This paper investigates Turkish NP, with emphasis on the structural position of possessors, demonstratives, numerals, and adjectives. Ellipsis within Turkish NPs is also investigated, which turns out to be a particularly useful tool for probing NP structure.

We will start by considering how Turkish, an article-less language, fares with respect to Bošković’s (2008a, 2010a) generalizations regarding the DP/NP languages parameter. In principle, even if some article-less languages don’t have DP, it is not out of question that some could have it, therefore we first test Turkish with respect to Bošković’s generalizations. We show Turkish patterns with NP, not DP languages, which has an important impact on the overall analysis we develop in later sections based on c-command tests, linear order, interpretation, and ellipsis of NP-internal elements.

1. NP/DP Generalizations and Turkish

Bošković (2008a, 2010a) argues for a no-DP analysis of languages without definite articles based on a number of crosslinguistic generalizations where the presence/absence of articles in a language plays a crucial role. These generalizations show that there is a fundamental difference between the traditional Noun Phrase (TNP) in languages with articles and article-less languages that cannot be reduced to phonology (overt vs phonologically null articles) since the generalizations involve syntactic and semantic, not phonological phenomena. Below, we will test Turkish with respect to those generalizations (given in subsection headings; see Bošković 2010a for detailed discussion of these generalizations, which are only briefly summarized to here).

1.1 Article-less languages disallow clausemate NPI licensing under NR, article languages allow it

With negative raising (NR), negation behaves as if it were lower than where it surfaces, as confirmed by clausemate NPIs. The NPI from (1) requires clausemate Neg, as (2), involving a non-NR verb claim, shows. Negation then must be present in the embedded clause of (3) when the NPI is licensed:

(1) John hasn’t/*has visited her in at least two years.
(2) *John doesn’t claim [that Mary has visited her [NPI in at least two years]]
(3) John doesn’t believe [that Mary has visited her [NPI in at least two years]]

Bošković observes whether or not a language allows clausemate NPI licensing under NR depends on whether it has articles, establishing 1.1. Turkish clausemate NPIs cannot be licensed long-distance, even under typical raising verbs like san ‘think/believe’. Turkish thus patterns with NP languages here.

---

1TNP is a neutral term that does not take a stand on the potential presence of functional projections in this domain.
1.2 Article-less languages disallow transitive nominals with two lexical genitives

1.2 concerns the availability of structures where both the external (not simply a possessor, but a true external argument) and the internal argument of a noun are genitive, where the genitive is realized via a clitic/suffix or a dummy P. Such cases are disallowed in article-less languages (which don’t otherwise allow multiplication of the same case like Japanese). The same holds for Turkish.

1.3. Only article-less languages may allow scrambling

Bošković observes traditional scrambling languages (e.g. Chukchi, Chichewa, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Serbo-Croatian, and Warlpiri) all lack articles.² As is well-known, Turkish is a scrambling language, hence fits 1.3.

1.4 Radical pro-drop is possible only in article-less languages

Bošković (2010a) defines radical pro-drop as productive pro-drop of subjects and objects in the absence of rich verbal agreement. This type of pro-drop differs from pro-drop in Spanish, which is licensed by verbal morphology. As a result, since Spanish has subject but not object agreement, pro-drop is allowed only with subjects. Radical pro-drop is allowed in Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Kokota, Hindi, Wichita, Malayalam, Thai, Burmese, and Indonesian, all NP languages.

Turkish has subject agreement and Spanish-style subject-drop. However, it also has productive object-drop although it lacks object agreement (see Şener and Takahashi 2010), hence fits 1.4 as an NP language.

1.5 Negative concord reading may be absent with complex negative constituents only in article negative concord languages

²What is meant by scrambling here is the kind of movement referred to as scrambling in Japanese which can take place long-distance out of finite clauses (German is thus not relevant here).
In some negative concord languages, like Italian, the negative concord reading is unavailable with complex negative constituents.

(7) a. Non ho visto nessuno.
   NEG have seen nobody
   ‘I didn’t see anybody.’ (Negative Concord only)

b. Nessuno studente ha letto nessun libro.
   no student has read no book (Double Negation only)

Bošković (2010a) shows that while DP languages differ regarding whether the double negation reading is forced in examples like (7)b, in NP languages only the negative concord reading is allowed here. The same holds for Turkish:

(8) Hiçbir çocuk hiçbir kitab-ı oku-ma-di.
   no child-nom no book-acc read-neg-past
   ‘No child read any book.’ (Negative Concord/*Double Negation)

1.6 Possessors may induce an exhaustivity presupposition only in article languages

Partee (2005) notes that while (9) has the presupposition ‘Zhangsan has exactly three sweaters,’ Mandarin (10) doesn’t have that exhaustivity presupposition, although it is definite:

(9) Zhangsan’s three sweaters
(10) Zhangsan de [san jian maoxianyi]
    Z DEPOSS three CL sweater
    ‘Zhangsan’s three sweaters’

Bošković (2010a) shows we are dealing here with a broader generalization, with the exhaustivity presupposition not being present in NP languages in this context. Turkish again patterns with NP languages: (11) doesn’t have the exhaustivity presupposition:

(11) Can-in üç bisiklet-i
    John-gen three bicycle-3s.poss

3The interpretation of the possessor may change in different syntactic contexts in Turkish and Chinese, see section 2.
1.7 Only article-less languages may allow LBE

Bošković (2010a) shows only article-less languages may allow AP left-branch extraction (LBE).

(12) Doroguji on videl [t₁ mašinu]  (Russian)
    *Expensive₁ he saw [t₁ cars]

It seems Turkish should be classified as a non-LBE language (Turkish does allow possessor extraction)

    P-nom thick book read-past
    ‘Pelin read a thick book.’


This still wouldn’t provide an argument for the DP status of Turkish given the one-way correlation status of 1.7. In fact, Bošković (2010a) notes LBE often requires A-N agreement, which Turkish doesn’t have. However, LBE is actually allowed in Turkish: an adjective can be postposed to the post-verbal field (Kornfilt 2003, Göksel and Kerslake 2005).

(14) ́Pelin [t₁ kitap] oku-du kalın₁.

Note postposing in Turkish involves only non-contrastive elements that are given in the previous discourse, classified as [–contrastive,+discourse anaphoric] in Şener (2010). Fronting however typically involves [+contrastive] constituents, which may also be [+topic] or [+discourse anaphoric]. As for foci, they remain in-situ—they cannot undergo movement no matter whether they are + or - contrastive (Şener 2010). Kalın in (13)a, e.g., must remain inside the NP if it is [+focus]. We therefore conclude adjectival LBE is not categorically ruled out in Turkish, its impossibility in fronting contexts being due to discourse factors (such adjectives must be [–contrastive,+discourse anaphoric] and all movement of such elements in Turkish is to the right).4

---

4See Şener (2010) for arguments based on c-command relations that postposing indeed involves rightward movement (it cannot be handled in terms of base-generation or remnant movement). Note that Slavic AP LBE is also subject to discourse restrictions. There are also syntactic constraints on it. Thus, LBE is disallowed from an NP that is an argument of another noun (Bošković 2010a,b). Significantly, Turkish patterns with Slavic here, which suggests AP postposing in Turkish should be indeed treated in the same way as Slavic AP LBE.

(i) a.[[pro yaşlı teyze-m]-in arkadaş-ı] Pelin-i gör-müş.
    old aunt-1s.poss-gen friend-3s.poss-nom P-acc see-evidential.past
    ‘The friend of my old aunt saw Pelin.’

b.*[[pro t₁ teyze-m]-in arkadaş-ı] Pelin-i gör-müş yaşlı₁.
1.9 Only article languages allow the majority superlative reading

Živanovič (2008) reports Slovenian (15) allows only the plurality reading.

(15) Največ ljudi pije pivo.
    most people drink beer
    Plurality reading (PR): ‘More people drink beer than any other beverage (though it could be less than half the people).’
    Majority reading (MR): *More than half the people drink beer.’

English *most* allows both readings, though in different contexts. German *most* also has both readings: (16) is ambiguous in this respect.

(16) Die meisten Leute trinken Bier.
    the most people drink beer.

Živanovič (2007) observes there’s a broader generalization here, where MR is allowed only in article languages (1.9 concerns only traditional determiners not the cases where MR is expressed with nouns like *majority*).

Gajewski (2011) shows Turkish disallows MR: the most natural interpretation of (17) is that events of beer drinking outnumbered events of drinking any other beverage.

(17) İnsanlar *en çok* bira iç-ti.
    people-nom most beer drink-past
    ‘People drank beer the most.’

Gajewski notes PR can have MR as an instance in context. Thus, (17) may be interpreted indirectly as counting other objects with certain background assumptions; i.e., one might get MR as an inference. However, Gajewski shows MR is unavailable in (17) under the following scenario, which enforces MR ((17) cannot be truthfully uttered in this context). Turkish thus again patterns with NP languages.

(18) Suppose people at a dinner were allowed more than one beverage. 60% of the people had a beer. 75% of the people had a glass of wine.

1.10 Inverse scope is unavailable in article-less languages (in some examples)
Another generalization from Bošković (2010a) concerns inverse scope interpretation of examples like (19), with the unmarked word order for the language. This interpretation is available in English.

(19) Someone loves everyone.

Bošković (2010a) observes that while DP languages differ regarding whether they allow inverse scope here (with most DP languages examined allowing it), this interpretation is as a rule disallowed in NP languages. As is well-known, Turkish here conforms with the general behavior of NP languages. Thus, the object cannot scope over the subject in (20).

(20) iki öğrenci her sandalye-yi kır-mış.
  two student-nom every chair-acc crush-evidential.past
  ‘Two students crushed every chair.’

1.11 Number morphology may not be obligatory only in article-less languages
Consider (21), where the N can be interpreted as plural in the absence of plural morphology.

(21) Susumu-ga hon-o yonda. (Japanese)
  Susumu-nom book-acc bought
  ‘Susumu bought a/the book/books.’

Bošković (2010a) observes languages without obligatory number morphology in non-numeral contexts, i.e. languages where some or all countable Ns can receive plural interpretation without number morphology, all lack articles, establishing 1.11. Note that 1.11 doesn’t require all NP languages to lack number morphology. While Turkish may appear to require it Turkish also productively allows examples like (22), where ‘book’ can be interpreted as plural in the absence of plural morphology (its case-marked counterpart cannot be so interpreted, see Aydemir 2004, Ketrez 2005, Öztürk 2004, Şener 2010).

(22) Can kitap oku-muş.
  John-nom book read-evidential.past
  ‘John read a book/books.’
Based on the above, we conclude Turkish patterns with other article-less languages studied by Bošković (2010a), which provides motivation for classifying it as an NP rather than a DP language.\(^5\)

2. The structure of Turkish NP

Before investigating word order within Turkish TNP, we will determine the position of possessors, which we will use as a pivot in the attempt to understand the distribution of other TNP-elements. The reason for this is that there is a rather straightforward test proposed in Despić (2011) that determines the position of possessors.

In his NP analysis of Serbo-Croatian (SC), Bošković (2010a) treats SC possessors and demonstratives as NP-adjuncts. One of the arguments for this analysis, noted by Despić (2011), is provided by (24), which contrast with English (23) in that the pronoun and the name cannot be co-indexed. Given that the possessor is an NP-adjunct and SC lacks DP, the possessor c-commands out of the TNP, which results in Condition B/C violations in (24).\(^6\)

(23)  
(24)  

\(^5\)Bošković also shows the above generalizations can be deduced under the DP/NP analysis. One of NP/DP generalizations involves adjunct extraction from TNP's, as in *From which city did Peter meet [girls ti]. It is claimed such extraction may be possible only in NP languages. Turkish disallows it:

(i) a.*okul-dan\(_t_1\) Mete [\(t_1\) kiz-lar]-la sinema-ya git-ti.  
   school-abl M-nom girl-pl-with movies-dat go-past
   ‘John went to the movies with girls from school.’

However, we are dealing here with a one-way correlation, where such extraction cannot be possible in DP languages, but can be allowed or disallowed in NP languages (the lack of articles is not the only factor, see Bošković 2010b for discussion of the phenomenon).

A number of Bošković’s generalizations are irrelevant because Turkish doesn’t have the relevant constructions. This concerns the generalizations regarding head-internal relatives, pronominal clitics, multiple-wh-fronting, obligatory classifiers, and focus-movement (see also a suggestion made in Bošković 2010a regarding Turkish and a generalization concerning negative constituents). Regarding the focus-movement generalization, according to which elements undergoing focus-movement are subject to a V-adjacency requirement only in DP languages, it should be noted Turkish requires linear adjacency of (non-D-linked) wh-phrases/foci to V. However, Şener (2010) argues this doesn’t stem from the movement of Wh/Foci and V to the Spec and Head position of a single projection in the left periphery, but is a consequence of left peripheral movement of all but Wh and Foci; Wh/Foci remain adjacent to V in Turkish because only Wh/Foci and the verb don’t undergo movement. This makes the focus-movement generalization irrelevant to Turkish.

\(^6\)Japanese and Chinese pattern with SC (Bošković 2010a, Cheng in preparation, Takahashi 2011; Takahashi notes that for some speakers relational nouns (like “father”) behave differently due to an interfering factor which is not relevant here. Note also that Condition A cannot be tested here due to interfering factors, see Despić (2011).
Significantly, Turkish patterns with SC, not English. As (25) shows, the possessor apparently c-commands out of its TNP as these sentences are clear violations of Conditions B/C. We therefore assume possessors are also NP-adjoined in Turkish, with the DP-layer missing in the language.

(25) a.*[Özpetek\(^1\)-in film]-i o\(^1\)-nu hayal kırıklığına uğrat-tı.
    Ö.-gen movie-3s.poss he-acc disappoint-past
    'Özpetek’s movie disappointed him.'
b.*[o\(^1\)-nun film]-i Özpetek\(^1\)-i hayal kırıklığına uğrat-tı.
    he-gen movie-3s.poss Ö.-acc disappoint-past
    'His movie disappointed Özpetek.'

Consider now word order within Turkish TNP: 7

(26) a. Poss»Dem»(A)»Num»(A)»N
    Can-in şu (eski) üç (eski) bisiklet-i
    John-gen that old three bicycle-3s.poss
    ‘those three old bicycles of John’s’
b.*Poss»Num»Dem»A»N
    *Can-in üç şu eski bisiklet-i
c.*Num»Poss»Dem»A»N
    *üç Can-in şu eski bisiklet-i
d.*Poss»A»Dem»Num»N
    *Can-in eski şu üç bisiklet-i
e. *A»Poss»Dem»Num»N
    *eski Can-in şu üç bisiklet-i

(27) a. Dem»Poss»(A)»Num»(A)»N
    şu Can-in (eski) üç (eski) bisiklet-i
b.*Dem»Num»Poss»A»N
    *şu üç Can-in eski bisiklet-i
c.*Num»Dem»Poss»A»N
    *üç şu Can-in eski bisiklet-i
d.*Dem»A»Poss»Num»N

\(^7\) (26)e/(27)d are possible on the irrelevant interpretation where there are multiple individuals with the name John and the one that is considered as the former (for whatever reason) is talked about here.

5
*şu eski Can-in üç bisiklet-i

e. *A»Dem»Poss»Num»N
*eski şu Can-in üç bisiklet-i

Poss must precede Num/Adj, but can precede or follow Dem. Num and Adj may shift order but these are the only options for them. Focusing on Poss/Num/A, their order follows if Poss is an NP-adjunct, as discussed above, and Num and Adj hold NP spec positions. The free order for Num and Adj is then a consequence of the free order for the specifiers, but they both must follow Poss.\(^8\)

Recall Bošković (2010a) argues both possessors and demonstratives are NP-adjuncts in SC. (27)a, where Dem precedes Poss, can be accounted for if Dem is also NP-adjoined in Turkish. This provides a simple account for the fact that Dem precedes Num and Adj, but may precede or follow Poss.\(^9\)

(28)

\[\text{NP} \quad \text{Poss|Dem} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Dem|Poss} \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Num|Adj} \quad N' \quad \text{Adj|Num}\]

\(^8\)We are treating numerals and adjectives differently from Bošković’s account of SC. Numerals actually have a rather peculiar behavior in SC, and SC adjectives differ in several respects from Turkish adjectives (e.g. they are much more mobile and agree in case/phi-features). We leave open whether these differences can be unified with the different structures for these elements proposed here and in Bošković (2010a). (However, note we follow Bošković’s 2009 approach to adjectives, where adjectives are located in multiple Specs of the same phrase, not Cinque’s 1994 approach.)\(^9\)Bir is traditionally claimed to be homophonous between an indefinite article and numeral ‘one’. Even if bir were an indefinite article, this wouldn’t require adopting a DP analysis for Turkish, given that Slovenian, which clearly has indefinite but not definite articles, behaves like NP languages in all respects, including the cases where indefinite articles are present (Bošković 2008b). Ketrez (2004), however, shows that “two” birs have identical syntactic distribution and that they are furthermore distributionally identical with other cardinal numbers. Thus, like other numerals, bir can precede or follow adjectives. Turkish TNPs in general can be interpreted as specific or non-specific, depending on the context and prosody. The same holds for bir/numeral phrases. Thus, while bir/iki can either follow or precede mavi in (i), phonological prominence on bir/iki in either position favors the specific interpretation, while the lack of phonological prominence favors the non-specific interpretation (see also Ketrez 2004, Öztürk 2004; for another parallel, see footnote 13). It thus appears there’s no reason to give bir a fundamentally different treatment from other numerals (due to space limitations we will not discuss bir further here).

A-nom blue one/two bicycle buy-past
‘Ali bought one/two blue bicycle(s).’
A significant prediction of this structure is this: Poss should c-command out of its TNP even when preceded by Dem since even in this case Poss is not dominated by the TNP. The prediction is borne out. (SC behaves in the same way, see Despić 2011, Bošković 2010a.)

(29) a.*[şu Özpetekˈ-in film]-i oˈ-nu hayal kıırıklığa uğrat-tı.

    that Ö.-gen movie-3s.poss he-acc disappoint-past

    'That movie of Özpetek’s disappointed him.’

b.*[şu oˈ-nun film]-i Özpetekˈ-i hayal kıırıklığa uğrat-tı.

    that he-gen movie-3s.poss Ö.-acc disappoint-past

    'That movie of him disappointed Özpetek.’

The violations of Conditions B/C in (29) provide clear evidence that Dem that precedes Poss is not in a separate projection (it doesn’t close off the c-command domain of Poss). We take this to be a strong argument for the claim defended here that Turkish TNPs lack DP.

To complete the paradigm, we provide examples where Poss precedes Num, Num+Classifier, and Adj, which are all ungrammatical due to Condition B violations:

(30) a.*[Özpetekˈ-in iki (tane) film]-i oˈ-nu hayal kıırıklığa uğrat-tı.

    Ö.-gen two CLL movie-3s.poss he-acc disappoint-past

    'Two movies of Özpetek’s disappointed him.’

b.*[Özpetekˈ-in eski film]-i oˈ-nu hayal kıırıklığa uğrat-tı.

    Ö.-gen old movie-3s.poss he-acc disappoint-past

    ‘Özpetek’s old movie disappointed him.’

We now return to 1.6, exploring its relevance for TNP-structure. Recall that, in contrast to English (9), Turkish (31) and Mandarin (32) don’t have the presupposition ‘Zhangsan has exactly three sweaters’:

(31) Can-in üç bisiklet-i

    John-gen three bicycle-3s.poss

\[\text{We leave open why (i) is only somewhat degraded.} \]
\[\text{(i) } [\text{Özpetekˈ-in şu film]-i oˈ-nu hayal kıırıklığa uğrat-tı.} \]
\[\text{Ö.-gen that movie-3s.poss he-acc disappoint-past} \]
\[\text{Notice that (ii) is fully unacceptable (due to a Condition C violation).} \]
\[\text{(ii) *[oˈ-nun şu film]-i Özpetekˈ-i hayal kıırıklığa uğrat-tı.} \]
\[\text{he-gen that movie-3s.poss Ö.-acc disappoint-past} \]
\[\text{‘That movie of his disappointed Özpetek.’} \]
(32) Zhangsan de [san jian maoxianyi]  
Z DE_Poss three CL sweater  
‘Zhangsan’s three sweaters’

Mandarin also allows the order in (33), which implies Z has more than three books (see Partee 2005):

(33) san ben [Zhangsan de] shu  
three CL Z DE_Poss book  
‘three of Zhangsan’s books’

Recall Poss»Num»N is the only licit order in Turkish. The order can yield different interpretations in different contexts, which can be seen when NPs are placed in clauses. Thus, (34), where the possessive NP is embedded in a sentence with a locative predicate, implies John has more than three bicycles:

(34) Can-in üç bisiklet-i garaj-da.  
John-gen three bicycle-3s.poss garage-loc  
‘John’s three bicycles are in the garage.’

If we take Mandarin word order to transparently reflect LF, (33) should be taken as indicating that the more-than-# reading requires Poss to be interpreted within the scope of Num. If in Turkish NPs with this reading Poss should also be interpreted inside Num, there should be a Poss position below Num. We therefore modify (28) by assuming Poss is merged below Num, presumably as N-complement, and then adjoins to NP:\(^{11}\)

(35)

\[ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{Poss} \]
\[ \text{Num|Adj} \]
\[ N' \]
\[ \text{Adj|Num} \]
\[ N' \]
\[ <\text{Poss}> \]
\[ N^0 \]

\(^{11}\)This movement violates Bošković’s (2005,2010b) version of anti-locality, which requires movement to cross at least one full phrase. Larson and Cho (1999), however, argue such examples involve richer structure (a null PP, with Poss starting as P-complement), in which case (35) can be modified so that the anti-locality problem doesn’t arise.
On the more-than-# reading, which in Mandarin requires Num»Poss order, Poss is then interpreted in its reconstructed position.

Bošković (2007) shows SC possessors can precede or follow adjectives. The order permutations in (36) have semantic effects. (36)b can only refer to the pants John formerly owned. To refer to an object John now possesses and that was once formerly pants (it could be shorts now) (36)a must be used. Importantly, Larson and Cho (1999) argue that on the former but not the latter reading Poss is interpreted within the scope of A, which is transparently reflected in the SC word order.

(36)  a. Jovanove bivše pantalone
      John’s former pants
  b. Bivše Jovanove pantalone

While Turkish allows only Poss»A order, (37) is ambiguous. Extending the above analysis to Turkish requires Poss to start below A, where it would reconstruct on the reading it shares with (36)b.

(37) Can-in eski pantolon-u
      J-gen former pants-3s.poss

The proposal is then that Poss in Turkish is base-generated low but moves to a higher position. An interesting prediction manifests itself when this proposal is combined with Takahashi’s (1996,2000,2001) claim that pro doesn’t undergo movement. The prediction is that null possessors inside subject NPs should not induce Condition C violations, unlike overt possessors, since such possessors wouldn’t move to the NP-adjoined position (see Kornfilt 1984, Sezer 1991 on pro possessors in Turkish). This prediction is borne out (compare (38) with (29)b).

(38) [su proi film]-i Özetek'i hayal kırıklığına uğrat-ti.
      that movie-3s.poss Ö.-acc disappoint-past
      'That movie of him disappointed Özetek.'

To conclude, we have shown only the orders below are allowed in Turkish and accounted for this by treating Poss and Dem as NP-adjuncts and Num and A as NP-Specs. Overt possessors move to this position, while pro possessors stay in a lower position.

(39) a. Poss»Dem »Num »A »N  b. Poss»Dem »A »Num »N
3. NP/N'-ellipsis

3.1. Impossible cases

We now turn to TNP-internal ellipsis, referred to below as NP/N'-ellipsis. Notice first that ellipsis inside bare objects with numerals is disallowed.


P.-nom every day five apple eat-pres J.-nom-however two eat-aor

‘Pelin eats five apples every day, while John eats 2 apples.’

Ellipsis inside bare objects with adjectives is also disallowed (the NP’s number is irrelevant):12


P.-nom old book sell-past S.-nom-however new sell-past

‘Pelin sold old books, while Susan sold new ones.’


P.-nom old car-pl sell-past S.-nom-however new -pl sell-past

‘Pelin sold old cars, while Susan sold new ones.’

NP/N'-ellipsis also cannot strand possessors:

(42) *[Pamuk-un kitab-ı-nı] oku-du-m,

P.-gen book-3sg.poss-acc read-past-1sg

ama [Oe-nin kitab-ı-nı] oku-ma-di-m.

but O.-gen read-neg-past-1sg

‘I read Pamuk’s book, but I didn’t read Oe’s.’

The unacceptability of all the examples in (40)-(42) receives a simple unified account under the present proposal that numerals, adjectives, and possessors are all NP-specifiers/adjuncts in Turkish, as

---

12See 3.2.2 for accusative objects.
in (43), given that only phrases (not segments or bar-level categories) can be elided. We take this to be a strong argument for the current analysis.13

(43)  
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Num} & \text{N'} & \text{Adj} & \text{N'} & \text{Poss} & \text{NP} \\
\end{array}
\]

We now turn to classifier constructions. Count nouns quantified by a numeral don’t require a CLassifier-Like element (CLL). CLL can, however, be present, bringing in an individuating function.

(44)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{a. üç kitap} & \text{b. üç } \text{tane kitap} \\
\end{array}
\]

three book  three CLL book

‘three (items of) books’

13It is well-known that, in contrast to accusative objects, bare objects (22) must incorporate into the verb in Turkish. There is a potential alternative analysis of the ellipsis facts that relies on the assumption that Ns with numerals/adjectives must incorporate, which would make ellipsis of Ns that strands V impossible. (This analysis is inapplicable to possessive NPs, which require accusative as direct objects.) However, a test from Aydemir (2004) shows Ns with numerals are not V-incorporated, though Ns with adjectives may be analyzed as V-incorporated. Consider (i), where deleting N leads to ungrammaticality (ia), whereas ellipsis of the entire nominal complement clause is grammatical (ib). Deleting Bir+NP is allowed, with or without V-ellipsis (ii).

(i)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{a. Bütün gün kitap oku-du-m,} & \text{*san-a da} & \text{kitap oku-ma-n-i} & \text{tavsiye ed-er-im.} \\
\text{all day book read-past-1sg} & \text{you-dat} & \text{read-nom-agr.2sg-acc recommend-aor-1sg} & \text{‘I read books all day, I recommend to you to read too.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Bütün gün kitap oku-du-m, san-a da kitap oku-ma-n-i tavsiye ed-er-im.

(ii)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Dün bir} & \text{kitap oku-du-m, san-a da} & \text{bir kitap oku-ma-n-i/bir kitap oku-ma-n-i} & \text{tavsiye ed-er-im} \\
\text{yesterday one book read-past-1sg} & \text{you-dat} & \text{read-nom-agr.2sg-acc recommend-aor-1sg} & \text{Aydemir (2004)} \\
\end{array}
\]

This can be taken as a test for obligatory incorporation: given that the bare NP in (i) must incorporate into the verb it cannot be elided without it. It must then be the case that the bir NP doesn’t (have to) incorporate.

This test indicates numeral NPs don’t (have to) incorporate:

(iii)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Dün iki} & \text{kitap oku-du-m, san-a da} & \text{iki kitap oku-ma-n-i} & \text{tavsiye ed-er-im.} \\
\text{yesterday two book read-past-1sg} & \text{you-dat} & \text{read-noml-2s.poss.acc recommend-aor-1sg} & \text{‘I read two books yesterday, I recommend you read them too.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

(iv)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{Dün iki} & \text{kitap oku-du-m, san-a da} & \text{iki kitap oku-ma-n-i} & \text{tavsiye ed-er-im.} \\
\text{yesterday two book read-past-1sg} & \text{you-dat} & \text{read-noml-2s.poss.acc recommend-aor-1sg} & \text{Aydemir (2004)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Bare NPs with adjectives behave differently:

(v)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{a. Ben soğuk çay iç-ceğ-im,} & \text{san-a da} & \text{soğuk çay iç-me-n-i} & \text{tavsiye ed-er-im.} \\
\text{I-nom cold tea drink-fut-1sg} & \text{you-dat} & \text{drink-noml-2s.poss.acc recommend-aor-1sg} & \text{‘I will drink cold tea, I recommend you drink it too.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Ben soğuk çay iç-ceğ-im, san-a da soğuk çay iç-me-n-i tavsiye ed-er-im.

However, the grammaticality status of (va) is not the same as that of (41). We interpret this as indicating that an additional factor is in play with (41), which we have discussed above.

Also, ellipsis is impossible in the subject NP in (via), where incorporation is clearly not an issue. The incorporation analysis then cannot be extended to this case. (Partial subject ellipsis is also impossible with numerals and possessives.)

(vi)  
\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{a. *[Yaşlı bakıcı]} & \text{çoçuk-ları azarla-di,} & \text{ama [genç bakıcı] onlar-i teselli et-ti.} \\
\text{old caretaker-nom kid-pl-acc scold-past but young they-acc console-past} & \text{‘The old caretaker scolded the students, but the young one tried to console them.’} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{this semester three student flunk-past but last semester five flunk-past.perfect} \\
\text{‘This semester three students flunked, whereas in the past semester five students had flunked.’} \\
\]

c. *[Pelin’in anne-si] dün gel-di, [Mete’nin anne-si] bugün gel-di. \\
\text{P.-gen mother-3s.poss yesterday come-past M.-gen today come-past} \\
\text{‘Pelin’s mother came yesterday, Mete’s came today.’} \\
\]
Importantly, NP/N'-ellipsis is possible if Num is accompanied by CLL, in contrast to (40), where there is no CLL and ellipsis is disallowed.¹⁴

    P.-nom every day three CLL apple eat-aor J.-nom-however two CLL         eat-aor
    ‘Pelin eats three apples every day, whereas John eats 2 apples.’

Bošković (2010a,b) and Despić (2011) argue SC numerals that are non-adjectival have a distinct projection above NP, namely QP. (SC also has adjectival numerals which don’t project additional structure.) Assuming Turkish numerals that are accompanied by a CLL also project larger structure than those without a CLL provides us with a straightforward account for (45). Consider (46).

(46)

Recall numerals are base-generated in SpecNP (28). We suggest Num moves to SpecCLLP in the presence of overt classifiers. (45) then involves simple NP-ellipsis.¹⁵,¹⁶

Recall possessors cannot be stranded under NP/N'-ellipsis. Under a DP analysis of Turkish, possessors are analyzed as occupying SpecDP, which naturally predicts Poss-stranding ellipsis should be possible. The ungrammaticality of (47)-(48) then shows the DP approach to Turkish TNP's fails: Turkish differs sharply from English regarding the possibility of Poss-stranding ellipsis.

¹⁴Such examples require a linguistic antecedent, which confirms we are indeed dealing here with ellipsis (see Hankamer and Sag 1976). Thus, (i) cannot be used in this situation: Two people are grocery shopping. Pointing to apples, A says:
(i) #Pelin her gün üç tane ye-r
    P.-nom every day three CLL eat-aor

¹⁵Note bare Num+CLL NPs don’t incorporate (see footnote 13).

(i) Dün üç tane kitap oku-du-m, san-a da üç tane kitap oku-ma n-i taviye ed-er-im.
    yesterday three CLL book read-past-1sg you-dat also          read-noml-2s.poss.acc recommend-aor-1sg

¹⁶We assume Num is in SpecCLLP and tane in CLL₀. Another possibility is that Num, which, being non-branching, is an ambiguous XP/X₀ element, is head-adjointed to tane (the ellipsis here then wouldn’t conform to Saito and Murasugi’s 1990 Spec-Head agreement requirement, but this requirement anyway has exceptions, see Bošković 2012). CLLP is then head-initial, which is not implausible given that there are other cases of mixed-headedness languages (nominal domain is a separate domain that doesn’t necessarily have to show the exact same properties as the clausal domain in terms of headedness). There are, however, alternatives where CLLP can be head-final. One alternative is the following: The head of CLLP is null and tane is in SpecCLLP. Num can be in the outer SpecCLLP, or adjoined to tane in SpecCLLP. We will compare these options below.
As discussed above, the impossibility of possessor-stranding ellipsis is straightforwardly accounted for under the current NP analysis, where possessors are NP-adjoined hence cannot be stranded under NP-ellipsis. Notice also that the ill-formedness of (48) is absolute in that stranding Num doesn’t change the judgment (see (49)). The same holds for demonstratives (50).17

(49) *[Auster-in iki kitab-i-ni] oku-du-m,
A.-gen two book-3s.poss-acc read-past-1sg
ama [Pamuk-un üç kitab-i-ni] oku-du-m.
but P.-gen three read-past-1sg

S.-gen that book-acc read-past-1pl but B.-gen read-past-1pl

All of this is expected under the current analysis, where (47)–(50) in fact receive a uniform account: NP-ellipsis fails to elide elements that “belong” to the NP.

Significantly, Poss-stranding ellipsis is possible in the presence of CLL.18
Pelin [Chomsky-nin üç tane kitab-ı-ni] oku-muş,

P.-nom C.-gen three CLL book-3s.poss-acc read-evidential.past

ama [Foucault-nun iki tane kitab-ı-ni] oku-muş.

but F.-gen two CLL read-evidential.past

‘S/he read three books of Chomsky’s, but s/he read 2 books of Foucault’s.’

The contrast between (49)/(52) and (51) is accounted for under the present proposal that CLL projects its own phrase, assuming Poss is CLLP-adjointed. (Poss must precede Num here, which, as discussed above, can be accounted for if Poss is adjoined to the phrase whose Spec Num occupies.)

The analysis also accounts for (54), where Num+CL is elided. ((54) would have to involve segment deletion, which is disallowed.)

*Pelin [Chomsky-nin üç tane kitab-ı-ni] oku-muş,

P.-nom C.-gen three CLL book-3s.poss-acc read-evidential.past

ama [Foucault-nun üç tane kitab-ı-ni] oku-ma-muş.

but F.-gen read-neg-evidential.past

Regarding binding properties of possessors, Condition B/C effects are predicted to show up in this context too since CLLPs don’t change Poss’s c-command properties:

a.*[Özpetek-i-in iki tane film]-i o^i-nu hayal kırıklığına uğrat-ti.

Ö.-gen two CLL movie-3s.poss he-acc disappoint-past
b. *Özpetek'i hayal kırıklığına uğrat-ti.  
   he-gen two CLL movie-3s.poss Ö.-acc disappoint-past  
   'His two movies disappointed Özpetek.'

Recall adjective-stranding ellipsis is impossible, which is not surprising under the current analysis: since the adjective is in SpecNP, (56) cannot involve full phrasal ellipsis.

   P.-nom old two book sell-evidential.past but M.-nom new sell-evidential.past  

Significantly, adjectives that precede CLL survive ellipsis, which can be easily accounted for if the adjective is in CLLP here (whether it moves or is base-generated there is irrelevant).19

   P.-nom thick three CLL book read-past P.-nom-however thin three CLL read-past  
   'Pelin read three long books, but Pinar read three short ones.'

Furthermore, (58) is unacceptable. This is also expected: since the adjective is part of CLLP, other elements in CLLP cannot be elided without the adjective.

   P.-nom thick three CLL book read-past P.-nom-however thin read-past

Adjectives in this context still must follow Poss, which indicates they are located in SpecCLLP. They can either follow or precede Num, which is not surprising given that both Num and Adj are Specs. Interestingly, adjectives cannot intervene between Num and CLL, which may help us tease apart the options from footnote 16.

(59) a. Pelin-in eski üç tane masa-sı  

19This kind of reduced NPs also require a linguistic antecedent, which indicates we are dealing with ellipsis here. Thus, (i) cannot be used in this situation: We are in a bookstore. Pointing to the books on the shelves, I say:
(i) *Pınar ince üç tane oku-du.
   P.-nom thin three CLL read-past
If *tane* is CLL$^6$, we need to assume that in (59)c we are dealing with a PF re-ordering (unless *eski* is NP-adjoined, see below). If *tane* and Num are in different CLLP-Specs, we need to assume there is a PF-adjacency requirement between the two, but PF re-ordering is not required for (59)c. Finally, if Num is adjoined to the CLLP-Spec where *tane* is located, no additional assumptions are required: *eski* can then only precede or follow the Num+$tane$ complex, depending on whether it is located in the higher or lower CLLP-Spec.

The above discussion implied *eski* in (59)c is located in CLLP, not NP. Independent evidence for this is provided by (60): to survive NP-ellipsis here *ince* must be located in CLLP. Is SpecNP still an option for adjectives that follow CLL? That depends on what is elided in (61): deleting *kalın+kitap* under NP-ellipsis would require this option to also be available. However, it’s not easy to determine what is elided here given that *kitap*-deletion doesn’t prevent the interpretation where Pinar read two long books (which is the only interpretation under *kalın+kitap* deletion; note that this is the most natural interpretation here).

(60) Pelin [uç tane *kalın* kitap] oku-du,

P.-nom three CLL thick book read-past

\[
\text{Pınar-sa [uç tane *ince* kitap] oku-du.}
\]

P-nom-however three CLL thin read-past

'Pelin read three long books, while Pinar read three short ones.'


Returning to possessors, there is one context where possessor-stranding ellipsis is possible even without CLLP, which is where possessives are used as predicates:

(62) a. Senin kuzeninin bu kazağı çok sevdiğini biliyorum.

*I know your cousin likes this sweater a lot.*

\[
\text{O yüzden, bu kazak artık \{kuzen-i-nin kazağı-i\].}
\]

because-of-that, this sweater-nom now cousin-3s.poss-gen sweater-3s.poss

‘Because of that, the sweater is now your cousin’s.’
b. Bu benim kazağım.

*this is my sweater.*

Bu da [sen-in/Pelin-in/kuzen-in-in kazağ-ı]

this too you-gen/Pelin-gen/cousin-3s.poss-gen sweater-3s.poss

‘And this is yours/Pelin’s/your cousin’s sweater.’

Following Bowers (1993) and Koster (1994), we assume the relevant NPs here are dominated by a predicate projection, PredP, the possessor being generated inside the NP and then moving to SpecPredP (or adjoining to PredP). This provides a simple account for Poss-stranding under NP ellipsis here, as in (63):

(63)

```
PredP
  ↓ Poss
PredP/Pred'
  ↓ NP
    ↓ N0
    ↓ tPoss
    ↓ Pred0
```

However, a number of authors have argued at least some cases of “stranded” possessors in predicate positions involve an intransitive use of possessors, without any kind of null elements (see Partee and Borschev 2001, Tremblay 1989, Zribi-Hertz 1997; note that, as discussed in footnote 24, Turkish stranded possessors allow only the possession reading, which is the one argued to involve no null element and, according to Tremblay, is confined to predicate positions; it is, e.g., disallowed with objects). Under this approach, (62) doesn’t involve ellipsis, hence there is no need to posit PredP and Poss-movement here.

In fact, such constructions don’t require a linguistic antecedent, which suggests we indeed may not be dealing with ellipsis here (see Zribi-Hertz 1997).

(64)  a. *A and B are planning to buy desks for several friends. In a store, A points to a desk and says:*

    Bu (masa) Pelin-in ol-malı

    this (desk) P.-gen be-deontic.necessity

    'This desk should be Pelin's.'

b. *A linguist is doing an experiment. She turns to the colleague and says (turning the informant over to his colleague):*

    Şu andan itibaren (o) sen-in

    from-now-on he-nom you-gen
‘From now on, he's yours.’

Finally, we take a brief look at NPs containing demonstratives. Consider (65):

(65) a. [Şu [iki kitab]-1 oku-du-m ama [bu [iki kitap]]-nu oku-ma-di-m.
    that two book-acc read-past-1sg but this -acc read-neg-past-1sg
    Intended Reading: ‘I read these two books but didn’t read those two books.’
    b. … bu-nu ‘this-acc’
    c. … bu-nlar-1 ‘this-pl-acc’

The two alternative forms given in (65)b/c can be used in the second conjunct. (65)b presupposes that the entity Dem picks out is a unique/single entity, which indicates the second conjunct cannot involve Num+N ellipsis (as in (65)a) because it simply is not semantically identical to the antecedent NP. (65)c seems a more likely candidate for an ellipsis analysis but we contend it shouldn’t be analyzed as ellipsis either. In (65)c, Dem bears plural; the elided constituent is then potentially identical to the antecedent. However, (65)c may mean ‘these ten books’ in a relevant context; it doesn’t have to be interpreted as ‘these two books’ (although this option is not excluded since two is plural).

(66) shows it is impossible to strand a numeral in the second conjunct NP:20

(66) *[Şu [iki kitap]]-1 oku-du-m ama [bu iki [kitap]]-yi oku-ma-di-m
    that two book-acc read-past-1sg but this two -acc read-neg-past-1sg

This is expected under the current analysis: being located in SpecNP, Num cannot survive NP ellipsis.

Most importantly, stranding Dem+Num is possible with classifiers. As (67) shows, the presence of CLL makes such ellipsis, which was disallowed without CLL, possible.

(67) [Şu [iki (tane) kitab]]-1 oku-du-m ama [bu iki tane [kitap]]-yi oku-ma-di-m
    that two (CLL) book-acc read-past-1sg but this two CLL -acc read-neg-past-1sg

20We assume (66) involves ellipsis (see also (50)), unlike only-demonstrative examples like (65). Acc is left behind in the ellipsis TNP in (66) because demonstrative TNPs generally require it (i); (66), however, remains unacceptable if Acc is elided.

(i) a. [bu iki kitap]*(-i) oku-ma-di-m.
   this two book-acc read-neg-past-1sg
   b. Bu-*’(nu) sev-er-im
   this-acc like-aor-1sg
   ‘I like this.’
‘I read those two books but didn’t read these two books.’

This is exactly what is expected: the numeral here moves to SpecCLLP, *kitap* is then a full NP hence can be deleted alone under NP-ellipsis.  

### 3.2 No ellipsis

In this section we discuss two cases that appear to involve ellipsis, arguing they shouldn’t be analyzed this way.

#### 3.2.1 Pronominal *ki*

We have seen Turkish possessors cannot be stranded under NP/N'-ellipsis:

(68) *[Pamuk-un kitab-i-ni] oku-du-m,  
    P.-gen book-3sg.poss-acc read-past-1sg  
    ama [Oe-nin kitab-i-ni] oku-ma-di-m.  
    but O.-gen read-neg-past-1sg  
‘I read Pamuk’s book, but didn’t read Oe’s.’

However, (68) becomes acceptable in the presence of *ki*, which attaches to Poss:

(69) [Pamuk-un kitab-i-ni] oku-du-m,  
    P.-gen book-3sg.poss-acc read-past-1sg  
    ama [Oe-nin-ki-ni] oku-ma-di-m.  
    but O.-gen-ki-acc read-neg-past-1sg  
‘I read Pamuk’s book, but didn’t read the one by Oe.’

This *ki* has been identified as a pronominal element in the literature, referred to as pronominal *ki* (see e.g. Lewis 1967, Göksel and Kerslake 2005). Adopting this analysis, we argue *ki*-NPs don’t involve ellipsis, which is what Hankamer (2004) also argues for. Evidence for this analysis comes from the observation that *ki* can only attach to a possessor if the NP is reduced; it cannot be used when the NP is fully represented. This means *ki* stands for the ellipsis site.

---

21We assume that, like Poss, Dem is here CLLP-adjoined (Dem can either precede or follow Poss, but it must precede Num and Adj). Whether it moves to this position or not is immaterial.

22*Ki* also attaches to locative/temporal expressions, turning them into nominal modifiers:

(i) dün-ki̇ hava  
    yesterday-ki̇ weather  
    ‘yesterday’s weather’
The claim that *ki* is a (pro)nominal element receives support from the observation that *ki*-NPs must receive case and can bear plural morphology. Consider also the following:

(71) [Auster-in iki kitab-1-ni oku-du-m]
    A.-gen two book-3s.poss-acc read-past-1sg
    ama [Pamuk-un-ki]-ni oku-ma-di-m.
    but P.-gen-ki acc read-neg-past-1sg
    ‘I read two books by Auster but didn’t read the one by Pamuk.’

(72) [Auster-in iki kitab-1-ni oku-du-m]
    A.-gen two book-3s.poss-acc read-past-1sg
    ama [Pamuk-un-ki-ler]-i oku-ma-di-m.
    but P.-gen-ki-pl acc read-neg-past-1sg
    ‘I read two books by Auster but didn’t read the ones by Pamuk.’

In (71), the *ki*-object cannot be interpreted like the first object, i.e. as ‘two books’. This is expected under the non-ellipsis analysis. In (72), the *ki*-object bears plural. Importantly, it’s not necessarily interpreted as denoting ‘two books’; there can be any number of books as long as it’s more than one.

Further support for the no-ellipsis analysis is provided by NPs containing other nominal elements. The *ki*-NP in (73) cannot be interpreted as ‘*that* book by Beckett’; it is simply interpreted as Beckett’s book.23

(73) [Sartre-in şu kitabı-ni oku-du-k ama [Beckett-in-ki]-ni oku-ma-di-k.]
    S.-gen that book-acc read-past-1pl but B.-gen-ki-acc read-neg-past-1pl

---

23*Ki* can only be supported by possessors (along with temporal/locative expressions, though these could involve a different *ki*), not by a demonstrative (or Adj/Num/CLL, even if Poss precedes them). We assume this is a morphological restriction.

(i)*[Sartre-in şu kitabı-ni oku-du-k ama [Beckett-in {şu-nu-ki/su-ki-ni}]-ni oku-ma-di-k.]
    S.-gen that book-acc read-pst-1pl but B.-gen that-acc-ki/that-ki-acc read-neg-past-1pl
    ‘We read that book by Sartre but we didn’t read that one by Beckett.’

(ii) [Şu Sartre-in kitabı-ni oku-du-k ama [şu Beckett-in-ki-ni] oku-ma-di-k.]
    ‘We read this book by Sartre but we didn’t read that one by Beckett.’
Finally, *ki*-NPs don’t require a linguistic antecedent, which confirms they don’t involve ellipsis.\(^{24}\)

\[\text{(74) } I\text{ know my friends are sending me presents for my birthday. I come home and find a number of presents on the table. Having opened one of them, I say:} \]

\[\text{Bu (hediye) Pelin-in-}ki\text{ ol-mal{\i}.} \]

\[\text{this (present) P.-gen-}ki\text{ be-epistemic.modal} \]

\[\text{‘This (present) must be Pelin’s.’} \]

\[\vspace{12pt} \]

\[3.2.2\text{ Stranded adjectives} \]

We have seen adjectives cannot be stranded under ellipsis in examples like (41). In many languages adjectives can be used in what appear to be ellipsis contexts without a noun but in such cases adjectives are essentially used as nouns, hence such cases shouldn’t be treated as involving ellipsis. Such cases often require overt manifestation of this special use of adjectives, such as special morphological marking on the adjective or use of an article, as in English “the rich”. Bošković (2005) observes NP languages seem much more productive in this respect. Turkish patterns with other NP languages in that such usage of adjectives is quite productive.\(^{25}\) However, as in other languages, it

\[^{24}\text{Ki\ seems similar to the Japanese pronoun } sore, \text{ which can also be modified by possessives (Takahashi 2008).}\]

\[^{25}\text{See Kornfilt (1997), Göksel and Kerslake (2005), who note that many adjectives in Turkish can be used as nouns. Turkish adjectives can also quite generally bear typical nominal morphology.}\]
generally requires special morphological marking. Thus, such adjectives in object position must be accusative case-marked, as illustrated by (75), which contrast with (41).

(75) a. Pelin eski kitabı sat-tı, Suzan-sa yeni-yi sat-tı.
   P.-nom old book-acc sell-past S.-nom-however new-acc sell-past
   P.-nom old car-pl-acc sell-past S.-nom-however new-pl-acc sell-past

Our claim is then that the reduced NPs above are simply nominalized adjectives, they don’t involve ellipsis. That this is indeed the case is confirmed by the fact that such reduced NPs don’t require a linguistic antecedent. Thus, (76) can be used in this context: John and Mary are planning to buy a table. They go into a shop, where there are a number of tables of different shapes and colors, one old others new. Pointing to one of them John says: ((77) can be used in a similar context involving car buying.)

(76) Eski-yi/Yuvarlağ-ı/Yeşil-i isti-yor-um.
   old-acc/round-acc/green-acc want-pres-1sg

— Consider also adjectives “stranded” in subject position. Note nominative has no morphological exponence in Turkish. Some adjectives in subject position require plural marking, some are only slightly degraded without it, and some are fully acceptable without it. (Plural should be taken as present or absent in both conjuncts in each coordination. Note that the partitivity marker –(s)I improves some degraded cases (ii), which confirms the relevance of overt nominal morphology.) A linguistic antecedent is not necessary.

(i) Yaşlı bakıcı-(lar) çocuk-lar-ı azarla-di, ama genç-*(ler) onlar-ı teselli et-ti.
   old caretaker-nom-pl kid-pl-acc scold-past but young-nom-pl they-acc console-past
   ‘The old caretaker(s) scolded the students, but the young one(s) tried to console them.’
(ii) Yeni araba-(lar) çok işle yara-di ama eski-?*(ler/si) epeye sorun çık-ar-di.
    new car-nom-pl very useful-past but old-nom-pl-partitive quite trouble cause-past
    ‘The new car(s) was/were very useful but the old one(s) was/were very troublesome.’
(iii) Hızlı araba-(lar) biz-i etkile-di, ama yavaş-?-(lar) hayal kırıklığına uğrat-ti.
      fast car-pl-nom we-acc impress-past but slow-pl-nom disappoint-past
      ‘The fast car(s) impressed us, but the slow one(s) disappointed us.’
(iv) Güçlü insan-(lar) biz-i etkile-r, ama zayıf-(lar) hayal kırıklığına uğrat-ir.
      strong person-pl-nom we-acc impress-aor but weak-pl-nom disappoint-aor
      ‘Strong people impress us, weak ones disappoint us.’
(v) Eski-*(ler) herşey-i bil-dikleri-ni düşün-ür-ler.
     old-nom-pl everything-acc know-noml-3pl.poss-acc think-aor-3pl
     ‘The elderly think they know everything.’
(vi) Zengin-(ler) Bush-u sev-er.
     rich -(pl) Bush-acc like-aor
     ‘The rich like Bush.’
(vii) Mete is lying on the ground, after being hit by a car. There is a green and a red car parked in the middle of the street. Pointing to the green car I tell the policeman:
     Yeşil vur-du o-na
     green hit-past he-dat
     ‘The green one hit him.’
Although Turkish is much more productive than e.g. English in this respect, some adjectives in Turkish resist nominal usage even under the morphological conditions noted above.

(78) *Senato gerçek soykırım iddiaları-nı tartış-tı, ama sözde-ler-i tartış-ma-di.

Senate-nom true genocide claims-acc discuss-past but alleged-acc discuss-neg-past

'The senate discussed the true claims of genocide, but it didn’t discuss the alleged ones.'

(79) *Pelin sıradan tablo-lar-ı sev-me-z ama muhteşem-ler-i sev-er.

P-nom ordinary painting-pl-acc like-neg-aor but magnificent-pl-acc like-aor

'Pelin doesn’t like ordinary paintings, but she likes magnificent ones.'

Given such cases and examples like (41), which are quite generally unavailable, we assume the cases of stand-alone adjectives noted above involve adjectives used as nouns, as confirmed by the accompanying nominal morphology and the fact that such adjectives can occur in non-ellipsis contexts.

To summarize, we have argued NP/N′-ellipsis is only licensed by \(\text{CLL}^0\) and (possibly) \(\text{Pred}^0\); there is no ellipsis licensed by D since there is no D. This provides a simple account for why simple possessor-stranding ellipsis is disallowed in Turkish, unlike English. We have also argued that several cases that appear to involve ellipsis do not actually involve ellipsis.

### 4. Conclusion

We have argued for a no-DP analysis of Turkish TNP. We have provided an account of word order and interpretation of elements within Turkish NP where Poss and Dem are NP-adjoined and Num and Adj are NP Specs. Overt possessors move to this position, while pro possessors stay in a lower position. We have shown Turkish disallows Poss/Dem/Adj/Num stranding under ellipsis, which follows under the NP analysis, given that these elements are “part” of NP. We have argued that a functional projection is present above NP in classifier and possibly predicate constructions. Such cases allow TNP-internal ellipsis, with elements located within the functional projection(s) in question (and outside of NP) surviving ellipsis.
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