiyorum.
I -dat going
'I am going to Ankara'

Since all sentences have to have Tense (V. Hacquard (p.c.)), I suggest that both examples 45&46 could contain a default Tense value.

In summary, I take FCCs as **deficient** because they never project both overt Tense and Aspectual phrases, unlike matrix clauses. In other words, they cannot contain both Asp^{o} and Tense^{o} in their lexical (sub)array.

5.2.2 No Tense (Phrase) in Nominalized Complement Clauses

Following Aygen (2002), Kennelly (1996, 1997), Sezer (2001), Taylan (1988, 1996), I will argue for (48) (contra Kornfilt, 2006 and Kelepir, 2007):

(47) Nominalized complement clauses (NCC) do not have Tense projection.

Below, I will argue that there is no TP in NCCs. Support comes from time adverbs. Past-time denoting adverbs cannot occur with non-past tenses, and future-time denoting adverbs can not occur with Past Tense:

(48) a. *Biz dün gelecegiz.
we yesterday will.come
'*We will come yesterday.'
b. *Biz yarin geldik.
we tomorrow came
'*We came tomorrow.'

However, *dün* 'yesterday' can occur with future-time denoting –(y)AcAK in embedded clauses, while the reference time of the event in the NCC is [+past]:

(49) Ahmet [Hasan-in dün gelecegini] söylemisti Cumartesi.
-gen yesterday will.come had.said Saturday
'Saturday Ahmet said that Hasan was going to come yesterday.'

Likewise, future-time denoting adverb yarin 'tomorrow' can occur with non-future denoting -DIK in embedded complement clauses, while the reference time of the event in the embedded clause is [+future]:

(50) [I can make the following statement to a friend on Thursday, where Friday and Saturday are the following consecutive days]:
Cumartesi gün-kü gazete-de Basbakan-in Amerika-ya Cuma günü
Saturday day-kI newspaper-loc prime.minister-gen -dat Friday day
geldigini] okuyacaksin."
came will.read
'You will read in Saturday's newspaper that the prime minister came to the U.S. on Friday.'

So, since there isn't a one-to-one correspondence between so-called Tense markers and time adverbs in embedded clauses, I argue that there is no Tense projection in embedded complement clauses in Turkish. It includes AspP selected by AgrP.

In conclusion, NCCs, lacking a TP projection, have either AspP projection making perfective/imperfective distinction or a Modality Phrase making REALIS/IRREALIS distinction (Bybee, 1998).

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, Gapping in Turkish is elision of Agr_SP (to which V^o raises overtly). We also have found out that the C^o with the [+E] feature that licenses gapping does not select deficient domains as its complement (see Polinsky (2007) for similar properties of sluicing). In gapping structures where remnants from a complement clause follow the matrix verb, coordination consists of two matrix clauses, and the elision site is the matrix

domain of the second conjunct. An agenda for future research is to develop a formal account of why defective domains cannot be selected by a C^o with [+E] feature licensing gapping.

References

Aygen,Gülsat. 2002. Finiteness, case and clausal architecture. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

Bybee, Joan L. 1998. "Irrealis" as a grammatical Category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40/2: 257-271.

Emonds, Joseph. 1976. *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.

Gallego, Angel, and Juan Uriagereka. 2007. Defective C. Handout of the talk presented at *The 2nd Brussels Conference on Generative Linguistics: Alternatives to Cartography*, Catholic University of Brussels.

Hankamer, Jorge. 1972. On the Nonexistence of Mirror Image Rules in Syntax. In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 1, ed. by J. Kimball, 199–212. New York and London: Seminar Press.

Ince, Atakan. 2006. Pseudo-sluicing in Turkish. In *University of Maryland Department of Linguistics Working Papers in Linguistics* (UMWPiL), Vol. XIV, ed. by Nina Kazanina, Utako Minai, Philip J. Monahan and Heather L. Taylor, 111-126.

Ince, Atakan. 2007. On Default Agreement in Turkish. Paper presented at Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics, Harvard University , Boston, MA.

Ince, Atakan. To appear. Sluicing in Turkish. In *Sluicing: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives*, ed. by Jason Merchant. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Johnson, Kyle. 2003. In search of the English middle field. Ms., UMass at Amherst, MA.

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2000. Directionality of identical verb deletion in Turkish Coordination. In *Jorge Hankamer WebFest*, http://ling.ucsc.edu/Jorge/kornfilt.html.

Merchant, Jason. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In *Topics in Ellipsis*, ed. by Kyle Johnson, 132-153. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and categories. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Polinsky, Maria. 2007. Is sluicing universal? Evidence from the field. Paper presented at 2007 LSA Annual Meeting, Anaheim, CA.

Szabolsci, Anna. 1994. The noun phrase. In *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 27: The syntactic structure of Hungarian*, ed. by F. Kiefer and K. Kiss, 179-274. New York: Academic Press.

Department of Linguistics
1401 Marie Mount Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

atakan@umd.edu