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1. Verb stranding ellipsis & lexical identity

Verb stranding ellipsis is ellipsis of a constituent out of which verb movement has taken place.

(1) a. \([TP \ V_i [\_P \rightarrow \_t, \_]]\) V-stranding VP ellipsis
b. \([CP \ V_i [\_P \rightarrow \_t, \_]]\) V-stranding TP ellipsis

It occurs in languages where some form of verb-movement (V-to-T, V-to(-T-to)-C, etc.) is attested:

- Hebrew (Doron 1991, Goldberg 2005),
- Irish (McCloskey 1991, 2011),
- Scottish Gaelic (Thoms 2014),
- Chinese (Otani and Whitman 1991),
- Swahili (Ngonyani 1996),
- Finnish (Holmberg 2001, 2015),
- Hungarian (Lipták 2012, 2013),
- Russian (Gribanova 2013a,b, 2015, to appear), see Holmberg (2015) for a list of other languages

(2) Q: On-ko Liisa kotona?
   A: On.
   is-Q Liisa at.home is ‘Is Liisa at home?’
   ‘He is.’

In V-stranding ellipsis, the lexical content of the verb must be identical to that of the antecedent.

THE LEXICAL IDENTITY CONDITION (LIC)
The antecedent- and target-clause main Vs of VP ellipsis must be identical, minimally, in their root and derivational morphology.

(Goldberg 2005, p. 171: 26, under the name verbal identity condition)

(3) Q: Ar cheannaigh siad teach?
    C.INT bought they house
    ‘Did they buy the house?’
    A: Creidim gur cheannaigh.
       believe.1SG C bought
       ‘I believe they did.’
(4) Q: Ar mhiiss-eáíl tú é? (Irish, McCloskey 2005)
   ‘Did you miss him?’
   A: * Chrothnaigh.
   ‘I did.’

Inflectional morphology, tense, mood, finiteness on the verb might vary:

(5) Q: Tazmini et Dvora la-mesiba? (Hebrew, Goldberg 2005)
   invite.FUT.2FSG A Dvora to.the-party
   '(Will) (you) invite Dvora to the party?’
   A: Kvar hizmani.
   already invite.PAST.1SG
   ‘I already did.’

The LIC does not characterize phrasal material that is A- or Ā-moved out of ellipsis sites:

(6) a. A: Bill brought a present to Hall.
    B: Did he [VP σ, bring a present to Hall]?
    b. Bill brought a present to Hall, and I will [VP σ, bring a present to Hall], too.

(7) a. Nuts, I like. Chocolate, I don’t [ν, like τ].
    b. I know he has five cats, but I don’t know how many dogs [TP σ, he has τ].

when the stranded material is A- or Ā-moved:

- ellipsis-external material need not be identical to its correlate in the antecedent
- ellipsis-internal material must be identical to its correlate, due to (8):

(8) Identity conditions on ellipsis internal material

   (i) E-GIVENness: Elided constituents are e-GIVEN (Merchant 2001: p. 26, 42)
      (a) An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo Ξ-type
          shifting, (i) A entails the F(ocus)-closure of E and (ii) E entails the F-closure of A.
      (b) The F-closure of α is the result of replacing F-marked parts of α with Ξ-bound variables of the appropriate
          type (modulo Ξ-type shifting, a type-shifting operation that raises expressions to type <t> and
          existentially binds unfilled arguments).

   (ii) Lexico-syntactic identity of ellipsis sites ('no new words') (Chung 2006: 84)
      Every lexical item in the numeration of the sluice that ends up (only) in the elided IP must be
      identical to an item in the numeration of the antecedent CP.
      (cf. * They’re jealous, but it’s unclear whom they are jealous of.)

   • importantly, the LIC does not apply if the stranded verb is contrastive, in a.o. Russian (ex. 9, Gribanova
     2013b, 2015), European Portuguese (Santos 2009), Swahili (Ngonyani 1996), Hungarian (Lipták 2013),
     (but puzzlingly, not in Hebrew and Irish (Goldberg 2005, McCloskey 2007), see Grivanova 2015)
     — expected since focus constituents are exempted from the calculation of e-GIVENness:

(9) Kto-to ètu vazu URONIL, i tot fakt, čto nikto (eë) ne PODNJAL, menja ogorčaet.
    someone this.A vase.A dropped and the fact that nobody it not picked up me upsets
    ‘Someone DROPPED this vase, and the fact that no one PICKED (it) up upsets me.’

PUZZLE: Why does a non-contrastive verb moved out of the ellipsis site have to comply with the LIC?
Verb stranding ellipsis and lexical identity in Hungarian

Explanations in the literature:
The stranded verb is inside the ellipsis site at the relevant level of interpretation (LF).

(10) a. \[CP [TP V_i [VP \overline{\text{e}}]]] \quad \text{PF-representation}
   b. \[CP [TP [VP V_i]]] \quad \text{LF-representation}

Two versions of the explanation:
① the verb undergoes head movement in PF only, so in LF it is inside the ellipsis site; Schoorlemmer and Temmerman (2012)
② the verb moves in overt syntax but it reconstructs to its source position in LF; Goldberg (2005)(the claim being that heads of phrases are necessarily given)

REST OF THE TALK:
○ I will exemplify V-stranding ellipsis in Hungarian, and the LIC operating in V-stranding.
○ I provide evidence that the LIC should not be accounted for with reference to head movement.

2. Introduction to Hungarian

- Hungarian is an SVO language, with relatively free word order, due to:
  ○ free scrambling of arguments (Surányi 2006)
  ○ free order of constituents in the postverbal field (É. Kiss 2008)
  ○ discourse configurationality: articulated left periphery harboring focus, topics, quantificational material, negation lined up according to scope (É. Kiss 1987, 1994, Brody 1995, Szabolcsi 1997, a.o.)

(11) clausal projections (Szabolcsi 1997, Bartos 1999, Surányi 2009a)

- there is general agreement in the literature that the finite verbs moves out of the VP
  → in line with this, Hungarian shows V-stranding ellipsis (see section 3 below)

    \[V \text{ moves to } T^0\] Brody 1995, Kenesei 1998, Olsvay 2004, É. Kiss 2008, Surányi 2009a
    \[V \text{ moves to } \text{Pred}^0\] Csirmaz 2004, É. Kiss 2006, Surányi 2009b
    but see Koopman and Szabolcsi (2000) for an account in terms of XP movement

Two distinguished relations in the Hungarian clause:
- focus — verb adjacency in clauses with a focus

(12) János MARIT \textit{mutatta} be Annának a moziban.
    J. Mari.ACC introduced.3SG PV Anna.DAT the cinema.IN
    ‘János introduced MARI to Anna in the cinema.’
• preverb — verb adjacency in neutral clauses

(13) János be mutatta Marit Annának a moziban.
J. PV(PREVERB) introduced Mari.ACC Anna.DAT the cinema.IN
‘János introduced Mari to Anna in the cinema.’

PREVERBS (PV, aka preverbal particles)

◦ resultative, terminative and locative particles (of category P, PP, Adv)
◦ determine lexical/situation aspect; normally, they telicize the event
◦ list of all preverbs, from Kiefer & Ladányi (2000)
  tovább (on), újra (again), végig (through), vissza (back), alá (under), elő (before), fölő (above), mellé (next), mőgé (behind), utána (after), át (across), keresztül (across), túl (beyond), hozzá (towards), neki (to), rá (onto), be (in/into), bele (in/into), elő (fore), fel (up), féle (aside), hátra (to the back), ide (here), ki (out), le (down), körül (round), oda (there), össze (inwards), szét (outwards), agyon (on the brain), meg (PRF), tönkre (bust)
◦ preverbs are a subset of verbal modifiers, which occur before the verb in neutral clauses:
  directional/locative DPs: a szobába megy lit. ‘into the room go’; predicative APs and NPs:
  ostobának bizonyul 'stupid prove'; bare arguments: elnökké választ 'president elect'; infinitival complements: úszni akar 'swim. INF want'

APPROACHES TO PREVERBS

◦ lexical accounts: preverb + verb = morphological word or lexical compound
  (Ackerman & Webelhuth 1997, see also autolexical account of Farkas and Sadock 1989)
  arguments: some preverb + verb combinations lack compositional meaning
  preverb + verb form input to derivational morphology
◦ syntactic accounts: preverb + verb are syntactically autonomous, independent units
  arguments: preverb and verb are non-adjacent in many syntactic contexts (cf. 12) ; non-adjacent even in seemingly lexical derivations (Lipták & Kenesei 2014)

I follow syntactic accounts, particularly Surányi (2009a), (É. Kiss 2008, Dékány & Hgedő to appear) in assuming:
◦ preverbs are phases, originating as e.g. predicates in a small clause inside the VP
◦ preverbs move to PredP to form a single complex predicate with the verb
◦ preverbs move on to Spec,TP, while the verb raises to T⁰

(14) adopted from Surányi (2009a)
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° preverbs are phrasal constituents (Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000, Den Dikken 2004, Surányi 2009a,b)

① PVS can be contrastively topicalized (15) or focused (16), independently of the host verb

(15) **Fel** Pétér *t* ment a lépcsőn. (fel *megy* = go up)
PV(up) Pétér went the stairs.ON
lit. ‘As far as up is concerned, it was Péter who went upwards on the stairs.’

(16) **FEL** ment Pétér a lépcsőn, nem LE.
PV(up) went Péter the stairs.ON not PV(down)
lit. ‘It was upwards that Péter went on the stairs, not downwards.’

② PVS can undergo long distance movement across a CP boundary (cf. 17), just like verbal modifiers of the *evidently* phrasal types (cf. 18) (Koopman & Szabolcsi 2000)

(17) **Fel** akarod [CP hogy *t* mondjak ]? (fel mond = resign)
PV want.2SG that resign.SUBJ.1SG
‘Do you want me to resign?’

(18) **Ostobának** akarod [CP hogy *t* bizonyuljak ]?
stupid.DAT want.2SG that resign.SUBJ.1SG
‘Do you want me to prove stupid?’

③ PVS undergo "preverb climbing" across infinitive clusters and scrambled arguments/adjuncts (cf. 19), just like verbal modifiers of the *evidently* phrasal type (cf. 20) (É. Kiss 1994, Koopman & Szabolcsi 2000)

(19) **Fel** fogom akarni újra *t* hívni. (fel *hív* = call)
PV FUT.1SG want.INF again call.INF Mari.ACC
‘I will want to call Mari again.’

(20) **A szobában** fogok akarni megint *t* maradni.
the room.INF fut.1SG want.INF again remain.INF
‘I will want to remain in the room again.’

④ syntactic autonomy of PVs would be difficult to account for if they are part of the verbal head (dubious nature of excorporation)

(21) János MARIT ~ mutatta be Annának a moziban.
J. Mari.ACC introduced.13G PV Anna.DAT the cinema.IN
‘János introduced MAR1 to Anna in the cinema.’

3. V-stranding ellipsis

V-stranding ellipsis is attested in contexts with emphatic polarity, i.e. in *responses* to assertions and answers to polar questions (for parallels between these discourse moves, Farkas and Bruce 2010)

° answer to a polar question

(22) A: János meg hívta a szomszédokat?
J. PV invited.3SG the neighbours.ACC
‘Did János invite the neighbours?’

B: Meg hívta.
PV invited.3SG
‘He did.’

° (dis)confirmatory response about the polarity of an assertion
A: János nem hívta meg a szomszédokat.  
J. not invited.3SG PV the neighbours:ACC  
‘János did not invite the neighbours.’

B: De, meg hívta.  
DE PV invited.3SG  
‘That’s not right, he did.’

3.1. Arguments for ellipsis in V-stranding contexts (Lipták 2013)

① CONTEXTS WHERE OMITTED OBJECT CANNOT BE pro  
Objects (animate and non-animate) can be dropped only in the singular, V-stranding nevertheless allows for missing plural objects.

J. saw.3SG the neighbours:ACC greeted.3SG they:ACC  
‘János saw the neighbours. He greeted them.’

saw.3SG J. the neighbours:ACC saw.3SG  
‘Did János see the neighbours?’ ‘He did.’

② CONTEXTS WHERE OMITTED SUBJECT CANNOT BE pro  
Reference to existential indefinites cannot be made via pro-drop (Holmberg 2015).

(27) Q: Jött valaki?  A: Jött.  
came.3SG someone came.3SG  
‘Did anyone arrive?’ ‘Yes.’ (= There came someone).

③ DISJUNCTIVE OMISSIONS (Gribanova 2013a)  
Disjunctors or other functional items without pronominal variants can be missing.

(28) A: Láttad a szomszédokat az utcán vagy a házmestert a folyósón?  
see.2SG the neighbours:ACC the street.ON or the janitor:ACC the corridor.ON  
‘Did you see the neighbours in the street or the janitor in the corridor?’
B: Láttam.  
saw.1SG  
‘I did.’ (= see the neighbours in the street or the janitor in the corridor)

④ PARTIAL OMISSION IS BANNED (Kenesei et al 1998)  
If the missing material contains multiple constituents, they all have to be missing.

(29) A: Meg hívta János a szomszédokat a házavatóra?  
PV invited.3SG J. the neighbours:ACC the housewarming:ONTO  
‘Did János invite the neighbours to the housewarming?’
B: Meg hívta (* János).  
PV invited.3SG J.  
⑤ SLOPPY IDENTITY  
Overt and pro-dropped object pronouns allow for strict readings only; our contexts can have a sloppy reading, too (but see the limitations of this argument in Hoji 1998).

M. saw.3SG the mother.POSS3SG.ACC Péter greeted 3SG.ACC  
‘Mari saw her mother. Péter greeted her.’ (= Mari’s mother)
b. Mari nem látta az anyját, de Péter látta. [strict, sloppy]

Mari did’t see her mother, but Péter saw her.’ (= Mari’s mother / Péter’s mother)

→ tests 1-5 indicate that the missing material does not correspond to individual null arguments/adjuncts, but the ellipsis of a constituent containing these arguments/adjuncts: this is an instance of V-stranding ellipsis

THE SYNTACTIC CONFIGURATION

◦ all examples involve the polarity projection PolP (Lipták 2013)
◦ preverb + verb strand in TP and vP elides (see also É. Kiss 2006, Surányi 2009a,b)
    see evidence against remnant VP-movement deriving these facts: Lipták (2013), Holmberg (2015) on Finnish
◦ ellipsis of vP is licenced by the affirmative Pol⁰ head (via long distance Agree, cf. Aelbrecht 2010)

(31) PolP
    ├── Pol'  
    │    │    Pol[+Aff]  
    │    │      └── TP  
    │    │          ├── PREVERB  
    │    │          │    └── T'  
    │    │          │        └── vP  
    │    │        └── V-Pred-v-T  
    │    └── v'  
    └── PredP

→ the ellipsis of a predicative constituent provides evidence that the verb in Hungarian does leave the core VP behind and moves to a higher position (Surányi É. Kiss 2006, 2009b,a)

3.2. Identity in V-stranding ellipsis

Hungarian V-stranding observes the lexical identity condition: the stranded verb has to be lexically identical to its antecedent; while inflectional morphology can vary (Lipták 2012, 2013).

(32) Q: Kedveled a szomszédokat? [near equivalence: kedvel vs. szeret ‘like’]
   like₁.2SG the neighbours.ACC
   ‘Do you like the neighbours?’
   
   A: Kedvelem. / Szeretem.
   like₁.1SG like₂.1SG
   ‘I do.’

(33) Q: Meg csinál-ná-d a házi feladataimat?
   PV do-COND-2SG the homework.POSS1SG.PL.ACC
   ‘Would you do my homeworks?’
   
   A: Meg csinál-lat-om.
   PV do-POT-1SG
   ‘I may do (them).’

Focused verbs do not comply with the LIC (Lipták 2013, Gribanova 2015) — in line with (10):

(34) János KÖZÖNTÖTTE a szomszédokat, Mari pedig MEG HIVTA.
    J. greeted.3SG the neighbours.ACC M. PRT PV invited.3SG
    ‘János GREETED the neighbours, and Mari INVITED (them).’
Further investigation, however, shows that the LIC is not a condition on ellipsis.

LIC can be violated by non-contrastive verbs when they are accompanied by an affirmative particle:

(35) Q: Be rak-tad a matekkönyveket a táskádba?
PV put₁-PAST.2SG the mathbooks.ACC the bag.POSS.2SG.INTO
‘Did you put the mathbooks in your bag?’

A1: ✓ Be rak-tam.
PV put₁-PAST.1SG
‘verb only’ response: identity is required

A2: ?* Be tet-tem.
PV put₂-PAST.1SG

A3: ✓ Be tet-tem, igen. verb + AFF particle: no identity required
PV put₂-PAST.1SG yes

A4: ✓ Igen, be tet-tem.
yes PV put₂-PAST.1SG
‘I did, yes.’

Importantly, the affirmative particle in A3 is an afterthought, it does not part of the elliptical clause (igen might also introduce an elliptical clause on its own, cf. Kramer and Rawlins 2009)

structure of A3: Be tet-tem [VP a matekkönyveket a táskádba], igen.
PV put₂-PAST.1SG the mathbooks.ACC the bag.POSS.1SG.INTO yes
‘I did, yes.’

Qualtrics survey of LIC-violating verb mismatches

Test items: simplex and complex verbs (varying preverb only, verb only and preverb + verb) with near-identical denotations; in two conditions

(36) A: Néz-ed az árfolyamokat minden nap?
look-2SG the exchange.rate.PL.ACC every day
‘Do you look at the exchange rates every day?’

B1: Figyel-em [öket minden nap]. condition 1: ‘verb only’ answer
watch-1SG them every day
‘I do watch (them every day).’

B2: Figyel-em [öket minden nap], igen. condition 2: verb + polarity particle
watch-1SG them every day yes
‘I do watch (them), yes.’

Table 1. Mean judgements of mismatches in V-stranding (N= 15, 1-to-5 scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB PAIRS</th>
<th>PATTERN</th>
<th>'verb only' elliptical answer</th>
<th>verb+polarity particle elliptical answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fel ad / el küld 'to post'</td>
<td>PV₁ V₁ / PV₂ V₂</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el szállít / el visz 'take away'</td>
<td>PV₁ V₁ / PV₁ V₂</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be rak / be tesz 'put into'</td>
<td>PV₁ V₁ / PV₁ V₂</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>béberbe ad / ki ad 'rent'</td>
<td>PV₁ V₁ / PV₂ V₁</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ossze tör / szét tör 'break'</td>
<td>PV₁ V₁ / PV₂ V₁</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>néz / figyel 'look'</td>
<td>V₁ / V₂</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• ‘verb only’ answers are degraded; compare: good control, full matching, ‘verb only’ answer: 4.60
• verb + polarity particle answers improve significantly compared to ‘verb only’ answers, in most cases to full acceptability, despite the fact that they also involve V-stranding ellipsis
→ the LIC is not a condition on ellipsis in Hungarian
→ the LIC is not due to the special status of head movement out of an ellipsis site

In fact, non-identical verb pairs cause degradation in *non-elliptical responses* as well, if they appear without an affirmative particle.

(i) answer using *verb + overt object*

(37) A: **Néz-ed** az árfolyamokat minden nap? 
look-2SG the exchange.rate.PL every day 
'Do you look at the exchange rates every day?'
B: **Figyel-em** öket. condition 1: *'V + obj only' answer*
watch-1SG them
B': **Figyel-em** öket, **igen.** condition 2: *V+obj+polarity particle answer*
watch-1SG them yes
'I watch them, yes.'

(ii) answer using a *verb + covert object*

(38) A: **Néz-ed** a forint árfolyamát minden nap? 
look-2SG the forint.Poss3SG exchange.rate.ACC every day 
'Do you look at the exchange rate of the Forint every day?'
B: **Figyel-em** pro, condition 1: *'V+pro only' answer*
watch-1SG them
B': **Figyel-em** pro, **igen.** condition 2: *V+pro+polarity particle answer*
watch-1SG them yes
'I watch it, yes.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Mean judgements of mismatches</th>
<th>ELLIPTICAL ANSWERS</th>
<th>NON-ELLiptical ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>verb-stranding</strong></td>
<td><strong>V + covert object</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 15, from Table 1</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fel ad ~ el küld 'post'</td>
<td>'V(P) only'</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V(P) + <strong>igen</strong></td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el szállít ~ el visz 'take away'</td>
<td>'V(P) only'</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V(P) + <strong>igen</strong></td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be rak ~ be tesz 'put into'</td>
<td>'V(P) only'</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V(P) + <strong>igen</strong></td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bérbe ad ~ ki ad 'rent'</td>
<td>'V(P) only'</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V(P) + <strong>igen</strong></td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>össze tör ~ szét tör 'break'</td>
<td>'V(P) only'</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V(P) + <strong>igen</strong></td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figyel ~ néz 'watch'</td>
<td>'V(P) only'</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V(P) + <strong>igen</strong></td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* without an affirmative particle, mismatching responses are degraded across the board: in elliptical answers and in non-elliptical ones
(see Peruch Mezari 2016 for similar results, comparing in Brazilian Portuguese mismatches in *V*-stranding *VPE* and null objects)
differentiating between verb-only utterances = 'echo-responses' ('echo answer' from Holmberg 2015) vs. responses consisting of the verb + affirmative particles

(39) Lexical Identity Condition, formulated for Hungarian
If a response utterance contains only V(P)-material, the antecedent- and target verb must be identical, minimally, in their root and derivational morphology.

if the LIC is not triggered by the presence of ellipsis, what is it about, then, in Hungarian?

Possible pragmatic explanation (see also Peruch Mezari 2016 for a similar approach):
In echo responses, the sole discourse move is that of affirmation of polarity.
  ° using an identical verb: expresses unambiguous affirmation
  ° using an non-identical verb: signals some kind of correction, which is difficult to interpret in the absence of further linguistic material

Another contexts where the LIC disappears: verbal answer followed by another assertion

(40) Q: Be rak-tad a matekkönyveket a táskádba?
PV put1-PAST.2SG the mathbooks.ACC the bag.POSS.2SG.INTO
‘Did you put the mathbooks in your bag?’
A1: ?* Be tet-tem.
PV put2-PAST.1SG
‘I did.’
A2: ✓ Be tet-tem,
PV put2-PAST.1SG but not sure
‘I did, but I am not sure they will be needed tomorrow.’

→ the LIC comes into play in utterances where affirmation of polarity is the only discourse move

Summary of findings about V-stranding
  ° the LIC that holds in V-stranding in Hungarian most likely has a pragmatic explanation
  ° the LIC that holds in V-stranding in Hungarian is not a condition on ellipsis, thus it should not be explained with reference to ellipsis, or head movement out of ellipsis sites

4. Preverb-stranding ellipsis

4.1. Basic properties of preverb-stranding
V-stranding ellipsis can yield a short response pattern: stranding only the preverb.
  ° affirmative answer to a polar question; confirmation of the polarity of an assertion

(41) A: Járos meg hivta a szomszédokat?
J. PV invited.3SG the neighbours.ACC
‘Did János invite the neighbours?’
B: Meg.
PV ‘He did.’
**Verb stranding ellipsis and lexical identity in Hungarian**

(42) A: A fiúk meg hívták a szomszédokat?
   the boys PV invited.3PL the neighbours.ACC
   ‘Did the boys invite the neighbours?’
B: János meg.
   J. PV
   ‘As far as János is concerned, he did.’

- antecedent of preverb-stranding cannot contain negation — see appendix

(43) A: János nem hívt meg a szomszédokat?
   J. not invited PV the neighbours.ACC
   ‘Did János not invite the neighbours?’
B: * (De), meg.
   DE PV
   ‘That’s not right, he did.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Arguments for ellipsis V-stranding-type ellipses (see Lipták 2012)</th>
<th>V-stranding</th>
<th>preverb-stranding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contexts where omitted object cannot be <em>pro</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contexts where omitted subject cannot be <em>pro</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disjunctive omissions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial omission is banned</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sloppy identity</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE SYNTACTIC CONFIGURATION:**

Preverb-stranding differs from V-stranding in that ellipsis bleeds V-movement out of the vP (see van Craenenbroeck & Lipták 2008 for other cases of bleeding)

(44) **structural configuration of preverb-stranding (Lipták 2012)**

Preverbs are phrasal items when stranded:
- the fact that ellipsis can leave them behind as single fragments is in fact another evidence for their phrasal status and attests to their syntactic autonomy (should preverb + verb form a lexical unit, preverb-stranding would violate *Lexical Integrity*, Selkirk 1982, Booij 1985)
- stranding is possible in contexts where there is *undoubtable* evidence that the preverb is a phrase: cf. long distance-moved preverbs in (17) above
Q: Fel akarod [CP hogy ti mondjak]?
Pv want.2SG that resign.SUBJ.1SG
'Do you want me to resign?'

A: Fel akarom [CP hogy ti mondjál].
Pv want.1SG that resign.SUBJ.2SG
'I do.' (want you to resign).

Preverb-stranding strands a phrasal item, not a head.

4.2. Identity in preverb-stranding: the basic facts

- lexical differences between stranded preverb and its correlate are not tolerated (Lipták 2012)

össze 'inwards' / szét 'outwards': identical meaning in combination with tör 'break':

Q: Össze törte János a poharakat? össze tör / szét tör = break
Pv1 broke.3SG J. the glasses.ACC
'Did János break the glasses?'

B1: Össze. mean = 4.87 (N= 15)
Pv1
'He did.'

B2:* Szét. mean = 1.53 (N= 15)
Pv2

bele 'in(to)' / be 'in(to)'; identical lexical (directional) meaning, also in combination with fér 'fit':

Q: Bele fért az autóba az összes csomag? mean = 1.69 (N = 13)
In1,3SG fit. 3SG the car.IN the all luggage
'Did all the luggage fit into the car?'

A: Bele. / * Be. In1,3SG

Q: Be fért az autóba az összes csomag? mean = 2.0 (N = 13)
In2 fit the car.IN the all luggage
'Did all the luggage fit into the car?'

A: Be. / * Bele. In2

If the LIC is a pragmatic condition in Hungarian, this is not surprising: we have an echo response ('preverb only') here, so we expect that the echo response requires lexically identity.

But this is not all: preverb-stranding shows an identity restriction to a stronger degree than V-stranding:

- judgements receive a lower score than in the case of V-stranding (compare Table 1)
- addition of affirmative particle does not improve the judgements at all

Q: Össze törte János a poharakat? mean = 4.87 (N= 15)
Pv1 broke.3SG J. the glasses.ACC
'Did János break the glasses?'

B1: Össze. mean = 4.87 (N= 15)
Pv1

B2:* Szét. mean = 1.53 (N= 15)
Pv2

B3:* Szét, igen. mean = 1.60 (N= 15)
Pv2 yes
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→ preverb-stranding shows a kind of lexical identity restriction that is not pragmatic in nature

QUESTION: What kind of lexical identity restriction characterizes preverb-stranding?

4.3. Identity in preverb-stranding: syntactic identity?

I. Identity as a PHONOLOGICAL condition?

Preverb-stranding is not PF-copying of a preverb, so the identity condition here is not phonological.

- Adpositional (locative) preverbs express an argument of the verb and show overt agreement with that argument in number and person (Marácz 1985).

Inflectional paradigm of adpositional preverb rá 'onto'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>(én)-rá-m 1-P-POS.1SG</td>
<td>(mi)-rá-nk we-P-POS.1PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'onto me'</td>
<td>'onto us'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 person</td>
<td>(te)-rá-d you-P-POS.2SG</td>
<td>(ti)-rá-tok you-P-POS.2PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'onto you'</td>
<td>'onto you (pl)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 person</td>
<td>(ő)-rá 3sg-P-POS.3SG</td>
<td>(ő)-rá-juk 3sg-P-POS.3PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'onto him/her'</td>
<td>'onto them'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such preverbs allow for inflectional mismatches under preverb-stranding → we are not dealing with a phonological identity condition of sorts:

(50) Q: Rá-d nézett János?
ONTO-2SG looked.3SG J.
‘Did János look at you?’
A: Rá-m.
ONTO-1SG
‘He did.’

II. Identity as a SYNTACTIC condition?

- Inflected locactive preverbs show up in two strategies: a doubling strategy and a 'simple' strategy (Surányi 2009b,c, É. Kiss 2002)

    the doubling strategy is used with lexical arguments

(51) János rá nézett { Mari-ra / a lányok-ra }.
J. ONTO-3SG looked.3SG Mari-ONTO the girl.PL-ONTO
‘János looked at Mari/at the girls.’

structure: [ArgP [PP [φP pro ]-rá ]] [PP [DP Mari ]-ra ]

pro-φP: non-argumental weak pronoun
(Cardinaletti & Starke 1999)
   János 3sg-ONTO.3SG looked.3SG Mari-ONTO
   ‘János looked at Mari.’

   J. ONTO.3SG looked.3SG Mari-ONTO
   ‘It was her/Mari that János looked at.’

◦ simple strategy is used with pronominal arguments
inflected preverb spells out full argument:

(53) a. János rá-m nézett (* rá-m).
   J. ONTO-1SG looked.3SG ONTO-1SG
   ‘János looked at me.’

b. János én-rá-m nézett.
   J. I-ONTO-1SG looked.3SG
   ‘idem’

c. János RÁ-M nézett, (... nem RÁ-D ).
   J. ONTO-1SG looked.3SG not ONTO-2SG
   ‘It was me who János looked at (not you).’

structure:

(54) János [Argp [pp [dp pro]-rá-m]] nézett.
   J. pro-ONTO-1SG looked.3SG
   ‘János looked at me.’

• Identity with inflected preverbs (non-contrastive contexts)

◦ simple strategy in both antecedent and ellipsis clause: 2 → 1 switch: tolerated

(55) A: Rá-d nézett valaki?
   ONTO-2SG looked.3SG someone
   ‘Did someone look at you?’

B: Rá-m.
   ONTO-1SG
   ‘Someone did.

◦ doubling strategy in antecedent, simple strategy in ellipsis clause: 3SP → 1SP switch: not tolerated

(56) A: Rá nézett Ón-re valaki?
   ONTO.3SG looked.3SG You.3SG-ONTO someone
   ‘Did someone look at You?’

B: * Rá-m. (compare V-stranding: ✓ Rá-m nézett.)
   ONTO-1SG
   ‘Someone did.’

3SP → 3PL switch: not tolerated

(57) A: Rá nézett a lányok-ra valaki?
   ONTO.3SG looked.3SG the girls-ONTO someone
   ‘Did someone look at the girls?’

B1: * Rá-juk. (compare V-stranding: ✓ Rá-juk nézett.)
   ONTO-3PL
   ‘Someone did.’

B2: ✓ Rá.
   ONTO.3SG
   ‘Someone did.’

→ The doubling strategy cannot antecede the simple strategy.
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configuration:

(58) Q: \[ TP \left[ \text{ArgP} \left[ PP \left[ \text{pro-} \text{φP} \text{-rā} \right] \right] \right] \text{[PredP} \ t \ V \left[ VP \left[ PP \left[ DP \text{a lányok}-\text{ra} \right] \right] \right] \] ]
A: \[ TP \left[ \text{ArgP} \left[ PP \left[ DP \text{pro-} \text{rá-juk} \right] \right] \right] \text{[PredP} \ t \ V \left[ VP \left[ t \right] \right] \] ]

○ preverb and its correlate are non-identical:
  (i) pro-φP and pro-DP are different lexical items
  (ii) pro-φP and pro-DP differ in syntactic category, and syntactic 'size' (DP < φP)

→ Possibly, if we follow (ii), we can phrase this as a syntactic identity condition (SIC):

In preverb-stranding, the stranded preverb and its correlate show full syntactic isomorphism (lexical and structural identity).

○ at least some lexical mismatches also entail syntactic differences of the above type between preverbs

mismatch (cf. 47/48): belé 'in(to)' preverb containing a nominal complement
be 'in(to)' intransitive preverb, fully grammaticalized adpositional PV
(V. Hegedüs, p.c)

(59) Q: Bele fért az autóba az összes csomag? doubling
  in\text{\textsubscript{1}} 3SG fit.\text{\textsubscript{3SG}} the car.IN the all luggage
  'Did all the luggage fit into the car?'
A: * Be.
  in\text{\textsubscript{2}}
intransitive preverb

(60) Q: * \[ TP \left[ \text{ArgP} \left[ PP \left[ \text{pro-} \text{bele} \right] \right] \right] \text{[PredP} \ t \ V \left[ VP \left[ PP \left[ DP \text{az autó}-\text{ba} \right] \right] \right] \] ]
A: \[ TP \left[ PP \left[ \text{be} \right] \right] \text{[PredP} \ t \ V \left[ VP \left[ t \right] \right] \] ]

less clear: how to explain the mismatch between össze vs. szét (cf. 46)

(61) Q: Össze törte János a poharakat?
  PV\text{\textsubscript{1}} broke.3SG J. the glasses.ACC
  ‘Did János break the glasses?'
B1: Össze.
B2:* Szét.
(both of the adverbal category)
PV\text{\textsubscript{1}}

5. Summary and conclusions

• Hungarian has two V-stranding ellipsis types: (full) V-stranding and preverb-stranding

• V-stranding and preverb-stranding are different when it comes to the lexical identity condition:
  ○ V-stranding ellipsis is characterized by a lexical identity condition that is pragmatic in nature
    → this condition does not say anything about ellipsis, or head movement out of ellipsis sites

  ○ preverb-stranding is characterized by a syntactic identity condition requiring syntactic isomorphism
    → this condition is an ellipsis-specific condition
    → this condition does not say anything about head movement, as stranded preverbs are phrases
Take home message for the study of head movement:
The lexical identity effects observed in Hungarian are not related to head movement.
Lexical identity effects cannot be taken as diagnostics for head movement.

Take home message for the study of ellipsis:
There are various types of identity conditions operative in V-stranding in a single language.
It's plausible that there are various types of identity conditions operating across languages, too, which might help understand the cross-linguistic variation we observe.

Appendix

The fact that preverb-stranding shows syntactic isomorphism might be linked to the fact that it is picky with respect to other properties as well: it needs phonological parallelism with a correlate in the antecedent clause.


(19) János  be-mutat-t-a  Mari-t  Anná-nak  a

John NOM VM-introduce-PAST-DEF-3SG Mary ACC Anna DAT the

mozi-ban.

'John introduced Mary to Anna at the cinema.'

- preverb-stranding leaves behind the most prominent item in the elliptical clause (see for comparable effects in other languages Dvořák 2007, Elfner et al 2015)

(62) A:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
* & * & * & * \\
(1 & (\phi \text{ be}) & (\omega \text{ mutatta})) & (\phi \text{ Marit }) (\omega \text{ Annának }) (\omega \text{ a moziban}) \\
* & * & * & * \\
\end{array}
\]

B:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
* & * & * & * \\
(1 & (\phi \text{ be}) & (\omega \text{ mutatta})) & (\omega \text{ Marit }) (\omega \text{ Annának }) (\omega \text{ a moziban}) \\
* & * & * & * \\
\end{array}
\]

- the need for PF-parallelism shows up in that PV-stranding cannot have an antecedent in which the preverb is not the most prominent item, i.e. it is not in immediately preverbal position
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- the antecedent cannot be in the progressive: V... PV order

(63) A: Épp mentél fel a lépcsőn, amikor hívtalak?
just go.PST.2SG PV the stairs.ON when call.PST.1SG
‘Were you going up the stairs when I called?’

just PV just go.PST.1SG
‘I was.’ ‘I was.’

- the antecedent cannot be an existential statement with a V... PV order

(64) A: Mentek már fel ezen a lépcsőn mások?
go.PST.3PL already PV this the stairs.ON others
‘Have there been others going up these stairs?’

yes PV yes go.PST.3PL
‘Yes, there have.’

- the antecedent cannot contain negation (either with the inner or outer reading): nem V... PV order

(65) A: János nem hívt meg a szomszédokat?
J. not invited.3SG PV the neighbours.ACC
‘Did János not invite the neighbours?’ / ‘Didn’t János invite the neighbours?’

B1: * (De), meg. B2: ✓ (De), meg hívt.
DE PV DE PV invited.3SG
‘That’s not right, he did.’

- importantly, V-stranding does not require PF-parallelism (65 B2), neither does it show a need for syntactic isomorphism as described in 4.3.
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