

## An in-situ analysis of reduced embedded questions with multiple *wh*-phrases in Uyghur

Xue Bai\*

**Abstract.** This paper provides a detailed description of reduced embedded questions with multiple *wh*-phrases in Uyghur and proposes to analyze them in terms of an in-situ analysis. We argue that reduced questions with multiple *wh*-phrases in Uyghur can be derived from in-situ focus sentences. This proposal is supported by the fact that the in-situ analysis can account for the observed properties of reduced questions, including the presence of a copula, the case-matching effect, the absence of the clause-mate effect, and island-insensitivity.

**Keywords.** multiple sluicing; Uyghur; case-matching effect; clause-mate condition

**1. Introduction.** Coined by Ross (1969), the term ‘sluicing’ is defined as the ellipsis process by which questions, such as (1a), are converted into their reduced forms, such as in (1b).

- (1) a. He is writing something, but you can’t imagine [what he is writing].  
 b. He is writing something, but you can’t imagine [what].

The embedded clause in (1a), indicated by square brackets, contains a *wh*-question. In (1b), this question is reduced to contain only a *wh*-phrase. The full-fledged *wh*-question and the reduced *wh*-question have the same interpretation (Ross 1969; Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001). The remaining *wh*-phrase in (1b), namely, *what*, is called a *wh*-remnant, which has a corresponding part in the preceding clause, i.e., *something*, that is called a correlate. The type of sluicing configuration that contains one remnant, as is the case in (1b), is called single sluicing. Sluicing also allows the presence of multiple remnants, which results in another type, called multiple sluicing (Takahashi 1994). Consider (2), which is cited from Merchant (2001):

- (2) ? Everybody brought something (different) to the potluck, but I couldn’t tell you [who what].

Anteceded by the first clause in (2), the reduced question contains two remnants, *who* and *what*.

The sluicing configurations above are also observed in Uyghur (Bai 2023a; 2023b). This paper contributes to the understanding of reduced embedded questions with multiple *wh*-phrases (henceforth, RQMWs) in Turkic languages. While previous studies, such as Gribanova (2013), have analyzed reduced embedded questions with single *wh*-phrases in Uzbek, a language closely related to Uyghur, this paper extends the inquiry to structures involving multiple *wh*-phrases, which have not yet been subject to close examination in Uyghur or other Turkic languages. By doing so, it fills a gap in the existing literature and provides a basis for comparative insights into the syntax of related languages. Furthermore, this paper refines theoretical accounts of multiple sluicing (Takahashi 1994; Merchant 2001; Abels & Dayal 2023; Cortés Rodríguez 2023) by

---

\* I would like to thank the organizing committee at TU+9, especially Young-Hoon Kim and Burak Öney, for their invaluable support and many efforts in making the conference a success. I thank the audience at TU+9 for their valuable comments and feedback. I thank Daiko Takahashi for his detailed guidance, constructive comments, and continued support. I thank my many Uyghur informants, who wish to remain anonymous, for sharing their knowledge with me. This work was supported by JST, the establishment of university fellowships towards the creation of science technology innovation, Grant Number JPMJFS2102. Author: Xue Bai (Dalian Minzu University [xue\\_bai@dlnu.edu.cn](mailto:xue_bai@dlnu.edu.cn) & [bai.xue.t6@alumni.tohoku.ac.jp](mailto:bai.xue.t6@alumni.tohoku.ac.jp)).

testing them against new empirical data. The present study proposes that RQMWs in Uyghur should be analyzed in terms of an in-situ analysis. The analysis also enriches cross-linguistic research on embedded questions, offering broader implications for understanding syntactic variation and universals.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents properties of RQMWs in Uyghur; Section 3 proposes an in-situ analysis to account for RQMWs in Uyghur; and Section 4 summarizes the entire discussion.

**2. Reduced Embedded Questions with Multiple *Wh*-phrases in Uyghur.** This section considers RQMWs in Uyghur. A typical case is shown in (3).

- (3) a. Biz-niñ matematika muällim-imiz bir oquğuçi-ni bir  
 1PL-GEN math teacher-1PL.POSS one student-ACC one  
 sinip-qa kir-güz-di-Ø,<sup>1</sup>  
 classroom-DAT enter-CAUS-PST-3SG  
 ‘The math teacher of our class made a student enter a classroom,’
- b. lekin män-Ø [u-niñ kim-ni qaysi sinip-qa kir-  
 but 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN who-ACC which classroom-DAT enter-  
 güz-gän-lik]-i-ni bil-mä-y-män.  
 CAUS-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC know-NEG-NPST-1SG  
 ‘but I don’t know who he made enter which classroom.’
- c. ??lekin män-Ø [kim-ni qaysi sinip-qa lik]-i-ni  
 but 1SG-NOM who-ACC which classroom-DAT COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
 bil-mä-y-män.  
 know-NEG-NPST-1SG  
 ‘lit. but I don’t know who which classroom.’

The sentence in (3a) antecedes the full-fledged embedded question in (3b) and the reduced question in (3c). Reduction of (3b) yields (3c), containing two *wh*-remnants followed by the COMP, which is in turn followed by the possessive agreement marker and the accusative marker assigned to the embedded clause by the matrix predicate *bil* ‘know.’ (3a) is a causative construction, where the causee, *bir oquğuçi* ‘one student,’ is marked accusative, and the internal argument of the predicate, *bir sinip* ‘one classroom,’ is marked dative. Correspondingly, the cases of the *wh*-remnants match those of their respective correlates. That is, in (3c), *kim* ‘who’ is assigned accusative case, and *qaysi sinip* ‘which classroom’ is assigned dative case.

Importantly, the case-marking on the *wh*-remnants is obligatory. If one of the remnants or both are not case-marked, the relevant reduced questions are not acceptable, as shown in (4a-c). That is, the case-matching effect is observed (Merchant 2001).

- (4) a. \* lekin män-Ø [kim qaysi sinip-qa lik]-i-ni  
 but 1SG-NOM who which classroom-DAT COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
 bil-mä-y-män.

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used in this paper: ABL = ablative; ACC = accusative; ADN = adnominal; ADVL = adverbializer; AUX = auxiliary; CAUS = causative; COMP = complementizer; COP = copula; DAT = dative; DES = desiderative; GEN = genitive; HON = honorific; LOC = locative; NEG = negation; NOM = nominative; NOML = nominalizer; NPST = non-past tense; PERF = perfective; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; POSTP = post-position; PST = past tense; 1PL = first-person plural; 1SG = first-person singular; 2SG = second-person singular; and 3SG = third-person singular.

- know-NEG-NPST-1SG  
‘lit. but I don’t know who which classroom.’
- b. \* lekin män-Ø [kim-**ni** qaysi sinip lik]-i-ni  
but 1SG-NOM who-ACC which classroom COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
bil-mä-y-män.  
know-NEG-NPST-1SG  
‘lit. but I don’t know who which classroom.’
- c. \* lekin män-Ø [kim qaysi sinip lik]-i-ni  
but 1SG-NOM who which classroom COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
bil-mä-y-män.  
know-NEG-NPST-1SG  
‘lit. but I don’t know who which classroom.’
- d. ? lekin män-Ø [kim-**ni** qaysi sinip-**qa** ikän lik]-i-ni  
but 1SG-NOM who-ACC which classroom-DAT COP COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
bil-mä-y-män.  
know-NEG-NPST-1SG  
‘lit. but I don’t know who which classroom.’

Note that the reduced question in (3c) is somewhat degraded. It becomes more acceptable when the copula *ikän* appears in the reduced question, as shown in (4d).<sup>2</sup> My study shows that RQMWs in Uyghur are a marked construction.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, multiple sluicing constructions are regarded as marked constructions in many languages, including English, Spanish, and Mandarin Chinese (Cortés Rodríguez 2023; Bai, Cortés Rodríguez & Takahashi 2023).

According to my findings, RQMWs in Uyghur do not adhere to the clause-mate condition (e.g., Merchant 2001; Abels & Dayal 2023). That is, the remnant *wh*-phrases in RQMWs can originate from different clauses. Let us start our discussion with the example below.

- (5) a. Güli-Ø Ayxan-ğa [Murat-niñ bir sinip-ta bir qiz  
Güli-NOM Ayxan-DAT Murat-GEN one classroom-LOC.POSTP one girl  
bilän paranglaş-qan-liq]-i-ni eyt-ip bär-di-Ø,  
POSTP chat-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC say-ADVL AUX-PST-3SG  
‘Güli told Ayxan that Murat chatted with a girl in a classroom,’
- b. män-Ø [Güli-niñ Ayxan-ğa [Murat-niñ qaysi sinip-ta  
1SG-NOM Güli-GEN Ayxan-DAT Murat-GEN which classroom-LOC.POSTP  
qaysi qiz bilän paranglaş-qan-liq]-i-ni eyt-ip  
which girl POSTP chat-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC say-ADVL  
bär-gän-lik]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
AUX-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
‘I wonder which girl Güli told Ayxan that Murat chatted with in which classroom.’

<sup>2</sup> The usage of the copula *ikän* is quite complex in Uyghur (Litip 2012). To my knowledge, there is no comprehensive analysis of *ikän* in the existing literature. However, a related copula, *e-kan*, has been analyzed in Uzbek. Interested readers may refer to Gribanova (2013) for further information.

<sup>3</sup> I asked 12 native speakers of Uyghur to evaluate the acceptability of the sentences presented in this paper. The speakers were instructed to judge whether the sentences were completely acceptable, acceptable (?), marginally acceptable (??), very degraded (?\*), or completely degraded (\*). The study of RQMWs in Uyghur involves highly complex data. There are speakers who do not accept cases of reduced questions with multiple remnants. This variability aligns with findings in studies of cross-linguistic multiple sluicing constructions.

- c. ? män-Ø [qaysi sinip-ta qaysi qiz bilän ikän lik]-  
 1SG-NOM which classroom-LOC.POSTP which girl POSTP COP COMP-  
 i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘I wonder with which girl in which classroom.’

The sentence in (5a) is intended to antecede the full-fledged embedded multiple *wh*-question in (5b) and the reduced question in (5c). The full-fledged question, which contains two in-situ *wh*-phrases, is acceptable. Reduction of (5b) yields (5c). The reduced question in (5c) includes two *wh*-remnants, whose correlates both belong to the complement clause in (5a). The reduced question is acceptable with the *wh*-remnants being clause-mates.

Then, let us examine what happens when the remnants are not clause-mates. Consider (6):

- (6) a. Güli-Ø biraw-ğa [Murat-niñ bir sinip-ta Aygül  
 Güli-NOM someone-DAT Murat-GEN one classroom-LOC.POSTP Aygül  
 bilän paranglaş-qan-liq]-i-ni eyt-ip bär-di-Ø,  
 POSTP chat-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC say-ADVL AUX-PST-3SG  
 ‘Güli told someone that Murat chatted with Aygül in a classroom,’  
 b. män-Ø [Güli-niñ kim-gä [Murat-niñ qaysi sinip-ta  
 1SG-NOM Güli-GEN who-DAT Murat-GEN which classroom-LOC.POSTP  
 Aygül bilän paranglaş-qan-liq]-i-ni eyt-ip  
 Aygül POSTP chat-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC say-ADVL  
 bär-gän-lik]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 AUX-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘I wonder who Güli told that Murat chatted with Aygül in which classroom.’  
 c. ? män-Ø [kim-gä qaysi sinip-ta ikän lik]-i-gä  
 1SG-NOM who-DAT which classroom-LOC.POSTP COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT  
 qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder who in which classroom.’

The sentence in (6a) serves as the antecedent of the complete embedded multiple question in (6b) and the reduced question in (6c). The correlates of the *wh*-phrases are *biraw-ğa* ‘someone-DAT’ in the matrix clause and *bir sinip-ta* ‘one classroom-LOC.POSTP’ in the embedded clause. The full-fledged question is acceptable with two in-situ *wh*-phrases. According to my informants, the reduced question, in which the first remnant *kim-gä* ‘who-DAT’ comes from the matrix clause and the second remnant *qaysi sinip-ta* ‘which classroom-LOC.POSTP’ is from the embedded clause, is also acceptable.<sup>4</sup> The observation that both (5c) and (6c) are acceptable reveals that RQMWs in Uyghur do not adhere to the clause-mate condition.

Further, my study shows that RQMWs in Uyghur are not sensitive to island effects. Before we look at the relevant data, let us note that scrambling is allowed in Uyghur (Asarina & Hartman 2011; Öztürk 2013; Jenkins 2023), as illustrated in (7).

- (7) a. Män-Ø [Zämira-niñ kitab-ni oqu-ğan-liq]-i-ni  
 1SG-NOM Zämira-GEN book-ACC read-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC

<sup>4</sup> As mentioned in this section, RQMWs are a marked construction in Uyghur. According to my study, there are speakers who do not accept cases of reduced questions with multiple remnants. Consequently, those speakers do not accept cases like (6) either.

- bil-i-män.  
 know-NPST-1SG  
 ‘I know that Zämirä read the book.’
- b. Kitab-ni<sub>i</sub> män-Ø [Zämirä-ni<sub>j</sub> t<sub>i</sub> oqu-ğan-liq]-i-ni  
 book-ACC 1SG-NOM Zämirä-GEN read-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
 bil-i-män.  
 know-NPST-1SG  
 ‘The book<sub>i</sub>, I know that Zämirä read t<sub>i</sub>.’  
 (adapted from Öztürk 2013: 180)

The sentence in (7a) contains a complement clause. When the object, *kitab-ni* ‘book-ACC,’ in the complement clause is scrambled to the matrix clause, the resulting sentence is acceptable, as shown in (7b).

In contrast, when an element is scrambled out of an adverbial clause, the resulting sentence is not acceptable. Consider (8):

- (8) a. Tursun-Ø [Aynur-Ø Mämät-kä amraq bol-ğaçqa] intayin  
 Tursun-NOM Aynur-NOM Mämät-DAT fond AUX-reason.ADVL very  
 xapa bol-di-Ø.  
 angry COP-PST-3SG  
 ‘Tursun was very angry because Aynur was fond of Mämät.’
- b. \* Mämät-kä<sub>j</sub> Tursun-Ø [Aynur-Ø t<sub>j</sub> amraq bol-ğaçqa]  
 Mämät-DAT Tursun-NOM Aynur-NOM fond AUX-reason.ADVL  
 intayin xapa bol-di-Ø.  
 very angry COP-PST-3SG  
 ‘lit. Of Mämät<sub>j</sub>, Tursun was very angry because Aynur was fond t<sub>j</sub>.’

The sentence in (8a) includes an adverbial clause. The object, *Mämät-kä* ‘Mämät-DAT,’ in the adverbial clause is moved to the initial position of the sentence, as shown in (8b). The resulting sentence is not acceptable.

Let us look at another set of data.

- (9) Context: Güli asked a person a question, which made Tursun happy. The speaker is aware of this context and says:
- a. Tursun-Ø [Güli-Ø kim-din bir soal sora-ğaçqa] xuşal  
 Tursun-NOM Güli-NOM who-ABL one question ask-reason.ADVL pleased  
 bol-di-Ø?  
 COP-PST-3SG  
 ‘lit. Who was Tursun pleased because Güli asked a question?’
- b. \* Kim-din<sub>i</sub> Tursun-Ø [Güli-Ø t<sub>i</sub> bir soal sora-ğaçqa]  
 who-ABL Tursun-NOM Güli-NOM one question ask-reason.ADVL  
 xuşal bol-di-Ø?  
 pleased COP-PST-3SG  
 ‘lit. Who was Tursun pleased because Güli asked a question?’

The adverbial clause in (9a), which includes an in-situ *wh*-phrase, is acceptable. When the *wh*-phrase is moved out of the adverbial clause, as in (9b), the sentence becomes unacceptable. The unacceptability of moving an element out of adverbial clauses, as shown in (8b) and (9b), indicates that adverbial clauses constitute islands for movement in Uyghur (Öztürk 2013).

Now let us consider the following reduced question where the correlates of the remnants are inside the adjunct island.

- (10) a. Tursun-Ø [bir oğul bala-Ø bir qiz-ğa bir närsä sowğa  
 Tursun-NOM one male child-NOM one girl-DAT one thing present  
 qil-ğaçqa] intayin xapa bol-di-Ø,  
 AUX-reason.AUX very angry COP-PST-3SG  
 ‘Tursun was very angry because a boy gave a thing to a girl,’  
 b. ? män-Ø [qaysi oğul bala-Ø qaysi qiz-ğa ikän lik]-i-gä  
 1SG-NOM which male child-NOM which girl-DAT COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT  
 qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘I wonder which boy to which girl.’

The sentence in (10a) antecedes the reduced question in (10b) with two *wh*-remnants. The correlates of the remnants are *bir oğul bala-Ø* ‘one male child-NOM’ and *bir qiz-ğa* ‘one girl-DAT,’ which are inside the adjunct island. The reduced question is acceptable, indicating that reduced questions in Uyghur are not sensitive to island effects (Bai 2023b).

This section has discussed properties of RQMWs in Uyghur, including the presence of the copula, case-matching effect, the absence of the clause-mate effect, and island-insensitivity.

**3. Analyses.** This section consists of four subsections. Section 3.1 argues against analyzing RQMWs in Uyghur in terms of a pseudo-slucing analysis. Section 3.2 provides arguments against a reduced cleft analysis. Section 3.3 argues against a focus movement analysis. Section 3.4 discusses an in-situ analysis to explain RQMWs in Uyghur.

3.1. ARGUMENTS AGAINST A PSEUDO-SLUICING ANALYSIS. We argue that RQMWs in Uyghur cannot be analyzed in terms of a pseudo-slucing analysis. Let us start our discussion by reviewing the pseudo-slucing analysis, which has been put forth to explain truncated interrogative questions in some *wh*-in-situ languages, such as MC (Wei 2004), Uzbek (Gribanova 2013), etc. According to Merchant (2001), a pseudo-sluced clause contains a *pronominal* subject, a copula, and a *wh*-phrase, as shown in the Mandarin example below.

- (11) a. Zhangsan kan-dao mouren,  
 Zhangsan see-ASP someone  
 ‘Zhangsan saw somebody,’  
 b. danshi wo bu zhidao [(shi) shenme ren].  
 but I not know COP what person  
 ‘but I don’t know what person.’  
 (cited from Li and Wei 2014: 296)  
 c. danshi wo bu zhidao [*pro* (shi) shenme ren]  
 but I not know he COP what person  
 ‘but I don’t know what person (he) was’  
 d. danshi wo bu zhidao [*ta* (shi) shenme ren].  
 but I not know he COP what person  
 ‘but I don’t know what person he was.’

The sentence in (11a) antecedes the reduced question in (11b), where the *wh*-remnant *shenme ren* ‘what person’ can optionally be preceded by the copula *shi*. In line with the pseudo-slucing analysis, the reduced question in (11b) can be analyzed as (11c), containing a null pronoun, which is

independently allowed in MC, a *pro*-drop language (Huang 1984). Moreover, the null pronoun in (11c) can be replaced by an overt pronoun *ta* ‘he,’ as illustrated in (11d).

Now let us consider the Uyghur data in (12).

- (12) a. Bir qiz-Ø bir muällim-din birqančä soal-lar-ni sora-di-Ø,  
 one girl-NOM one teacher-ABL some question-PL-ACC ask-PST-3SG  
 ‘A girl asked a teacher some questions.’
- b. ? meniñ [qaysi qiz-niñ qaysi muällim-din ikän lik]-i-ni  
 1SG.GEN which girl-GEN which teacher-ABL COP COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
 bil-gü-m bar.  
 know-DES.NOML-1SG have  
 ‘lit. I want to know which girl which teacher.’
- c. meniñ [*pro* qaysi qiz-niñ qaysi muällim-din ikän lik]-i-ni  
 1SG.GEN which girl-GEN which teacher-ABL COP COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
 bil-gü-m bar  
 know-DES.NOML-1SG have  
 ‘I want to know (it) was which girl which teacher’
- d. \* meniñ [u-niñ qaysi qiz-niñ qaysi muällim-din ikän lik]-  
 1SG.GEN 3SG-GEN which girl-GEN which teacher-ABL COP COMP-  
 i-ni bil-gü-m bar.  
 3SG.POSS-ACC know-DES.NOML-1SG have  
 ‘lit. I want to know it was which girl which teacher.’

The sentence in (12a) antecedes the reduced question in (12b) consisting of two *wh*-remnants and the copula *ikän*. In line with the pseudo-slucing analysis (Wei 2004; Adams 2004; Gribanova 2013; Barros 2014), the reduced question is analyzed as (12c) containing an empty pronominal subject, remnants, and the copula. As predicted by the pseudo-slucing analysis, the empty pronoun should be able to alternate with an overt pronoun, as shown in (12d). However, (12d) containing the pseudo-sluced clause with the overt pronominal subject is not acceptable. Moreover, in a pseudo-sluced clause, the *wh*-remnants are the complement of the copula and hence cannot be assigned case. Contrarily, *wh*-remnants in RQMWs in Uyghur must be case-marked. The discussions in this subsection show that cases of RQMWs cannot be analyzed in terms of the pseudo-slucing analysis.

3.2. ARGUMENTS AGAINST A REDUCED CLEFT ANALYSIS. We argue that RQMWs in Uyghur cannot be analyzed in terms of a reduced cleft analysis because there are discrepancies between the cleft construction in Uyghur and RQMWs.<sup>5</sup> The first main discrepancy is that the cleft construction in Uyghur does not allow case-marked pivots. See (13) and (14) for an illustration.

- (13) [Meniñ бүгүн мәктәп-тә kör-gän-im] siz(-\*ni).  
 1SG.GEN today school-LOC.POSTP see-PERF.ADN-1SG.POSS 2SG.HON-ACC  
 ‘It was you that I saw at school today.’
- (14) [U-niñ bu sowğat-ni bär-gän-i] sän(-\*gä).  
 3SG-GEN this gift-ACC give-PERF.ADN-3SG.POSS 2SG-DAT

<sup>5</sup> It has been discussed in previous literature that cleft constructions can serve as a source of sluicing in Turkic languages (Gribanova 2013; Bai 2023a). Intriguingly, cleft sentences in Uzbek (Gribanova 2013) exhibit notable differences from those in Uyghur (Bai 2023a). For detailed discussions, interested readers may refer to Gribanova (2013).

‘It was to you that he gave this gift.’

The cleft construction in Uyghur contains a presuppositional clause, indicated with square brackets in (13) and (14), and a focused constituent. Importantly, the focused element (pivot) cannot be accompanied by case markers. When the pivots are not case-marked, the cleft sentences become acceptable. It may be assumed that the pivot in the cleft construction is in nominative case, which has a zero morpheme in Uyghur (see İnce 2006; 2009 for this assumption on the cleft construction in Turkish).

The second main discrepancy is that the cleft construction in Uyghur does not allow the presence of multiple pivots, as demonstrated in (15).

- (15) a. \* [U-niñ bär-gän-i] kim-gä nemä-ni?  
 3SG-GEN give-PERF.ADN-3SG.POSS who-DAT what-ACC  
 ‘lit. What to whom was it that he gave?’
- b. \* [U-niñ bär-gän-i] kim-gä nemä?  
 3SG-GEN give-PERF.ADN-3SG.POSS who-DAT what
- c. \* [U-niñ bär-gän-i] kim nemä-ni?  
 3SG-GEN give-PERF.ADN-3SG.POSS who what-ACC
- d. \* [U-niñ bär-gän-i] kim nemä?  
 3SG-GEN give-PERF.ADN-3SG.POSS who what

As shown in (15a), the cleft sentence with multiple pivots is not acceptable. Additionally, the multiple cleft sentence is unacceptable when one of the pivots is not marked for case or when neither pivot is marked for case, as illustrated in (15b-d).

Since RQMWs in Uyghur contain multiple case-marked remnants, they cannot be derived from cleft sentences. Consider the following example:

- (16) a. Murat-Ø mälum jay-din mälum kişi-gä bir sowğat  
 Murat-NOM some place-ABL some person-DAT one present  
 äwät-ti-Ø,  
 send-PST-3SG  
 ‘Murat sent a present to someone from somewhere,’
- b. ? män-Ø [qäyär-din kim-gä ikän lik]-i-gä qiziq-ip  
 1SG-NOM where-ABL who-DAT COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL  
 qal-di-m.  
 AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder to whom from where.’
- c. \* män-Ø [[u-niñ bir sowğat äwät-kän-i]-niñ qäyär-din  
 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN one present send-PERF.ADN-3SG.POSS-GEN where-ABL  
 kim-gä ikän lik]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 who-DAT COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder to whom from where it was that he sent a present.’

The sentence in (16a) is the antecedent of the reduced question with two remnants in (16b) and the embedded multiple cleft sentence in (16c). While the reduced question is acceptable, the multiple cleft sentence is not. Accordingly, RQMWs in Uyghur cannot be analyzed in terms of the reduced cleft analysis.

3.3. ARGUMENTS AGAINST A FOCUS MOVEMENT ANALYSIS. This subsection provides arguments against a focus movement analysis. Before looking at the relevant data, let us first consider an in-situ focus construction in Uyghur.

- (17) Murat-Ø saña bu zänjir-ni bär-gän ikän-Ø.  
 Murat-NOM 2SG.DAT this necklace-ACC give-PERF.NOML COP-3SG  
 ‘It turned out that Murat gave this necklace to you.’

The sentence in (17) is an in-situ focus sentence, which does not contain a gap (Bai 2023b). The in-situ focus sentence is headed by the copula *ikän*. I assume that *ikän* functions as the Foc head, just as the copula *da* functions as the Foc head in the in-situ focus construction in Japanese (e.g., Hiraiwa & Ishihara 2012).

In an in-situ focus sentence, any element can receive focus interpretation. See (18-20) for an illustration.

- (18) a. Kim-Ø u kitab-ni oqu-ğan ikän-Ø?  
 who-NOM that book-ACC read-PERF.NOML COP-3SG  
 ‘Who was it that read that book?’  
 b. Murat-Ø u kitab-ni oqu-ğan ikän-Ø.  
 Murat-NOM that book-ACC read-PERF.NOML COP-3SG  
 ‘It turned out that MURAT read that book.’
- (19) a. Murat-Ø qaysi kitab-ni oqu-ğan ikän-Ø?  
 Murat-NOM which book-ACC read-PERF.NOML COP-3SG  
 ‘Which book was it that Murat read?’  
 b. Murat-Ø u Inglizčä kitab-ni oqu-ğan ikän-Ø.  
 Murat-NOM that English book-ACC read-PERF.NOML COP-3SG  
 ‘It turned out that Murat read THAT ENGLISH BOOK.’
- (20) Ayxan-Ø bögün qäyär-dä kim-ni kör-ğan ikän-Ø?  
 Ayxan-NOM today where-LOC.POSTP who-ACC see-PERF.NOML COP-3SG  
 ‘lit. Whom at where was it that Ayxan saw today?’

In the in-situ focus sentences, the subject in (18b) and the object in (19b) can be focalized. Moreover, an in-situ focus sentence allows multiple focused elements. The sentence in (20) contains two focused elements, *qäyär-dä* ‘where-LOC.POSTP’ and *kim-ni* ‘who-ACC,’ both of which remain in situ.<sup>6 7</sup>

Keeping the in-situ focus construction in mind, let us consider the reduced question in (21).

- (21) a. Murat-Ø mälum jay-din mälum kiši-gä bir sowğat äwät-ti-Ø,  
 Murat-NOM some place-ABL some person-DAT one present send-PST-3SG  
 ‘Murat sent a present to someone from somewhere,’  
 b. ? män-Ø [qäyär-din kim-gä ikän lik]-i-gä qiziq-ip  
 1SG-NOM where-ABL who-DAT COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL  
 qal-di-m.

<sup>6</sup> According to the previous literature (e.g., Yakup 2016; Çetinkaya 2023), Uyghur employs multiple devices to indicate focused information, such as syntactic and prosodic devices. Moreover, Uyghur allows multiple focused elements in one sentence (Çetinkaya 2023).

<sup>7</sup> As discussed in prior literature (Çetinkaya 2023), Uyghur exhibits preverbal focus, which may support the in-situ analysis. This is because elements can receive a focus interpretation in a preverbal position without requiring movement. I thank an anonymous reviewer for highlighting this point.

- AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder to whom from where.’
- c. mǎn-Ø [u-niŋ qäyär-din kim-gä sowğat äwät-kän  
 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN where-ABL who-DAT present send-PERF.NOML  
 ikän lik]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder it was that he sent a present to whom from where.’
- d. mǎn-Ø [ForceP [FocP [FinP u-niŋ qäyär-din kim-gä sowğat  
 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN where-ABL who-DAT present  
 äwät-kän] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m  
 send-PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder it was that he sent a present to whom from where’

The sentence in (21a) is the antecedent of the reduced question in (21b) and the full-fledged in-situ focus sentence in (21c). The reduced question contains two case-marked remnant phrases, followed by the copula *ikän* and the COMP. Following the cartographic approach, where the CP projection is split into different layers (e.g., Rizzi 1997; 2001; Rizzi & Bocci 2017), I assume that the in-situ focus sentence in (21c) is analyzed as (21d).

Now, let us consider a possible derivational process of the reduced question in (21b), as illustrated in (22).

- (22) a. \* mǎn-Ø [ForceP [FocP qäyär-din<sub>i</sub> kim-gä<sub>j</sub> [Foc' [FinP u-niŋ t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>  
 1SG-NOM where-ABL who-DAT 3SG-GEN  
 sowğat äwät-kän] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]] lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip  
 present send-PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL  
 qal-di-m.  
 AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder it was that to whom from where he sent a present.’
- b. mǎn-Ø [ForceP [FocP qäyär-din<sub>i</sub> kim-gä<sub>j</sub> [Foc' [FinP u-niŋ t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>  
 1SG-NOM where-ABL who-DAT 3SG-GEN  
 sowğat äwät-kän] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]] lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip  
 present send-PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL  
 qal-di-m  
 AUX-PST-1SG

The *wh*-phrases in (21d) undergo focus movement to the specifier position of FocP, as shown in (22a). When the FinP in the in-situ focus sentence is elided, indicated with grey shading in (22b), the reduced question in (21b) is derived. A major problem exists in this analysis. That is, (22a) with fronted *wh*-phrases is not acceptable. The unacceptability of (22a) indicates that RQMWs in Uyghur could not be analyzed in terms of a focus movement analysis.

3.4. AN IN-SITU ANALYSIS. We argue that RQMWs in Uyghur can be analyzed in terms of an in-situ analysis. An in-situ analysis has been advanced to account for reduced embedded questions in some languages such as Japanese and Turkish (e.g., Kimura 2010; Kimura & Takahashi 2011; Abe 2015; Sato 2016; Palaz 2018). Let us start our discussion with the example below.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> An anonymous reviewer inquires whether (23d) represents a case of stripping. Stripping often involves reduced clauses with non-*wh* remnants. According to Fukaya and Hoji (1999), sluicing is discussed as a special case of stripping.

- (23) a. Murat-Ø məlum jay-din məlum kişi-gä bir sowğat  
 Murat-NOM some place-ABL some person-DAT one present  
 äwät-ti-Ø,  
 send-PST-3SG  
 ‘Murat sent a present to someone from somewhere,’
- b. ? män-Ø [qäyär-din kim-gä ikän lik]-i-gä qiziq-ip  
 1SG-NOM where-ABL who-DAT COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL  
 qal-di-m.  
 AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder to whom from where.’
- c. män-Ø [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> u-niŋ qäyär-din kim-gä sowğat äwät-  
 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN where-ABL who-DAT present send-  
 kän] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>] lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder it was that he sent a present to whom from where.’
- d. män-Ø [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> u-niŋ qäyär-din kim-gä sowğat äwät-  
 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN where-ABL who-DAT present send-  
 kän] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>] lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m  
 PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG

The sentence in (23a) is the antecedent of the reduced question in (23b) and the full-fledged in-situ focus sentence in (23c). An in-situ analysis involves nonconstituent deletion (van Craenenbroeck & den Dikken 2006). As shown in (23d), nonconstituent deletion is applied to all the elements in the FinP except the *wh*-remnants, indicated with grey shading in (23d). The resulting structure is identical to the reduced question in (23b). Since this analysis does not involve movement, it is called an in-situ analysis. Note that the deletion does not affect the copula since it functions as the Foc head. One of the advantages of the in-situ analysis is that it explains the presence of the copula in RQMWs. Moreover, this analysis straightforwardly accounts for the case-matching effect observed in RQMWs since the *wh*-phrases in the in-situ focus sentences are case-marked.

The in-situ analysis can explain the observation that RQMWs in Uyghur are not sensitive to island effects.<sup>9</sup> See the example below.

- (24) a. Tursun-Ø [bir oğul bala-Ø bir qiz-ğa bir närsä sowğa  
 Tursun-NOM one male child-NOM one girl-DAT one thing present  
 qil-ğaçqa] intayin xapa bol-di-Ø,  
 AUX-reason.AUX very angry COP-PST-3SG  
 ‘Tursun was very angry because a boy gave a thing to a girl,’
- b. ? män-Ø [qaysi oğul bala-Ø qaysi qiz-ğa ikän lik]-i-gä  
 1SG-NOM which male child-NOM which girl-DAT COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT  
 qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG

<sup>9</sup> According to previous literature (Ross 1969; Merchant 2001), island-insensitivity has been observed in sluicing across many languages. One line of analysis is the “repair by deletion” approach, which posits that island violations can be repaired when the island-violating structure is eliminated from the surface structure (Lasnik 2001). However, RQMWs in Uyghur cannot be explained by a movement-and-deletion analysis; instead, their island-insensitivity can be accounted for by an in-situ analysis.

- ‘I wonder which boy to which girl.’
- c. mǎn-Ø [ForceP [FocP [FinP Tursun-niŋ [ForceP qaysi oğul bala-Ø  
 1SG-NOM Tursun-GEN which male child-NOM  
 qaysi qiz-ğa bir nǎrsä sowğa qil-ğaçqa] intayin xapa  
 which girl-DAT one thing present AUX-reason.AUX very angry  
 bol-ğan] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 COP-PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder it was that Tursun was very angry because which boy gave a thing to  
 which girl.’
- d. mǎn-Ø [ForceP [FocP [FinP Tursun-niŋ [ForceP qaysi oğul bala-Ø  
 1SG-NOM Tursun-GEN which male child-NOM  
 qaysi qiz-ğa bir nǎrsä sowğa qil-ğaçqa] intayin xapa  
 which girl-DAT one thing present AUX-reason.AUX very angry  
 bol-ğan] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip qal-di-m  
 COP-PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG

The sentence in (24a) antecedes the reduced question in (24b) and the full-fledged in-situ focus sentence in (24c). The correlates of the two *wh*-phrases are inside the adjunct island in (24a). Nevertheless, the reduced question is acceptable, indicating that reduced questions are insensitive to island effects. This observation can be captured by the in-situ analysis since the in-situ focus sentence in (24c) containing two in-situ *wh*-phrases is not sensitive to island effects (e.g., Sato 2016). Now let us apply nonconstituent deletion to (24c), as shown in (24d); we obtain the reduced question in (24b).

Further, the in-situ analysis can capture the observation that RQMWs in Uyghur do not adhere to the clause-mate condition (e.g., Sato 2016). Consider (25):

- (25) a. Güli-Ø biraw-ğa [Murat-niŋ bir sinip-ta Aygöl  
 Güli-NOM someone-DAT Murat-GEN one classroom-LOC.POSTP Aygöl  
 bilän paranglaş-qan-liq]-i-ni eyt-ip bär-di-Ø,  
 POSTP chat-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC say-ADVL AUX-PST-3SG  
 ‘Güli told someone that Murat chatted with Aygöl in a classroom,’
- b. ? mǎn-Ø [kim-gä qaysi sinip-ta ikän lik]-i-gä  
 1SG-NOM who-DAT which classroom-LOC.POSTP COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT  
 qiziq-ip qal-di-m.  
 excite-ADVL AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder who in which classroom.’
- c. mǎn-Ø [ForceP [FocP [FinP Güli-niŋ kim-gä [ForceP Murat-niŋ qaysi  
 1SG-NOM Güli-GEN who-DAT Murat-GEN which  
 sinip-ta Aygöl bilän paranglaş-qan-liq]-i-ni  
 classroom-LOC.POSTP Aygöl POSTP chat-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC  
 eyt-ip bär-gän] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-gä qiziq-ip  
 say-ADVL AUX-PERF.NOML COP COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT excite-ADVL  
 qal-di-m.  
 AUX-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. I wonder it was that Güli told whom that Murat chatted with Aygöl in which  
 classroom.’
- d. mǎn-Ø [ForceP [FocP [FinP Güli-niŋ kim-gä [ForceP Murat-niŋ qaysi

1SG-NOM		Güli-GEN	who-DAT	Murat-GEN	which
sinip-ta		Aygül	bilän	paranglaş-qan-liq]-i-ni	
classroom-LOC.POSTP		Aygül	POSTP	chat-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC	
eyt-ip	bär-gän]		ikän <sub>Foc</sub> ]	lik <sub>Force</sub> ]-i-gä	qiziq-ip
say-ADVL	AUX-PERF.NOML	COP		COMP-3SG.POSS-DAT	excite-ADVL
qal-di-m					
AUX-PST-1SG					

The sentence in (25a) serves as the antecedent for the reduced question in (25b) and the full-fledged in-situ focus sentence in (25c). The *wh*-phrases come from different clauses. That is, *kim-gä* ‘who-DAT’ is from the matrix clause, and *qaysi sinip-ta* ‘one classroom-LOC.POSTP’ is from the embedded clause, as shown in (25c). When nonconstituent deletion is applied to (25c), the reduced question in (25b) is derived, and its acceptability is accounted for.

Up to this point, we have considered cases of truncated clauses with *wh*-remnants. Now let us look at cases with non-*wh*-remnants, as exemplified in (26).

- (26) a. Ayxan-Ø [Aygül-niñ tünügün Ürümçi-dä Inglizçä  
 Ayxan-NOM Aygül-GEN yesterday Urumqi-LOC.POSTP English  
 emtihan-ğa qatnaş-qan-liq]-i-ni aqla-p-tu-Ø,  
 exam-DAT attend-PERF.NOML-COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC hear-ADVL-PST-3SG  
 ‘Ayxan heard that Aygül attended an English exam in Urumqi yesterday,’
- b. ? lekin män-Ø [ülüşkün Qäşqär-dä ikän  
 but 1SG-NOM the.day.before.yesterday Kashgar-LOC.POSTP COP  
 lik]-i-ni aqla-di-m.  
 COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC hear-PST-1SG  
 ‘lit. but I heard that in Kashgar the day before yesterday.’
- c. lekin män-Ø [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> u-niñ ülüškün  
 but 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN the.day.before.yesterday  
 Qäşqär-dä Inglizçä emtihan-ğa qatnaş-qan] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]  
 Kashgar-LOC.POSTP English exam-DAT attend-PERF.NOML COP  
 lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-ni aqla-di-m.  
 COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC hear-PST-1SG  
 ‘but I heard that it was that she attended the English exam in Kashgar the day before  
 yesterday.’
- d. lekin män-Ø [<sub>ForceP</sub> [<sub>FocP</sub> [<sub>FinP</sub> u-niñ ülüškün  
 but 1SG-NOM 3SG-GEN the.day.before.yesterday  
 Qäşqär-dä Inglizçä emtihan-ğa qatnaş-qan] ikän<sub>Foc</sub>]  
 Kashgar-LOC.POSTP English exam-DAT attend-PERF.NOML COP  
 lik<sub>Force</sub>]-i-ni aqla-di-m  
 COMP-3SG.POSS-ACC hear-PST-1SG

The sentence in (26a) functions to antecede the truncated clause in (26b) with two non-*wh*-remnants, which is acceptable. The full-fledged counterpart of (26b) is shown in (26c). When nonconstituent deletion is applied to (26c), indicated with grey shading in (26d), the truncated clause can be derived. The discussions in this section have shown that the in-situ analysis is a viable analysis accounting for RQMWs in Uyghur. The in-situ analysis does not posit movement

in Uyghur, a *wh*-in-situ language (Litip 2012).<sup>10</sup>

**4. Conclusion.** This paper has discussed reduced embedded questions with multiple remnants in Uyghur. We show that the observed properties of RQMWs can be accounted for by an in-situ analysis, while other analyses, including the pseudo-sludging analysis, the reduced cleft analysis, and the focus movement analysis, cannot explain RQMWs in Uyghur. Future comparative research between RQMWs in Uyghur and other Turkic languages may provide additional support for the in-situ analysis and offer further insights into the study of multiple sludging.

## References

- Abe, Jun. 2015. *The in-situ approach to sludging*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.222>.
- Abels, Klaus & Veneeta Dayal. 2023. On the syntax of multiple sludging and what it tells us about *wh*-scope taking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 54(3). 429–477. [https://doi.org/10.1162/ling\\_a\\_00448](https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00448).
- Adams, Perng Wang. 2004. The structure of sludging in Mandarin Chinese. *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium (PWPL)* 10. 1, ed. by Sudha Arunachalam, 1–16.
- Asarina, Alya & Jeremy Hartman. 2011. Genitive subject licensing in Uyghur subordinate clauses. *Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFSL)* 7, ed. by Andrew Simpson, 17–32.
- Bai, Xue. 2023a. Reduced embedded questions in Uyghur. *Journal of International Cultural Studies* 29. 171–188.
- Bai, Xue. 2023b. *An exploration of multiple sludging from a cross-linguistic perspective*. Sendai: Tohoku University dissertation.
- Bai, Xue, Álvaro Cortés Rodríguez & Daiko Takahashi. 2023. An experimental investigation of multiple sludging in Mandarin Chinese. *Languages* 8(1). 88. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8010088>.
- Barros, Matthew. 2014. *Sludging and identity ellipsis*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University dissertation.
- Barros, Matthew, Patrick Elliott & Gary Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. Ms., Rutgers University, University College London, and University of Edinburgh.
- Çetinkaya, Emre. 2023. The linguistic realization of focus in Uyghur: Can the two focusing strategies be used interchangeably? *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 59. 27–41. <https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2022-2001>.
- Cortés Rodríguez, Álvaro. 2023. *Multiple sludging through an experimental lens: Amelioration effects, crosslinguistic variation, and processing*. Tübingen: University of Tübingen dissertation.
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen & Marcel den Dikken. 2006. Ellipsis and EPP repair. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37(4). 653–664. <https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2006.37.4.653>.
- Fukaya, Teruhiko & Hajime Hoji. 1999. Stripping and sludging in Japanese and some implications. *Proceedings of WCCFL* 18, ed. by Sonya Bird, Andrew Carnie, Jason D. Haugen, and Peter Norquest, 145–158.
- Gribanova, Vera. 2013. Copular clauses, clefts, and putative sludging in Uzbek. *Language* 89(4). 830–882. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2013.0074>.

---

<sup>10</sup> An anonymous reviewer suggested the possibility of operator movement. Due to space limitations, this possibility will be explored in future work. We thank the reviewer for their insightful suggestion.

- Hiraiwa, Ken & Shinichiro Ishihara. 2012. Syntactic metamorphosis: Clefts, sluicing, and in-situ focus in Japanese. *Syntax* 15.142–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2011.00164.x>.
- İnce, Atakan. 2006. Pseudo-sluicing in Turkish. *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 14: 111–126.
- İnce, Atakan. 2009. *Dimensions of ellipsis: Investigations in Turkish*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland dissertation.
- Jenkins, Robin. 2023. Covert movement and finite ECM in Japanese, Turkish, and Uyghur. To appear in *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS)* 58.
- Kimura, Hiroko. 2010. A *wh*-in-situ strategy for sluicing. *English Linguistics* 26. 43–59. [https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj.27.1\\_43](https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj.27.1_43).
- Kimura, Hiroko & Daiko Takahashi. 2011. NPI and predicative remnants in Japanese sluicing. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 19. 141–154.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? *Proceedings of the 31st North East Linguistics Society (NELS)* 31. 2: 1–20.
- Litip, Tohti. 2012. *A reference grammar of modern Uyghur*. Beijing: Social Sciences Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199243730.001.0001>.
- Öztürk, Balkız. 2013. Rightward movement, EPP and specifiers: Evidence from Uyghur and Khalkha. In Gert Webelhuth, Manfred Sailer & Heike Walker (eds.), *Rightward movement in a comparative perspective*. 175–210. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.200.07ozt>.
- Palaz, Bilge. 2018. Towards a unified account of clausal ellipsis in Turkish: A non-movement analysis. Ms., *University of Delaware*.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*. 281–338. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7).
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the position “Int(errogative)” in the left periphery of the clause. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current studies in Italian syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. 287–296. Amsterdam: Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9780585473949\\_016](https://doi.org/10.1163/9780585473949_016).
- Rizzi, Luigi & Giuliano Bocci. 2017. Left periphery of the clause: Primarily illustrated for Italian. In Martin Everaert & Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax*. 2171–2200. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733.wbsyncom104>.
- Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS)* 5: 252–286.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2016. An in-situ syntax of sluicing in Indonesian. *Proceedings of the 23rd Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association* 23: 243–257.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3. 265–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01733066>.
- Wei, Ting-Chi. 2004. *Predication and sluicing in Mandarin Chinese*. Kaohsiung: National Kaohsiung Normal University dissertation.
- Yakup, Abdurishid. 2016. Focus in Turkish and Uyghur: A preliminary report on an ongoing contrastive investigation. *Turkic Languages* 20. 113–131. <https://doi.org/10.13173/TL/2016/1/113>.