

Grigory Sibilev (HSE University)¹

Introduction: Gribanova (2013) argues that Uzbek employs a copula-based strategy to form pseudo-slucing constructions (1). One of the main arguments she provides in favor of this idea lies in (i) the possibility of optional case marking on the remnant, (ii) genitive subject agreement patterns, and (iii) the availability of deep anaphora in the sense of (Hankamer and Sag 1976). However, one of the obvious problems with such an analysis is the lack of an adequate explanation for the possibility of case connectivity in these constructions, since the assumption that ‘these are copular clauses that permit the appearance of a case marker in their pivots’ (Gribanova and Manetta 2016, 636) directly contradicts our understanding of the mechanism of case assignment.

(1) *Siz kim-ga-dir pul ber-a-siz, lekin kim-ga*
2SG who-DAT-INDEF money give-PRS-2SG but who-DAT

e-kan-lig-i-ni bil-ma-y-man
COP-KAN-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC know-NEG-PRS-1SG

‘You gave money to someone, but I don’t know (to) who.’

(Gribanova and Manetta 2016, 635)

Mishar Tatar data: Mishar Tatar is a *wh*-in-situ language (Tatevosov et al. 2017) with a very similar pattern of forming pseudo-slucing constructions (2). However, in this language, there is no deep anaphora in embedded *wh*-questions (3), it has obligatory case connectivity on the remnant and the pseudo-slucing construction is possible only in the presence of *i-kän*, which has the semantics of the so-called ‘evidential perfect’.

(2) *Marat akça bir-gän kem-ge-der ä kem-*(ge) *(i-kän)-e-n*
M. money give-PFCT who-DAT-INDEF but who-DAT AUX-KAN-3-ACC

bel-m-im
know-NEG-1SG

‘(i) ‘(Someone told me that) Marat gave money to someone, but I don’t know to who.’

*(ii) ‘(I saw that) Marat gave money to someone, but I don’t know to who.’

(3) *min *(bu) nerse bel-m-im*
1SG DEM this know-NEG-1SG

‘I don’t know what this is.’

VP-ellipsis is always an option: the core intuition underlying this proposal is that in Uzbek and Mishar Tatar, despite the impossibility of genuine sluicing (in the sense of Merchant 2001), a less constrained operation — VP-ellipsis — may be involved. Under this approach, the remnant is rescued via scrambling to various available [spec XP] positions. Thus, in Mishar, *-kän* is necessary for forming pseudo-slucing is that the presence of the indirect evidentiality feature [+indir] (inspired by Simeonova and Zareikar 2015 approach) allows EvidP to project a specifier position, into which the remnant scrambles (4). Such movement is possible in Uzbek too, but in different way: *-kan-* does not realize the [+indir] feature in pseudo-slucing constructions and in fact is only an allomorph of aspectual marker *-gan-*, as was noted by Gribanova (2013,

¹The results of the project “Linguistic and cognitive diversity in formal models, computer tools, and educational resources” (2025-2027), carried out within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University), are presented in this work.

24). However, the landing site for the remnant could be the [spec CP] position projected by the complementizer *-lig-* (5), and since only the verbal complex is deleted, *-kan-* introduced by the separate exponent *e-* remains unaffected and may optionally appear.

(4) [EvdP_[+indir] XP_{wh} [TP [VP *t_{wh}*]]] (5) [CP XP_{wh} [TP [AspP [VP *t_{wh}*]]]]

In Mishar, scrambling to [spec CP] is impossible because *wh*-embedded VP-clauses are only introduced via nominalization, and scrambling out of a nominalization is prohibited (6), thereby eliminating the option of scrambling the remnant to the [spec nP] position.

(6) **a-nəŋ_i min* [t_i *jua-gan-e-n*] *bel-em*
 3-GEN 1SG shower-PRFCT-3-ACC know-1SG
 ‘I know he washed himself.’

Discussion: The proposed analysis aligns well with the assumption that certain *wh*-in-situ languages can form pseudo-sluicing constructions via scrambling (see, e.g., [Morgunova 2019](#) for Buryat), differing only in that languages exhibit different available landing sites for the remnant in such constructions. Moreover, it should be noted that the proposed approach is not entirely inconsistent with the core idea of [Gribanova \(2013\)](#), since those Uzbek examples where case marking is absent are likely to represent copula-based sources.

Abbreviations: 1,2,3 – person; ACC – accusative; AUX – auxiliary; COP – copula; DAT – dative; DEM – demonstrative; GEN – genitive; INDEF – indefinite; NEG – negation; PFCT – perfective; POSS – possessive; PRS – present tense; SG – singular.

References: • [Gribanova, V. \(2013\)](#). Copular clauses, clefts, and putative sluicing in Uzbek. *Language*, 89(4):830–882. • [Gribanova, V. and Manetta, E. \(2016\)](#). Ellipsis in Wh-in-situ languages: Deriving apparent sluicing in Hindi-Urdu and Uzbek. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 47(4):631–668. • [Hankamer, J. and Sag, I. \(1976\)](#). Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 7(3):391–428. • [Merchant, J. \(2001\)](#). *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford linguistics. Oxford University Press. • [Morgunova, E. \(2019\)](#). Scrambling-derived sluicing-like constructions: Evidence from buryat. In *Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics:(MIT Working Papers in Linguistics# 90)*, pages 169–176. MIT press. • [Simeonova, V. and Zareikar, G. \(2015\)](#). The syntax of evidentials in azeri, bulgarian, and persian. In *Proceedings of the 2015 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*. • [Tatevosov, S., et al. \(2017\)](#). *Tatar in a Typological Perspective: The Mishar Dialect*. Buki Vedi, Moscow. [in Russian].