



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## Sluicing

Lipták, A.K.; Bánréti, Z.

### Citation

Lipták, A. K. (2022). Sluicing. In Z. Bánréti (Ed.), *Syntax of Hungarian: coordination and ellipsis* (pp. 139-154). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. doi:10.5117/9789463728775

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3479655>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# Chapter 5

## Sluicing

Anikó Lipták

<b>5.1.</b>	<b>Sluicing in <i>wh</i>-interrogatives</b>	<b>140</b>
<i>5.1.1</i>	<i>Sluicing with a single <i>wh</i>-remnant</i>	<i>140</i>
<i>5.1.2</i>	<i>Sluicing with multiple <i>wh</i>-remnants</i>	<i>142</i>
<b>5.2.</b>	<b>Sluicing with non-<i>wh</i> remnants</b>	<b>144</b>
<b>5.3.</b>	<b>Relative sluicing</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>5.4.</b>	<b>Case connectivity in sluicing</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>5.5.</b>	<b>Sluicing and locality</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>5.6.</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>5.7.</b>	<b>Bibliographical notes</b>	<b>154</b>

### 5.1. Sluicing in *wh*-interrogatives

Sluicing is a construction that has the surface form of a single *wh*-constituent but is interpreted as an entire question. In this chapter, it is treated as ellipsis of a clause to the exclusion of the question phrase. In English, and in most other languages, sluicing is restricted to interrogatives with constituent *wh*-questions, as has been known since Ross (1969), Lobeck (1995: 54–62) and Merchant (2001: 54–61). Hungarian sluicing is perfectly fine in *wh*-interrogatives, and unlike in English, the kind of ellipsis sluicing involves can also be found with *non-wh*-remnants and contexts other than interrogatives. The latter property is due to the fact that sluicing-like TP ellipsis is licensed after any operator material that participates in a movement similar to that of *wh*-constituents (sluicing tracks *wh*-movement, van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, Lipták 2015).

#### 5.1.1. *Sluicing with a single wh-remnant*

Hungarian allows for sluicing in *wh*-interrogatives (Bánréti 1992, 2007, van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006), in line with the fact that it fronts its *wh*-phrases to the left periphery, above the TP node. Just like in other languages, the *wh*-phrase in the sluice can be embedded or non-embedded and can correspond to an overt or implicit indefinite correlate, which can be either an argument or an adjunct. In case the correlate is implicit, the construction is referred to as sprouting.

- (404) a. Valaki úszott a tóban, de nem tudom, ki. *embedded sluicing*  
 someone swim.Past.3Sg the lake.Ine but not know.1Sg who  
 ‘Someone was swimming in the lake, but I don’t know who.’
- b. Félix úszott valahol, de nem tudom, hol.  
 Félix swim.Past.3Sg somewhere but not know.1Sg where  
 ‘Félix was swimming somewhere, but I don’t know where.’
- c. A: Valaki úszott a tóban. *matrix sluicing*  
 someone swim.Past.3Sg the lake.Ine  
 ‘Someone was swimming in the lake.’  
 B: Igen? Ki?  
 yes who  
 ‘Was that the case? Who?’
- (405) a. Félix beszélgetett, de nem láttam, kivel. *embedded sprouting*  
 Félix talk.Past.3Sg but not see.Past.1Sg who.Ins  
 ‘Félix was talking but I didn’t see who with.’
- b. A hajó elsüllyedt, és jó lenne tudni, mitől.  
 the ship sink.Past.3Sg and good be.Cond know.Inf what.Abl  
 ‘The ship sank, and it would be good to know what it was due to.’
- c. A: Félix beszélgetett. *matrix sprouting*  
 Félix talk.Past.3Sg  
 ‘Félix was talking.’

B: Tényleg? Kivel?  
 really who.Ins  
 ‘Was that the case? Who with?’

The *wh*-phrase in the sluiced clause can have arbitrary complexity, including *which*-phrases (cf. (406a)) and may include coordinated *wh*-constituents as well (see Chapter 3) (cf. (406b)). Note that using coordinated *wh*-phrases is the predominant way to express a reading in which the question is about a single pair of entities.

- (406) a. Egy diákunk úszott a tóban, de nem tudom, melyik  
 a student.Poss.1Pl swim.Past.3Sg the lake.Ine but not know.1Sg which  
 diákunk.  
 student.Poss.1Pl  
 ‘One of our students was swimming in the lake, but I don’t know which one.’
- b. Valaki ellopott valamit. Ki fog derülni, hogy ki és  
 someone Prt.steal.Past.3Sg something.Acc Prt Fut.3Sg transpire.Inf Compl who and  
 mit.  
 what.Acc  
 ‘Someone stole something. It will come to light who and what.’

The *wh*-phrase in sluicing can also contain a contrastive element – for example, a contrastive nominal – which must be in explicit contrast with a contrastive correlate in the antecedent of sluicing. Examples of this sort are referred to in the English literature as ‘contrast sluicing’.

- (407) Nem az érdekel, hogy hány KÓLÁT ittál. Az érdekel, hogy  
 not that interest.3Sg Compl how.many coke.Acc drink.Past.2Sg that interest.3Sg Compl  
 hány SÖRT.  
 how.many beer.Acc  
 ‘What interests me is not how many cokes you drank. What interests me is how many beers.’

Sluicing can linearly follow its antecedent containing the correlate (representing forward ellipsis), or precede its antecedent (representing backward ellipsis). The latter is possible when the sluiced clause expresses concessive meaning and is syntactically subordinated to the antecedent clause that follows it (Bánréti 2007):

- (408) a. Bár nem láttam, hogy ki, úgy tűnt, hogy valaki úszott a  
 although not saw.1Sg Compl who so seem.Past.3Sg Compl someone swim.Past.3Sg the  
 tóban.  
 lake.Ine  
 ‘Although I did not see who, someone seemed to have swum in the lake.’
- b. Nem tudjuk, hogy mitől, de sokan megijedtek.  
 not know.1Pl Compl what.Abl but many Prt.get.scared.Past.3Pl  
 ‘We don’t know what of, but many people got scared.’

The interrogative clause containing the sluice can not only be an interrogative complement to verbs (like all examples above) but can occur as an interrogative argument to nouns or be the clausal subject of adjectival predication as well.

- (409) a. Valaki ellopta az iratokat. Annak kiderítése, hogy ki, nehéz lesz.  
 someone Prt.steal.Past.3Sg the paper.Pl.Acc that.Dat finding.Poss.3Sg Compl who difficult  
 be.Fut.3Sg  
 ‘Someone stole the papers. Finding out who will be difficult.’
- b. Valaki ellopta az iratokat. Érthetetlen, hogy miért.  
 someone Prt.steal.Past.3Sg the paper.Pl.Acc understand.able.neg Compl why  
 ‘Someone stole the papers. It’s impossible to understand why.’

Similarly, the sluiced proposition can be embedded inside a clausal complement to a postposition, like in the following case, which represents an instance of antecedent contained deletion (as the event modifier *nélkül* PP is contained inside the TP of the main clause).

- (410) Félix megcsókolt valakit, anélkül, hogy tudta volna, kit.  
 Félix Prt.kiss.Past.3Sg someone.Acc that.without Compl know.Past.3Sg Cond who.Acc  
 ‘Félix kissed someone without knowing who.’

Finally, when sluicing is a complement of existential predication, as in the so-called modal existential construction (Šimik 2010), it corresponds to a non-interrogative *wh*-clause:

- (411) Félix megcsókolna valakit, de nincs kit.  
 Félix Prt.kiss.Cond.3Sg someone.Acc but neg.be.3Sg who.Acc  
 ‘Félix would like to kiss someone, but there is nobody (to kiss).’

As some of the above examples illustrated, the sluicing *wh*-remnant is not necessarily initial in its clause. It can be preceded by the complementizer of interrogative (and indicative) clauses, *hogy*, due to the fact that *wh*-constituents occupy a low position in the left periphery below the complementizer layer (É. Kiss 1987). This position is furthermore reserved for (contrastive) focus constituents, standardly called FocP. Since FocP can be preceded not only by complementizers but also topics, the *wh*-remnant can be preceded by topics as well at least for some speakers (others find a topic and a *wh*-remnant degraded):

- (412) %Tudom, hogy Júlia ebédre és vacsorára is meghívott valakit,  
 know.1Sg Compl Júlia lunch.Sub and dinner.Sub also Prt.invite.Past.3Sg someone.Acc  
 de nem emlékszem, hogy vacsorára kit.  
 but not remember.1Sg Compl dinner.Sub who.Acc  
 ‘I know that Júlia invited people to her place for lunch and for dinner, but I don’t remember who she invited for dinner.’

### 5.1.2. *Sluicing with multiple wh-remnants*

Similar to other multiple *wh*-movement languages, which can front more than one *wh*-phrase to the left periphery, Hungarian also allows for sluicing after multiple *wh*-pronouns (van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2013).

- (413) Félix adott mindenkinek valamit enni. Elmondjam, kinek  
 Félix give.Past.3Sg everyone.Dat something.Acc eat.Inf Prt.tell.Subj.1Sg who.Dat  
 mit? Annának egy almát, Baláznak egy banánt és Csillának  
 what.Acc Anna.Dat a apple.Acc Balázs.Dat a banana.Acc and Csilla.Dat  
 egy csokit.  
 a chocolate.Acc  
 ‘Félix has given something to eat to everyone. Shall I tell you what and to whom? An apple to  
 Anna, a banana to Balázs and a chocolate to Csilla.’

As (413) shows, the interpretation of multiple *wh*-sluicing is usually used to refer to pairs of individuals, where each *wh*-phrase ranges over two or more entities paired to one another in the response to the question. In this respect, multiple *wh*-sluicing fully tracks the interpretation that is available for multiple *wh*-movement without ellipsis in the language. For many speakers (but not all), multiple *wh*-fronting like (414) in Hungarian asks for a response that is listing pairs made up of individuals who left messages and those who received them (E. Kiss 1993), this is the interpretation corresponding to (a). The interpretation that refers to a single message leaver–message receiver pair, i.e., interpretation (b), is unavailable.

- (414) Ki kinek hagyott üzenetet?  
 who who.Dat leave.Past.3Sg message.Acc  
 ‘Who left a message for whom?’  
 a. ✓ Everyone left a message for someone. I wonder who each person left a message for.  
 b. \* A single person left a message for someone. I wonder who the person was and for whom he left a message.

For these speakers, multiple sluicing is also used in the (a) interpretation, but not the (b) one prompting the single pair answer. Accordingly, multiple sluicing is perfect in a context in which there are more than one individuals leaving messages (each to a potentially different one), as in (415).

- (415) Mindenki hagyott üzenetet valakinek. Nem tudom, hogy ki  
 everyone leave.Past.3Sg message.Acc someone.Dat not know.1Sg Compl who  
 kinek.  
 who.Dat  
 ‘Everyone left a message for someone. I don’t know which person for which person.’

Multiple sluicing, however, is unavailable in contexts that presuppose the existence of only one message leaver, observe (416a). In contexts like this, the sluiced interrogative clause contains coordinated *wh*-phrases that characteristically refer to single-pair situations (see Section 3.8 in Chapter 3), as shown in (416b). Note that (416a) is pronounced with the characteristic intonation of multiple *wh*-fronting, that is, with accent on the immediately preverbal *wh*-word only. With accent on both *wh*-words, the single-pair reading is available (416c). This latter example illustrates the paratactic coordination of question phrases (see section 3.8).

- (416) a. \*Valaki hagyott üzenetet valakinek. Nem tudom, hogy ki "kinek.  
 someone leave.Past.3Sg message.Acc someone.Dat not know.1Sg Compl who who.Dat  
 'Someone left a message for someone. I don't know who or for whom.'
- b. Valaki hagyott üzenetet valakinek. Nem tudom, hogy ki és  
 someone leave.Past.3Sg message.Acc someone.Dat not know.1Sg Compl who and  
 kinek.  
 who.Dat  
 'Someone left a message for someone. I don't know who (it was) and for whom (he left a message).'
- c. Valaki hagyott üzenetet valakinek. Nem tudom, hogy "ki, "kinek.  
 someone leave.Past.3Sg message.Acc someone.Dat not know.1Sg Compl who who.Dat  
 'Someone left a message for someone. I don't know who (it was) and for whom (he left a message).'

In some cases of multiple *wh*-fronting, like the one in (417), asking for the beginning and end points of an interval, the interpretation makes reference to a single pair of times. In these contexts, multiple sluicing inherits this single pair interpretation, too:

- (417) Hánytól hányig dolgozik ma Bea?  
 how.many.Abl how.many.Ter work.3Sg today Bea  
 'From what time till what time is Bea working today?'
- (418) Bea dolgozik ma, de már nem emlékszem, hánytól hányig.  
 Bea work.3Sg today but already not remember.1Sg how.many.Abl how.many.Ter  
 'Bea is working today, but I don't remember from what time to what time.'

## 5.2. Sluicing with non-*wh* remnants

The ellipsis of clauses to the exclusion of a single constituent can also take place in non-interrogative clauses in Hungarian. The sole surviving phrase can be emphatic operator material like contrastive focus and quantifiers. This kind of clausal ellipsis will be referred to as focus-sluicing in this chapter.

- (419) Valaki úszott a tóban. Azt hiszem, (hogy) PÉTER.  
 someone swim.Past.3Sg the lake.Ine that.Acc think.1Sg Compl Péter  
 'Someone was swimming in the lake. Péter, I think.'
- (420) Tudtam, hogy Félix sok lányt meghívott, de nem tudtam,  
 know.Past.1Sg Compl Félix many girl.Acc Prt.invite.Past.3Sg but not know.Past.1Sg  
 hogy mindet.  
 Compl every.Acc  
 'I knew Félix had invited many girls, but I didn't know he had invited every one of them.'

Focus sluicing can be contrastive or non-contrastive with respect to its correlate in the antecedent clause. When non-contrastive, it has an indefinite correlate, as in the previous two examples. When contrastive, it has a contrastive focus correlate, which occurs in a parallel position in the clause (cf. (407) above for *wh*-sluicing):

- (421) Mari szerint Beát hívta meg Félix. Én viszont úgy  
 Mari according.to Bea.Acc invite.Past.3Sg Prt Félix I however so  
 tudtam, hogy Júliát.  
 know.Past.1Sg Compl Júlia.Acc  
 ‘According to Mari it was Bea who Félix invited. I on the other hand believed that it was Júlia.’

Focus sluicing shares many properties with *wh*-sluicing. Just like in *wh*-sluicing, the remnant of ellipsis can be preceded by topics and quantifiers for some speakers (cf. (412) above):

- (422) %Tudtam, hogy Júlia ebédre és vacsorára is meg szokott hívni  
 know.Past.1Sg Compl Júlia lunch.Sub and dinner.Sub also Prt Habit.3Sg invite.Inf  
 valakit, de nem tudtam, hogy vacsorára mindig PÉTERT.  
 someone.Acc but not know.Past.1Sg Compl dinner.Sub always Péter.Acc  
 ‘I knew that Júlia invites people for lunch and for dinner, but I didn’t know that she always invites only Péter for dinner.’

In focus sluicing, ellipsis can also apply backwards, although some speakers find this pattern degraded:

- (423) %Bár azt nem láttam, hogy éppen Péterrel, de azt  
 although that.Acc not see.Past.1Sg Compl just Péter.Ins but that.Acc  
 hallottam, hogy Félix beszélgetett valakivel.  
 hear.Past.1Sg Compl Félix talk.Past.1Sg someone.Ins  
 ‘Even though I could not see that it was with Péter, I could hear that Félix was talking to someone.’

The host clause of focus sluicing can also be a propositional argument to non-verbal elements:

- (424) a. Valaki ellopta az iratokat. Annak a gyanúja, hogy  
 someone Prt.steal.Past.3Sg the papers.Acc that.Dat the suspicion.Poss.3Sg Compl  
 talán Péter, többekben felmerült.  
 possibly Péter many.Ine Prt.arise.Past.3Sg  
 ‘Someone stole the papers. The suspicion that it might be Péter arose in many.’  
 b. Valaki ellopta az iratokat. Feltehető, hogy Péter.  
 someone Prt.steal.Past.3Sg the papers.Acc possible Compl Péter  
 ‘Someone stole the papers. It is possible that it was Péter.’

Focus sluicing furthermore can have multiple ellipsis remnants.

- (425) Félix adott valamit valakinek. Azt hiszem, hogy egy  
 Félix give.Past.3Sg something.Acc someone.Dat that.Acc believe.1Sg Compl a  
 könyvet Júliának.  
 book.Acc Júlia.Dat  
 ‘Félix gave something to someone. I think he gave a book to Júlia.’

Such multiple focus sluicing has the interpretation of so-called complex focus constructions in non-elliptical sentences (Alberti and Medve 2000, Surányi 2003),

which contain one fronted and one in-situ focus, and establish focus on a pair of constituents, cf. (426).

- (426) Félix adott valamit valakinek. Azt hiszem, hogy EGY  
 Félix give.Past.3Sg something.Acc someone.Dat that.Acc believe.1Sg Compl a  
 KÖNYVET adott JÚLIÁNAK.  
 book.Acc give.Past.3Sg Júlia.Dat  
 ‘Félix gave something to someone. I think he gave a book to Júlia.’

The reading of ‘true’ multiple focus constructions, in which the two foci appear unrelated in the semantic representation, is unavailable in multiple focus sluicing.

- (427) Nem emlékszem pontosan, melyik évfolyam hány tárgyból vizsgázik.  
 not remember.1Sg exactly which year how.many subject.Ela take.exam.3Sg  
 \*De úgy emlékszem, hogy csak az ELSŐSÖK csak EGY tárgyból.  
 but so remember.1Sg Compl only the first.year.students only one subject.Ela  
 ‘I don’t recall exactly which students take an exam in how many subjects. But I do remember that only the first-year students take an exam in only one subject.’

Finally, given that focus sluicing is not restricted to a particular clause-type, it can occur in indicatives (see all examples so far in this section), polar questions (cf. (428)), as well as relative clauses (cf. (429)) or conditionals (cf. (430)).

- (428) Valaki úszott a tóban. Kíváncsi vagyok, (hogy) PÉTER-e.  
 someone swim.Past.3Sg the lake.Ine curious be.1Sg Compl Péter-QPart  
 ‘Someone was swimming in the lake. I wonder if it was Péter.’

- (429) Péternek azt a fotót mutattam meg, amit Annának.  
 Péter.Dat that.Acc the photo.Acc show.Past.1Sg Prt Rel.what.Acc Anna.Dat  
 ‘The photo I showed to Péter was the (same) one that I showed to Anna.’

- (430) Nem tudom, hogy Félix hány lányt hívott meg. Ha mindet,  
 not know.1Sg Compl Félix how.many girl.Acc invite.Past.3Sg Prt if every.Acc  
 bajban vagyunk.  
 trouble.Ine be.1Pl  
 ‘I don’t know how many girls Félix invited. If he invited all of them, we are in trouble.’

### 5.3. Relative sluicing

A further subtype of non-*wh*-sluicing in Hungarian is sluicing after relative pronouns (Lipták 2015). One of the contexts where this is possible are relative clauses in which the relative pronoun is explicitly contrastive with respect to another relative pronoun, like in the following example.

- (431) Olvasni kell. Elképesztő, amit ír, és elképesztő, ahogy.  
 read.Inf must astonishing Rel.what.Acc write.3Sg and astonishing Rel.how  
 ‘You have to read him. It’s astonishing what he writes, and also how.’

The other contexts involve relative pronouns in headless relative clauses and pronominally headed ones, which have a tautological meaning. Relative clauses of this type have a pragmatic import that is similar to free choice (*whatever-*)relatives.

- (432) A rovaroknak három pár lábuk van, a százlábúaknak meg annyi,  
 the insect.Pl.Dat three pair foot.Poss.3Pl is the millipede.Pl.Dat and that.much  
 amennyi.  
 Rel.how.much

‘Insects have three pairs of legs. Millipedes on the other hand have as many as they do.’

- (433) Nem tudom, hogyan alakult volna a sorsom, de bizonyos,  
 not know.1Sg how develop.Past.3Sg Cond the life.Poss.1Sg but sure  
 hogy másképp, mint ahogy.

Compl otherwise than Rel.how

‘I don’t know how my life would have turned out, but surely it would have been different from the way it did.’

- (434) Az építményadót eddig a kerületek szedték – már ahol.  
 the building.tax.Acc this.Ter the district.Pl collect.Past.3pl at.all Rel.where

‘It was the districts that collected the building tax till now – at least in places where they did.’

The latter type of relative sluicing (that in (432)–(434)) is an instance of antecedent contained deletion: the elided clause is contained inside the TP of the matrix clause.

Unlike *wh-* and focus sluicing, relative sluicing does not operate backwards, and cannot have multiple remnants, as the following examples show.

- (435) \*Már ahol, az építményadót eddig a kerületek szedték.  
 at.all Rel.where the building.tax.Acc this.Ter the district.Pl collect.Past.3Sg

‘It was the districts that collected the building tax till now – at least in places where they did.’

- (436) Az építményadót eddig a kerületek szedték – \*már ahol amikor.  
 the building.tax.Acc this.Ter the district.Pl collect.Past.3pl at.all Rel.where Rel.when

‘It was the districts that collected the building tax – at least in places and at times where and when they did.’

Case connectivity in relative sluicing will be taken up in section 5.4 below.

#### 5.4. Case connectivity in sluicing

Remnants of sluicing must appear with the same morphological case as their antecedent in Hungarian (cf. Ross 1967, Merchant 2001, Chung 2013 on English in this respect). This case restriction holds in all types of sluicing: *wh-*, focus and relative sluicing alike. Nominative remnants are ruled out when corresponding to non-nominative correlates. The latter observation discounts the possibility that Hungarian sluicing elides a cleft-type predicate structure like (438): in clefts, the subject can only appear in the nominative case.

- (437) a. Félix beszélgetett valakivel, de nem láttam, {kivel/\*ki}.  
 Félix talk.Past.3Sg someone.Ins but not see.Past.1Sg who.Ins/ who.Nom  
 ‘Félix was talking to someone, but I didn’t see who with.’
- b. Júlia meghívott valakit, de nem tudom, {kit/\*ki}.  
 Júlia Prt.invite.Past.3Sg someone.Acc but not know.1Sg who.Acc/who.Nom  
 ‘Júlia invited someone, but I don’t know who (she invited).’
- (438) Félix beszélgetett valakivel, de nem láttam, ki volt az.  
 Félix talk.Past.3Sg someone.Ins but not see.Past.1Sg who.Nom was that  
 ‘Félix was talking to someone, but I didn’t see who that was.’

Case connectivity extends to the use of adpositional markers and rules out mismatches in form even under synonymous readings. To illustrate a case of such a mismatch, consider *felől* and *-ről* ‘about’ in the following example. They can be used interchangeably to denote the theme of the verb *érdeklődik* ‘inquire’, but they cannot be exchanged under sluicing.

- (439) a. \*Érdeklődtek valaki felől, de már nem emlékszem, kiről.  
 inquire.Past.3pl someone about but already not remember.1Sg who.Del  
 ‘They inquired about someone, but now I don’t remember who.’ (intended meaning)
- b. \*Érdeklődtek valakiről, de most nem emlékszem, ki felől.  
 inquire.Past.3pl someone.Del but now not remember.1Sg who about  
 ‘They inquired about someone, but now I don’t remember who.’ (intended meaning)

Case connectivity is thus responsible for the fact that sluicing remnants with a morphologically distinct case from their correlates are ungrammatical when followed by ellipsis.

One further illustrative example for this comes from the realm of possessed noun phrases. The possessor in these can either be nominative or dative in Hungarian (Szabolcsi 1994), dative possessors being extractable from their DPs. As the following examples show, a dative possessor cannot have a nominative correlate under sluicing, but must have a dative correlate, even though the two are semantically equivalent. (Note that we only illustrate sluices with dative case, as nominative *wh*-phrases cannot extract out of the possessed phrase.) An alternative is to use an anaphoric possessed *wh*-pronoun *kié* that corresponds to the entire nominal, as shown in (440c), see Chapter 7.

- (440) a. \*Egy résztvevő telefonja megcsörrent, de nem láttam, kinek.  
 a participant.Nom phone.Poss3Sg Prt.ring.Past.3Sg but not see.Past.1Sg who.Dat
- b. Egy résztvevőnek a telefonja megcsörrent, de nem láttam, kinek.  
 a participant.Dat the phone.Poss3Sg Prt.ring.Past.3Sg but not see.Past.1Sg who.Dat  
 ‘A participant’s phone started ringing, but I couldn’t see whose.’
- c. Egy résztvevő telefonja megcsörrent, de nem láttam, kié.  
 a participant.Nom phone.Poss3Sg Prt.ring.Past.3Sg but not see.Past.1Sg who.Posr  
 ‘A participant’s phone started ringing, but I couldn’t see whose.’

(441) shows that the observed case restriction is not found in non-elliptical sentences: there, the combination of the nominative-dative case is acceptable.

- (441) Egy résztvevő telefonja megcsörrent, de nem láttam, kinek  
 a participant.Nom phone.Poss3Sg Prt.ring.Past.3Sg but not see.Past.1Sg who.Dat  
 csörrent meg a telefonja.  
 ring.Past.3Sg Prt the phone.Poss3Sg  
 ‘A participant’s phone started ringing, but I couldn’t see whose phone started ringing.’

A different environment in which case connectivity rears its head is long distance dependencies with subjects. In non-elliptical clauses, an embedded subject can be placed into a superordinate clause across bridge verbs, a phenomenon referred to as sentence-intertwining (cf. É. Kiss 1987). In such constructions, nominative subjects can show up with accusative case (for some speakers obligatorily, for others optionally, see Gervain 2003).

- (442) Melyik lányt szeretné, hogy felolvassa a verset?  
 which girl.Acc like.Cond.2Sg Compl Prt.read.Subj.3Sg the poem.Acc  
 ‘Which girl would you like to read out the poem?’

The same kind of case-switch, however, is ruled out for all speakers under sluicing if the correlate of the accusative-marked subject is in the nominative, cf. (443a). The sentence is only well-formed if the correlate appears in the matrix clause and undergoes case-switch itself, cf. (443b). (443b), compared to (443c), shows an independent property of sluicing, namely that it can ignore a mismatch in verbal agreement on the elided verb: as can be observed in (443c), the embedded verb exhibits definite conjugation, while the verb in the antecedent clause exhibits indefinite conjugation (see Section 4.3. in Chapter 4 for similar facts involving ellipsis).

- (443) a. Azt szeretné, hogy egy lány olvassa fel a verset, de  
 that.Acc like.Cond.3Sg.Def Compl a girl read.Subj.Def Prt the poem.Acc but  
 már nem emlékszem, {✓melyik lány/\*melyik lányt}.  
 already not remember.1Sg which girl which girl.Acc  
 ‘He’d like a girl to read out the poem, but now I don’t remember which girl (he’d like to read it).’
- b. Egy lányt szeretne, hogy felolvassa a verset,  
 a girl.Acc like.Cond.3Sg.Indef Compl Prt.read.Subj.Def the poem.Acc  
 de már nem emlékszem, {\*melyik lány/✓melyik lányt}.  
 but already not remember.1Sg which girl which girl.Acc  
 ‘He’d like a girl to read out the poem, but now I don’t remember which girl (he’d like to read it).’
- c. Egy lányt szeretne, hogy felolvassa a verset, de már  
 a girl.Acc like.Cond.3Sg.Indef Compl Prt.read.Subj.Def the poem.Acc but already  
 nem emlékszem, melyik lányt szeretné.  
 not remember.1Sg which girl.Acc like.Cond.3Sg.Def  
 ‘He’d like a girl to read out the poem, but now I don’t remember which girl he’d like to read it.’

Note finally that postposition-stranding is possible by *wh*- and focus sluicing remnants only in case the postposition can strand via regular *wh*-/focus-movement,

too. Such postpositions, like *együtt* in (446) can be stranded and thus need not occur next to the *wh*-phrase in a sluiced clause (cf. (447)).

(444) a. Bea kin keresztül kapott híreket Gyuriról?

Bea who.Sup across get.Past.3Sg new.Pl.Acc Gyuri.Del

‘Via who did Bea get some news about Gyuri?’

b. \*Bea kin kapott híreket keresztül Gyuriról?

Bea who.Sup get.Past.3Sg news.Acc across Gyuri.Del

intended: ‘Via who did Bea get some news about Gyuri?’

(445) \*Bea híreket kapott valakin keresztül, de nem tudom, kin.

Bea new.Pl.Acc get.Past.3Sg someone.Sup across but not know.1Sg who.Sup

intended: ‘Bea got some news via someone, but I don’t know across who.’

(446) a. Kivel együtt jön ma Félix a színházba?

who.Ins together come.3Sg today Félix the theatre.Ill

b. Kivel jön együtt ma Félix a színházba?

who.Ins come.3Sg together today Félix the theatre.Ill

(447) Félix valakivel együtt jön ma a színházba, de nem tudom,

Félix someone.Ins together comes.3Sg today the theatre.Ill but not know.1Sg

kivel.

who.Ins

‘Félix comes to the theatre together with someone tomorrow, but I don’t know together with who.’

Relative sluicing differs from *wh*- and focus sluicing, however. This type of sluicing remnants can and in fact must occur without their postpositions even in cases the postposition in question cannot be stranded via ordinary A-bar fronting. The sluiced remnants that can occur this way must be case marked.

(448) A felkelők azon keresztül kapnak fegyvereket, akin (?\*keresztül).

the rebel.Pl that.Sup across receive.3Pl weapon.Pl.Acc that.Sup across

intended: ‘The rebels receive weapons with the mediation of some people, whoever they might be.’

The reason for this is most likely a prosodic ban on multi-word remnants in relative sluicing, a restriction that is also responsible for ruling out multi-word postpositional remnants as opposed to single-word case-marked ones for many speakers:

(449) a. Félix nem beszél velem, azért, amiért.

Félix not speak.3Sg Ins.1Sg that.Cau Rel.what.Cau

‘Félix does not speak to me for whatever reason that he does not speak to me.’

b. ?\*Félix nem beszél velem, a miatt, ami miatt.

Félix not speak.3Sg Ins.1Sg that because Rel.what because

\*‘Félix does not speak to me because of the reason for which he does not speak to me.’

Sluicing in modal existential constructions has to observe the same condition: two-word remnants are degraded, thus a *wh*-phrase and a postposition with independent word status sounds odd in this construction.

- (450) a. Félix szívesen panaszkodott volna valamiért, de nem volt miért.  
 Félix gladly complain.Past.3Sg Cond something.Cau but not was what.Cau
- b. ?\*Félix szívesen panaszkodott volna valami miatt, de nem volt mi miatt.  
 Félix gladly complain.Past.3Sg Cond something because but not was what because  
 ‘Félix would have gladly complained about something, but there was nothing to complain about.’

### 5.5. Sluicing and locality

Sluicing can occur in main clauses and in embedded ones and can involve remnant formation across clausal boundaries that are transparent to extraction. The following two examples show that both the short-distance and the long-distance readings are available, and the two derive distinct meanings, as expected. The elided chunk is given in brackets, with the most embedded extraction site marked as *t*. The grammaticality of non-elliptical continuation is given after the first bracket.

- (451) Mondtam nekik, hogy vegyenek fel valakit. Azt ajánlottam,  
 tell.Past.1Sg Dat.3pl Compl hire.Subj.3Pl Prt someone.Acc that.Acc suggest.Past.1Sg  
 hogy PÉTERT (✓vegyék fel *t*).  
 Compl Péter.Acc hire.Subj.3pl Prt  
 ‘I told them to hire someone. I suggested they hire Péter.’

- (452) Mondtam nekik, hogy vegyenek fel valakit. Azt hiszem,  
 tell.Past.1Sg Dat.3pl Compl hire.Subj.3pl Prt someone.Acc that.Acc think.1Sg  
 PÉTERT (✓mondtam nekik, hogy vegyék fel *t*).  
 Péter.Acc tell.Past.1Sg Dat.3pl Compl hire.Subj.3pl Prt  
 ‘I told them to hire someone. I think I told them to hire Péter.’

In many cases sluicing also appears to give grammatical results in cases where remnant formation proceeds across domains that are not transparent to extraction (Bánréti 2007). (453) involves extraction of a single conjunct from inside a coordinated phrase, (454) illustrates extraction out of a relative clause and (455) shows that sluicing can be grammatical when the *wh*-phrase corresponds to a postnominal modifier of a noun, something that cannot undergo extraction:

- (453) Juli meghívta Félixet és egy lányt, de nem tudom, kit  
 Juli Prt.invite.Past.3Sg Félix.Acc and a girl.Acc but not know.1Sg who.Acc  
 (\* hívta meg Félixet és *t*)  
 invite.Past.3Sg Prt Félix.Acc and  
 ‘Juli invited Félix and a girl, but I don’t know who.’

- (454) Keresnek valakit, aki beszél egy bizonyos szláv nyelvet,  
 search.3Pl somebody.Acc Rel.who speak.3Sg a certain Slavic language.Acc  
 de nem tudom, melyiket (\*keresnek valakit aki beszél *t*).  
 but not know.1Sg which.Acc search.3Pl someone.Acc Rel.who speak.3Sg  
 ‘They are looking for someone who speaks a certain Slavic language, but I don’t know  
 which one.’
- (455) Említettek egy együttműködést, de nem emlékszem, kivel  
 mention.Past.3pl a cooperation.Acc but not remember.1Sg who.Ins  
 (\*említettek egy együttműködést *t*).  
 mention.Past.3pl a cooperation.Acc  
 ‘They mentioned a cooperation, but I don’t remember who with.’

In these examples, it appears that sluicing is grammatical even though parallel non-elliptical examples are not, which indicates that sluicing is capable of ‘repairing’ the ungrammaticality in some way. The nature of this repair mechanism is not clear. There are also cases in which sluicing does not repair otherwise ungrammatical extractions, cf. the following case of extraction out of a *-va* participial adverbial clause:

- (456) Félix valamit a fülére akasztva kiment a teremből.  
 Félix something.Acc the ear.Poss3Sg.Sub hang.Part Prt.leave.Past.3Sg the room.Ela  
 \*Azt hiszem, egy CSERESZNYÉT (\*a fülére akasztva  
 that.Acc think.1Sg a cherry.Acc the ear.Poss3Sg.Sub hang.Part  
 ment ki).  
 leave.Past.3Sg Prt  
 intended: ‘Félix left the room having hung something on his ear. I think it was a cherry.’

It is important to note that contrast sluicing does not repair ungrammatical extraction in any contexts. Consider the following case in which a contrastive *wh*-phrase appears in a subject clause island. The island nature of the subject clause is illustrated in (458).

- (457) A: Pétert AZ érdekli, hogy hány KÓLÁT ittál.  
 Péter.Acc that interest.3Sg Compl how.many coke.Acc drink.Past.2Sg  
 ‘What interests Péter is how many cokes you drank.’  
 B1: Nem, (AZ (érdekli)), hogy hány SÖRT (ittál).  
 no that interest.3Sg Compl how.many beer.Acc drink.Past.2Sg  
 B2: \*Nem, hány SÖRT (ittál).  
 no how.many beer.Acc drink.Past.2Sg  
 intended: ‘No, what interests him is how many beers you drank.’
- (458) \*Hány KÓLÁT érdekli Pétert, hogy *t* ittál?  
 how.many coke.Acc interest.3Sg Péter.Acc Compl drink.Past.2Sg  
 intended: ‘How many cokes does it interest Péter whether you drank them?’

As speaker B’s response pattern shows, B1 being grammatical and B2 being ill-formed, only those responses are grammatical that minimally spell out the island

category, i.e. the embedded complementizer of the subject clause and, optionally, some matrix clause material and/or the embedded predicate that follows the fronted *wh*-phrase inside the island. Crucially, the fact that the embedded complementizer needs to be present shows that the *wh*-phrase is found in its source clause.

A similar pattern shows up in cases in which the sluiced remnant contains a pronominal modifier of the type that cannot extract out of the nominal it contains (so-called left branch extraction). Such pronominal modifiers can occur as sluiced remnants, but crucially they are always case marked.

- (459) A: Bea magas táncpartnert választott magának.  
 Bea tall dance.partner.Acc choose.Past.3Sg self.Dat  
 ‘Bea chose a tall dance partner for herself.’
- B: Milyen magasat?  
 how tall.Acc  
 ‘How tall (a dance partner did she choose for herself)?’

Since modifiers of nouns only appear with case on them in nominal ellipsis (see Chapter 7), the case ending on (459B) reveals that we are dealing with an elliptical noun phrase here *milyen magas táncpartner-t* ‘how tall a dance partner-Acc’. In other words, the modifier does not undergo extraction out of the noun phrase.

## 5.6. Summary

Sluicing is a construction that has the surface form of a single *wh*-constituent but is interpreted as an entire question. It is treated as ellipsis of a clause to the exclusion of the question phrase. Hungarian sluicing is perfectly fine in *wh*-interrogatives, and unlike in English, the kind of ellipsis sluicing involves can also be found with non-*wh*-remnants and contexts other than interrogatives. The latter property is due to the fact that sluicing-type TP ellipsis is licensed after any operator material that participates in a movement similar to that of *wh*-constituents.

The *wh*-phrase in the sluice can occur in an embedded or a non-embedded clause and can correspond to an overt or implicit indefinite correlate, which can be either an argument or an adjunct. In case the correlate is implicit, the construction is referred to as sprouting. The *wh*-phrase in the sluiced clause can have arbitrary complexity, including *which*-phrases and may include coordinated *wh*-constituents as well. Note that using coordinated *wh*-phrases is the predominant way to express a reading in which the question is about a single pair of entities.

Sluicing can linearly follow or precede its antecedent containing the correlate (representing forward or backward ellipsis, respectively). The latter is possible when the sluiced proposition is concessive in meaning and is syntactically subordinated to the antecedent clause that follows it.

The interrogative clause containing the sluice can be an interrogative complement to verbs or nouns or can be the clausal subject of adjectival predication as well. The interpretation of multiple *wh*-sluicing is usually used to refer to pairs of individuals, where each *wh*-phrase ranges over more than one entity that is paired with another in the response given to the question. In this respect multiple *wh*-sluicing

fully tracks the interpretation that is available for multiple *wh*-movement without ellipsis in the language.

Sluicing can also be found with non-*wh*-remnants such as contrastive foci and quantifiers, as well as others. This kind of clausal ellipsis was referred to as focus-sludging that can be contrastive or non-contrastive with respect to its correlate in the antecedent clause. When non-contrastive, this kind of sludging has an indefinite correlate. When contrastive, it has a contrastive focus correlate, which occurs in a parallel position.

A further subtype of non-*wh*-sludging in Hungarian is sludging after relative pronouns. One of the contexts where this is possible is the relative clause in which the relative pronoun is explicitly contrastive with respect to another relative pronoun. Other contexts with relative pronouns as sludged phrases are tautological relative clauses that have a pragmatic import similar to free choice relatives.

Remnants of sludging must appear with the same morphological case as their antecedent in Hungarian. This case restriction holds in all types of sludging: *wh*-, focus and relative sludging alike. Nominative remnants are ruled out when corresponding to non-nominative correlates. The latter observation discounts the possibility that Hungarian sludging elides a cleft-type predicate structure, as in clefts, the subject can only appear in the nominative case.

Case connectivity extends to the use of adpositional markers and rules out mismatches in form even under synonymous readings.

Sludging can occur in main clauses and in embedded ones and can involve remnant formation across clausal boundaries that are transparent to extraction. Interestingly, sludging is grammatical in some cases even though parallel non-elliptical examples are not, which indicates that sludging is capable of ‘repairing’ the ungrammaticality in some way.

### 5.7. Bibliographical notes

Sludging is a term of generative syntax, whose investigation started fairly recently. The first comprehensive treatment of Hungarian sludging with reference to *wh*-phrases can be found in Bánréti (2007). Focus sludging has been described in van Craenenbroeck and Lipták (2006). The existence of relative sludging was pointed out in Lipták (2015). The locality properties of Hungarian sludging have been mentioned in Bánréti (2007), Lipták (2011) and Griffiths and Lipták (2014).