ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS IN TURKISH
Martina Gračanin-Yuksek
Middle East Technical University

I.	INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND ON ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS

In this talk, I investigate alternative questions **(AQs)** in Turkish. An AQ contains a disjunction and offers the hearer a choice of alternatives from which to choose the answer, as in (1).

1. Does John drink coffee or tea?

In languages like English, the question in (1) is ambiguous between a yes/no reading, represented in (2a), and an alternative reading, represented in (2b).

2. a. Does John drink either of the two: {coffee, tea}?   *Yes/no reading*

   b. Which of the two does John drink: {coffe, tea}?   *Alternative reading*

In Turkish, a disjunctive question with a yes/no reading has the form in (3a), while a disjunctive question with an alternative reading looks like (3b).

3. a. Ali çay **ya da/veya** kahve içti   **mi**?   *Yes/no question*
      Ali tea or$_1$ /or$_2$ coffee drank Q
      'Did Ali drink coffee or tea?'

   b. Ali çay **mı** (yoksa) kahve **mı** içti?   *Alternative question*
      Ali tea Q   not-if coffee Q   drank
      'Did Ali drınk tea or coffee?'

Since an AQ like the one in (3b) never yields a yes/no interpretation, Turkish data offer a possibility of a more direct inspection of the structure of alternative readings.

Analyses of AQs (questions like (1), with an alternative reading in (2b)) cross-linguistically vary along two dimensions:

 i.   THE PROPOSED SIZE OF THE DISJUNCTS:

   a. **'Small' disjuncts analysis** – on this analysis, the disjuncts in an AQ contain no phantom structure, i.e. they are structurally the size that can be observed on the surface (Larson 1985, Beck and Kim 2006),

   b. **'Big'disjuncts analysis** – on this analysis, the disjuncts are bigger than on the surface and the structure involves deletion in the second disjunct (Han and Romero 2004a, 2004b; Roelofsen and Pruitt 2011; Gracanin-Yuksek 2012).

Thus, depending on which of the two approaches outlined in (ia-b) is taken, (1) has either the structure in (4) or the structure in (5a/b).

4. Does John drink [[coffee] or [tea]]?   *Small disjuncts analysis*

5. a. Does [[John drink coffee] or [~~John drink~~ tea]]?   *Big disjuncts analysis*
                                                             (disjunction of TPs)

   b. [[Does John drink coffee] or [~~does John drink~~ tea]]?   *Big disjuncts analysis*
                                                             (disjunction of CPs)

    ii.   **THE PRESENCE *VERSUS* ABSENCE OF A WH-OPERATOR** that originates at the edge of the disjunctive phrase and moves to the left periphery, marking the scope of the disjunction: Op^{WH} present: Larson 1985, Han and Romero 2004a, 2004b; Op^{WH} absent: Beck and Kim (2006).

On the analyses that propose the presence of the Op^{WH}, (1) has the structure in (6a/b), while on the analyses that deny the presence of such an operator, (1) has the structure in (7)=(4)/(5).

6. a. Op_i [does John drink [t_i [coffee] or [tea]]   *Small disjuncts analysis*
                                                             + Op_{WH} movement

   b. Op^{WH}_i Did [t_i [John drink coffee] or [~~John drink~~ tea]]   *Big disjuncts analysis*
                                                             + Op_{WH} movement

7. a. Does John drink [[coffee] or [tea]]?   *Small disjuncts analysis*
                                                             NO Op_{WH} movement

   b. Does [[John drink coffee] or [~~John drink~~ tea]]?   *Big disjuncts analysis*
                                                             (disjunction of TPs)
                                                             NO Op_{WH} movement

   c. Does [[John drink coffee] or [~~does John drink~~ tea]]? *Big disjuncts analysis*
                                                             (disjunction of CPs)
                                                             NO Op_{WH} movement

    II.   **CLAIM AND THE ROADMAP OF THE TALK**

<u>**CLAIM**</u>:

    AQs in Turkish involve **big disjuncts** and the surface string is derived *via* **a deletion operation**.[1]

The **EVIDENCE** for the claim comes from **the possibilities of the (apparent) extraposition of the second disjunct** in matrix and embedded AQs.

---

[1] I will remain agnostic as to whether in this language AQs do or do not involve an Op^{WH}.

The talk will proceed as follows:

- **Section III** → Introduction to Turkish AQs

- **Section IV** → Presentation of evidence for the claim that **Turkish AQs involve big disjuncts:**
    o Extraposition possibilities of the second disjunct in matrix and embedded clauses in conjunction with:
        ▪ Constraints of scrambling of focused phrases in Turkish and
        ▪ Constraints on (forward) gapping in Turkish

- **Section V** → Discussion of **how big 'big' actually is** (CP or smaller) – a question that I will not answer today.
    o Positions in which the question particle *mI* is allowed to appear in:
        ▪ Polar questions,
        ▪ Alternative questions (first *versus* the second disjunct).

- **Section VI** → Conclusion

III.   ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS IN TURKISH

In Turkish, AQs are formed by inserting after each alternative/disjunct, the particle *mI,* otherwise used as a question particle in polar questions.[2] The disjuncts are optionally disjoint by the word *yoksa* 'if not', but the presence of *mI* after each alternative remains obligatory regardless of whether *yoksa* is present or absent.

An example of a Turkish polar question is given in (8) below, while examples in (9) illustrate AQs ((9b) is repeated from (3b) above).

8. Nermin okula   **mı** gitmiş?   *Polar question*
   Nermin school.DAT Q   go.EVİD./PERF.
   'Did Nermin go to school?'

9. Ali çay **mı** (yoksa) kahve **mi** içti?   *Alternative question*
   Ali tea Q   not-if   coffee Q   drank
   'Did Ali drınk tea or coffee?'

---

[2] The particle *mI* is classified as a clitic (Kornfilt 1997) which undergoes vowel harmony with the constituent to its left and "does not receive word final stress, but causes the preceding syllable to be stressed." (Aygen 2007: 2) However, as stated in Göksel andKerslake (2005) and Kornfilt (1997), if there are other factors affecting the stress (for example, if *mI* is preceded by a suffix which resists stress), the stress is determined by internal stress pattern of the word or phrase to which *mI* attaches.

AQs in Turkish may also be embedded, as in (10), regardless of whether the embedded clause is tensed (10a) or not (10b). [3]

10. a. Hasan [Ali kahve **mi** (yoksa) çay **mı** içti   ] anladı?
     Hasan [Ali coffee Q   not-if tea Q   drink.PAST] understnd.PAST
     'Did Hasan figure that Ali drank COFFEE or TEA?'

  b. Hasan [Ali'nin kahve **mi** (yoksa) çay **mı** içtiğini   ] sordu.
     Hasan [Ali.GEN coffee Q   not-if tea Q   drink.N.ACC] ask.PAST
     'Hasan asked whether Ali drinks/drank COFFEE or TEA.'

a. INTERROGATIVE PARTICLE *mI*

The function of the particle *mI* in questions is twofold:

   i. **It turns a statement into a yes/no question** (i.e. takes scope over the entire proposition),

   ii. **It functions as a question focus particle** (Kornfilt 1997), narrowing down the questioned part of the proposition and questioning only the phrase to which it is attached, i.e. taking narrow scope (Göksel and Kerslake 2005).

While any placement of *mI* allows for a narrow scope interpretation, only the following placements also yield a wide scope reading:

   i. The placement **on the predicate** (sentence-finally) (Göksel andKerslake 2005, Kornfilt 1997, Kamali 2011), as shown in (11a), and

   ii. The placement **on the immediately pre-verbal constituent** (Göksel andKerslake 2005, Kamali 2011), as shown in (11b).

11. a. Ali araba aldı   **mı**?
     Ali car   bought Q
     'Did Ali buy a car?' / 'Did Ali **BUY** a car?

  b. Ali araba **mı** aldı?
     Ali car   Q bought
     'Did Ali buy a car?' / 'Was it **A CAR** that Ali bought?'

If *mI* appears in a position other than those illustrated in (11), it necessarily functions as a question focus particle, focusing the constituent to which it attaches. This will be important in the discussion that follows.

---

[3] In (10a), the AQ is embedded under the matrix predicate *anla-* 'understand' and the question takes matrix scope. In (10b), however, it appears under the predicate *sor-* 'ask', where it has embedded scope. Whether an embedded AQ receives embedded or matrix scope seems to depend on a number of factors, including the lexical semantics of the embedding predicate as well as the means of complementation (Coşkun 2010). I am not sure at the moment whether these differences play a role in the argument I am making here, but the fact that not only AQs, but also wh-phrases which occur in an embedded wh-question show parallel variability in scope suggests that the scope of an embedded interrogative element depends on factors that are independent of the structure of AQs.

IV.   EXTRAPOSITION OF THE SECOND DISJUNCT IN AQS

  a. *MATRIX AQS*

In matrix AQs, the second disjunct (together with *yoksa,* when present) can appear post-verbally, in an extraposed position (12b).

12. a. Ali mi (yoksa) Ayşe mi kahve içti?
       Ali Q   not-if   Ayşe Q   coffee drank
       'Was it Ali or Ayşe who drank coffee?'

    b. Ali mi kahve içti   (yoksa) Ayşe mi?
       Ali Q   coffee drank   not-if   Ayşe Q

On a 'small' disjuncts analysis, (12b) is derived from (12a)/(13a) by extraposing the *yoksa*+second disjunct, as shown in (13b).

13. a. [[Ali mi] [(yoksa) Ayşe mi]] kahve içti?   = (12a)
          Ali Q   not-if Ayşe Q   coffee drank

    b.[[Ali mı] t_1] kahve içti *[(yoksa) Ayşe mı]]$_1$*?   = (12b)

On the 'big' disjunct analysis, both (12a) and the string in (12b) are clausal disjunctions, with different parts of first/second disjunct deleted, as shown in (14a) and (14b).

14. a. [[Ali mi ~~kahve içti~~] [(yoksa) [Ayşe mi kahve içti]]]?   = (12a)
          Ali Q coffee drank not-if   Ayşe Q coffee drank

    b. [[Ali mi kahve içti] [(yoksa) [Ayşe mi ~~kahve içti~~]]]?   = (12b)

Independent facts about Turkish grammar argue against the analyses in (13) and for the analyses in (14).

Turkish is a scrambling language, which allows scrambling of both focused and non-focused phrases in polar questions, as shown in (15b) and (16b).

15. a. **Ali** dün   çay mı içti?
       Ali yesterday tea   Q   drink.PAST
       'Did Ali drink tea yesterday?'

    b. Dün   çay mı içti   **Ali**?
       yesterday tea   Q   drink.PAST Ali

16. a. Ayşe **yarın**   **mı** okula   gidecek?
       Ayşe tomorrow Q   school.DAT go.FUT
       'Is it tomorrow that Ayşe will go to school?'

    b. **Yarın**   **mı** Ayşe okula   gidecek?
      tomorrow   Q Ayşe school.DAT go.FUT

However, there is a constraint, operative in Turkish, which prohibits focused material from scrambling to the right of the verb (Erguvanlı, 1984; Göksel, 1998; Göksel and Özsoy, 2000; Kural, 1992).

Thus, (17) below contrasts both with (15b), in which non-focused material scrambled to the right of the verb and and with (16b), in which focused material scrambled to the front of the sentence.[4]

17. *Ayşe okula   gidecek **yarın**   **mı**?
     Ayşe school.DAT go.FUT   tomorrow Q

The derivation in (13b), which assumes the 'small' disjunct analysis, necessarily involves moving a focused phrase rigtwards across the verb, which (17) shows to be disallowed. This argues for the claim that **AQs in Turkish are derived from big rather than from small disjuncts.**

    a. *EMBEDDED AQS*

Embedded AQ facts can also be explained by the 'big' disjunct analysis of AQs. AQs can be embedded, as (18a) shows, but in contrast to matrix AQs, in embedded AQs, the second disjunct (with *yoksa*) cannot extrapose.

The second disjunct, originating in an embedded AQ, can appear neither (immediately) to the right of the embedded verb (18b), nor (immediately) to the right of the matrix verb (18c).[5]

18. a. Hasan Ali'nin kahve mi **(yoksa) çay mı** içtiğini   sordu.
     Hasan Ali.GEN coffee Q   not-if tea Q drink.N.ACC ask.PAST
     'Hasan asked whether Ali drinks COFFEE or TEA.'

   b. *Hasan Ali'nin kahve mi içtiğini   **(yoksa) çay mı** sordu.
     Hasan Ali.GEN coffee Q drink.N.ACC not-if   tea Q ask.PAST

   c. *Hasan Ali'nin kahve mi içtiğini   sordu   **(yoksa) çay mı**.
     Hasan Ali.GEN coffee Q drink.N.ACC ask.PAST not-if   tea Q

---

[4] Recall that the particle *mI* when placed on any constituent other than the predicate and the immediately preverbal constituent necessarily functions as a focus particle, i.e. focuses the phrase to which it attaches. Thus, the adverbial phrase *yarin mi* 'tomorrow?', because it is focused, cannot scramble to a position after the verb.
[5] Example (18c) is good on a matrix questions reading, where the disjunction is at the matrix level, as in (i). Recall from (10b) that AQ embedded under the matrix predicate *sor-* 'ask' always yields narrow scope interpretation for the question. This suggests that the fact that (18c) is good on the reading in (i), but not on the relevant reading is not an effect of the interrogative embedded particle(s) taking scope at different levels, but rather of different syntactic structures.

    i.   Did Hasan ask whether Ali drank coffee or did Hasan ask whether Ali drank tea?

The small disjuncts analysis offers a straightforward explanation of these facts: all of the examples in (18b-c) involve the rightward movement of a focused phrase over the (embedded/matrix) verb.

On the 'big' disjuncts analysis, the ill-formedness of examples in (18b-c) is a bit harder to derive. On this analysis, all of the examples in (18) have the structure in (19). Different forms of the AQs (the grammatical one in (18a), as well as the two ungrammatical ones in (18b-c)) are supposed to arise from different deletion operations that apply to (19).

19. [Hasan [[Ali'nin kahve mi içtiğini]   [yoksa [Ali'nin çay mı içtiğini]]]   sordu.
    Hasan   Ali.GEN coffee Q drink.N.ACC not-if Ali.GEN tea Q drink.N.ACC ask.PAST

The ill-formedness of **(18c)** follows straightforwardly on this analysis, since no deletion operation can derive the string in (18c) from the underlying structure in (19).

The word order in **(18b)** would arise if the deletion operation in (20) applied.

20. [Hasan [[Ali'nin kahve mi içtiğini]   [yoksa [A̶l̶i̶'̶n̶i̶n̶ çay mı i̶ç̶t̶i̶ğ̶i̶n̶i̶]]]   sordu.
    Hasan   Ali.GEN coffee Q drink.N.ACC not-if Ali.GEN tea Q drink.N.ACC ask.PAST

Since (18b) is ungrammatical, something must be blocking such deletion operation. Ince (2009), who investigates properties of gapping in Turkish, shows that forward gapping in Turkish is a root phenomenon, i.e. applies only to matrix clauses.

Ince shows that examples like (21), which involve gapping in the embedded clause, are ungrammatical.

21. *Zeynep [Hasan'ın   karidesi   yediğini] [Mehmet'in   de   istiridyeyi] duydu.
     Zeynep Hasan.GEN shrimp.ACC eat.N.ACC Mehmet.GEN and   oyster.ACC heard
     'Zeynep heard that Hasan ate shrimp and Mehmet the oyster.'

The example improves if the rightmost conjunct exrtaposes to a position after the matrix verb, as in (22) (Kornfilt 2000).

22. Zeynep [Hasan'ın   karidesi   yediğini] duydu [Mehmed'in   de   istiridyeyi.]
    Zeynep Hasan.GEN shrimp.ACC eat.N.ACC heard   Mehmet.GEN and   oyster.ACC
    'Zeynep heard that Hasan ate shrimp and Mehmet the oyster.'

Kornfilt (2000) proposes that the contrast between (21) and (22) is due to "a condition in Turkish syntax that precludes the generation of embedded clauses that are not verb-final and which are internal to a higher clause." Since in (21) the embedded clause is internal to the superordinate clause, the sentence is out. In (22), on the other hand, the embedded clause is not internal to the matrix clause (is not followed by any material belonging to the higher clause) and the sentence is grammatical.

If Kornfilt is correct, the ungrammaticality of (18b) is expected, but it is puzzling that the AQ in (18c) is ill-formed, given that there also the embedded disjunct has been extraposed to a position where it is not followed by the matrix material.

Ince (2009) argues against Kornfilt's claim, discussing examples like (23a), parallel to (22), which involve **gapping within a disjunction phrase in the embedded clause**. Ince states that (23a) only allows for the reading in (23b), but not for the one in (23c); by uttering (23a), the speaker does not assert Ahmet's knowledge of the disjunction, but the 'disjunction of Ahmet's knowledge'.

23. a. Ahmet Hasan'ın   pastayı   yediğini biliyor,   veya Meral'ın   dondurmayı.
       Ahmet Hasan.GEN cake.ACC eat.N.ACC know.PRES.PROG. or   Meral.GEN ice-cream.ACC

    b. 'Either Ahmet knows that Hasan ate pasta or Ahmet knows that Meral ate ice-cream.'

    c. #'Ahmet knows either that Hasan ate pasta or that Meral ate ice-cream.'

This suggests that the structure does not involve a disjunction of embedded clauses, but rather involves a disjunction at the matrix level, as shown in (24).

24. [[Ahmet [Hasan'ın   pastayı   yediğini biliyor]]   veya
       Ahmet Hasan.GEN cake.ACC eat.N.ACC know.PRES.PROG. or

    [~~Ahmet~~ [Meral'ın   dondurmayı   ~~yediğini   biliyor~~.]]]
       Ahmet   Meral.GEN ice-cream.ACC eat.N.ACC   know.PRES.PROG.

Ince concludes that forward gapping in Turkish is allowed only at the level of the matrix clause. If this argument is successful, then the ill-formedness of the example in (18b) is explained even on the 'big' disjunct analysis.

Example (18b) is ill-formed because it involves an illicit forward ellipsis at the level of the embedded clause, as in (25).

25. [Hasan [[Ali'nin kahve mi içtiğini]   [yoksa [~~Ali'nin~~ çay mı ~~içtiğini~~]]]   sordu.
        Hasan   Ali.GEN coffee Q drink.N.ACC not-if Ali.GEN tea Q   drink.N.ACC ask.PAST

I conclude that the data involving extraposition of the second disjunct in matrix and embedded clauses support the 'big' disjuncts analysis of AQs in Turkish. We are next going to inspect exactly how big 'big' is.

V.   HOW BIG IS 'BIG'?

There are claims in the literature that the disjuncts in an AQ are the size of a CP: Gračanin-Yuksek (2012) for Croatian, Roelofsen and Pruitt (2011) for English, Uegaki (2013) for Japanese.

Given that in Turkish, each disjunct in an AQ obligatorily contains *mI*, which is the question particle in the language, a natural hypothesis is that in Turkish AQs the disjuncts are CPs.

However, a comparison of the possible placements of *mI* in polar and alternative questions sheds doubt on this hypothesis.

a. PLACEMENTS OF MI IN POLAR AND ALTERNATIVE QUESTIONS

In polar questions, *mI* can attach to any constituent except pre-nominal modifiers and complements of postpositions.

Recall from section (IIIa) that a polar question is ambiguous between a neutral, wide scope (**WS**) interpretation and the focused, narrow scope (**NS**) interpretation only when *mI* appears on the verb (26a) or on the immediately preverbal constituent (26b).

26. a. Ahmet arabayı sattı **mı**?   *WS/NS:* mI *on the verb*
    Ahmet car.ACC sold Q
    WS: 'Did Ali sell the car?'
    NS: 'Did Ali SELL the car?'

  b. Ali kitabi   **mi** okuyor?   *WS/NS:* mI *on the preverbal constituent*
    Ali book.ACC   Q   read.PRES.PROG.
    WS: 'Is Ali reading the book?'
    NS: 'Is it THE BOOK that Ali is reading?'

Placing *mI* on any other constituent only results in an obligatory NS reading (27).

27. a. Ali **mi** gözetmenlik yapıyor?   *NS:* mI *on the subject*
    Ali Q proctoring   do.PRES.PROG.
    NS: 'Is it ALI who is doing the proctoring?'

  b. Ali bugün **mü** saçlarını   kestirecek?   *NS:* mI *on the adverbial*
    Ali today Q   hair.ACC   cut.CAUS.FUT
    NS: 'Is it TODAY that Ali will have his hair cut?'

In AQs, *mI* can also attach to the subject (28a), adjunct (28b), object (28c), or verb (28d).

28. a. Ali **mi** (yoksa) Ayşe **mi** geldi?   *AQ:* mI *on the subject*
    Ali Q   not-if Ayşe Q   came
    'Is it Ali or is it Ayşe who came?'

  b. Ali bugün **mü** (yoksa) yarın   **mı** geliyor?   *AQ:* mI *on the adverbial*
    Ali today Q   not-if tomorrow Q come.PRES.PROG.
    'Is Ali coming today or tomorrow?'

  c. Hasan çayı   **mı** (yoksa) suyu   **mu** içti?   *AQ:* mI *on the object (preverbal)*
    Hasan tea.ACC Q   not-if water.ACC Q   drank
    'Did Hasan drink the tea or the water?'

d. Mehmet ata   bindi   **mi** yoksa attan   indi   **mi**   *AQ:* mI *on the verb*
   Mehmet horse-on got-on   Q   not-if   horse-from got-off   Q
   'Did Mehmet get on the horse or off the horse?'

However, in contrast to polar questions, in AQs *mI* on the verb can only take narrow scope, as in (28d), while the wide scope is impossible, as (29) shows.

29. a. *Ahmet arabayı sattı **mı** (yoksa) Hasan kredi aldı   **mi**?
       Ahmet car.ACC sold Q   not-if   Hasan loan took Q
       Int: 'Did Ahmet sell the car or (did) Hasan take a loan?'

    b. *Ahmet arabayı sattı **mı** (yoksa) kredi aldı   **mi**?
       Ahmet car.ACC sold Q   not-if   loan   took Q
       Int: 'Did Ahmet sell the car or did he take a loan?'

Instead, the wide scope reading arises if *mI* appears on the immediately preverbal constituent, as in (30).

30. a. Ahmet arabayı **mı** sattı (yoksa) Hasan kredi **mi** aldı?
       Ahmet car.ACC Q   sold not-if   Hasan loan Q   took
       'Did Ahmet sell the car or (did) Hasan take a loan?'

    b. Ahmet arabayı **mı** sattı (yoksa) kredi **mi** aldı?
       Ahmet car.ACC Q sold   not-if   loan Q   took
       'Did Ahmet sell the car or did he take a loan?'

Aygen (2007) argues that *mI* in polar questions in which it appears on the verb occupies C^0 position in overt syntax. The ungrammaticality of examples in (29) then might suggest that the disjuncts in a Turkish AQ, while clausal, do not contain C^0 position, i.e. are not as big as the CP.

However, in Gračanin-Yuksek (2012), I argue that in Croatian, AQs involve a disjunction of polar questions (CPs). However, although a yes/no interrogative CP in Croatian obligatorily involves the interrogative clitic *li*, in an AQ, this clitic can only appear in the first disjunct, not in the second, as in (31). This is reminiscent of the situation in Turkish.

31. a. Da   **li** Petar prodaje auto ili Marija diže kredit?   *Croatian*
       that Q Petar sells   car   or Marija lifts loan
       'Is Petar selling the car or is Marija taking a loan?'

    b. *Da **li** Petar prodaje auto ili (da) **li** Marija diže kredit?
        that Q Petar sells   car   or   that Q Marija lifts loan

Moreover, at least in some languages, there is overt evidence that AQs involve a disjunction of CPs (contra Han and Romero 2004a, b), as shown below by examples from English, where the fronted auxiliary appears in both disjuncts, and Japanese and Korean, where the question particle may show up on the verb in each disjunct.

32. a. **Did** John drink wine or **did** he drink beer?

    b. Taro-wa koohii-o   non- da- **no** ocha-o non- da- **no**?   *Japanese*
       Taro.TOP coffee.ACC drink.PAST.Q   tea.ACC drink.PAST.Q   (Uegaki 2013: 5)
       'Did Taro drink coffee or tea?'

    c. Chelswu-ka   khophi-lul masi- ess- **ni** animyen cha-lul masi- ess- **ni**?   *Korean*
       Chelswu.NOM coffee.ACC drink.PAST.Q if-not   tea.ACC drink.PAST.Q (H&R 2004a)
       'Which of these two things did Chelswu drink: coffee or tea?'

It is therefore worth considering whether examples in (29) are ill-formed due not to the lack of C^0 position within the disjuncts, but due to some independent fact about Turkish grammar.

Indeed, the data in (33) below suggests that the first disjunct (and by the Law of the Coordination of Likes (Williams 1981), the second one as well) does contain the C^0 position. They show that *mI* with a WS interpretation actually can appear on the verb in the first disjunct, as long as it doesn't appear on the verb in the second disjunct.

33. Ahmet arabayı sattı **mı** (yoksa) Hasan kredi **mi** aldı?
     Ahmet car.ACC sold Q not-if   Hasan loan Q took
     'Did Ahmet sell the car or Hasan take a loan?'

Thus, the problem with the examples in (29) might not lie in their syntax. It is possible that the problem is in the intonation.

Göksel and Kerslake (2005) state that **a polar question** with *mI* involves a high rise in the intonation just before *mI*, followed by falling intonation.

The same source states that in **an AQ**, each alternative has a high rise followed by a fall, sometimes with a rise in the juncture point between the two alternatives.

Kornfilt (1997) states that in a polar question, with *mI* on the predicate, as in (26a), the stress falls on the predicate, followed by a drop in the pitch immediately after the intonation peak.

Kornfilt also discusses contrastive stress, stating that in contrastive constructions, the pitch is higher, and the drop in pitch after the stress is more pronounced.

It seems to me that an AQ with WS reading and *mI* on the verb in each disjunct require:

   – Each disjunct to be pronounced with the intonation of the polar question, so a rise on the predicate, followed by a fall on *mI*, and

   – The drop in pitch to be more audible after the focused constituent (the TP), as required by the contrastive intonation (since the two TPs are being contrasted).

It is possible that not both of these requirements can be met, which might explain why such questions are ill-formed.

If this is on the right track, we might have a way of reconciling the possibilities of *mI* placement in AQ (compared to polar questions) with the claim that the disjuncts are as big as CPs.

VI.   CONCLUSION

In this talk, I presented evidence for the analysis of AQs in Turkish on which they involve a disjunction of clauses. I argued for this claim based on the extraposition possibilities of the second disjunct in both matrix and embedded AQs.

Finally, I discussed the actual size of the disjuncts in an AQ. We have seen that there is evidence both for and against the claim that disjuncts in a Turkish AQ are CPs. I offered no definitive answer to this question. Instead, I speculated that if the disjuncts in an AQ are indeed CPs, the impossibility of *mI* to appear on the verb is a result of conflicting requirements on the intonation that such a question would pose.

References

Aygen, Gulsat. 2007. Q-particle. *Dil ve edebiyat dergisi* 4:1, 1-30.

Beck, Sigrid and Shin-Sook Kim. 2006. Intervention Effects in Alternative Questions. *Journal of Comparative German Linguistics* 9, 165-208.

Coşkun, Hatice. 2010. Question elements in Turkish complement clauses. *Turkic Languages* 14: 43-68.

Erguvanlı, Eser. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Göksel, Aslı. 1998. Linearity, focus and the postverbal position in Turkish. In: Johanson, L. (Ed.), *The Mainz Meeting Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden. pp. 85–106.

Göksel, Aslı and Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish, A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Göksel, Aslı and Sumru Özsoy, 2000. Is there a focus position in Turkish? In A. Göksel and C. Kerslake (eds.) *Studies on Turkish and Turkic Languages; Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Turkish Linguistics,* 219-228. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Gracanin-Yuksek, Martina. 2012. The syntax of disjunctive questions. Paper presented at SinFonIJA 5, Vienna, Austria, September 27-29.

Han, Chung-Hye and Maribel Romero. 2004a. The Syntax of *Whether/Q…Or* Questions: Ellipsis Combined with Movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 3, 527-564.

Han, Chung-Hye and Maribel Romero. 2004b. Disjunction, Focus, and Scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 2, 179-217.

Ince, Atakan. 2009. Gapping in Turkish. In Anisa Schardl, Martin Walkow, and Muhammad Abdurrahman (eds.) *Proceedings of thirty-eighth annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 425-438. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Kamali, Beste. 2011. The Question Particle in Turkish: Consequences for the Interfaces. *In Online complement to Proceedings of WCCFL 28*, M. Byram Washburn, S. Ouwayda, Ch. Ouyang, B. Yin, C. Ipek, L. Marston, A. Walker (eds).

Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish.* New York: Routledge.

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

Kural, Murat. 1997. Post-verbal constituents in Turkish and the Linear Correspondence Axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28; 498-519.

Larson, Richard. 1985. On the syntax of disjunction scope. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 217-264.

Roelofsen, Floris and Kathryn Pruitt. 2011. Disjunctive questions: Prosody, syntax, and semantics. Presented at a seminar at the Georg August Universität Göttingen, April 2011.

Uegaki, Wataru. 2013. Japanese alternative questions are disjunctions of polar questions. Ms. MIT.

Williams, Edwin. 1981. Transformationless grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:645-653.