



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Predicate ellipsis

Lipták, A.K.; Bánréti, Z.

Citation

Lipták, A. K. (2022). Predicate ellipsis. In Z. Bánréti (Ed.), *Syntax of Hungarian: coordination and ellipsis* (pp. 155-186). 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/1887/3479819>

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

Chapter 6

Predicate ellipsis

Anikó Lipták

6.1.	Introduction	156
6.2.	Ellipsis following auxiliary and semi-lexical material	156
6.2.1.	<i>Ellipsis of infinitival predicates</i>	156
6.2.2.	<i>Ellipsis of lenni ‘be.Inf’</i>	159
6.3.	Ellipsis following finite lexical verbs (V-stranding ellipsis)	162
6.3.1.	<i>V-stranding in polarity contexts</i>	162
6.3.2.	<i>V-stranding in non-polarity contexts</i>	164
6.3.3.	<i>Evidence for ellipsis in V-stranding</i>	166
6.4.	Ellipsis following verbal modifiers: particle stranding ellipsis	169
6.4.1.	<i>The contexts of particle stranding</i>	169
6.4.2.	<i>The parallelism requirement in particle stranding</i>	171
6.4.3.	<i>The types of preverbal elements in particle stranding</i>	172
6.4.4.	<i>Agreement (mis)matches with adpositional particles in particle stranding</i>	174
6.5.	Ellipsis after preverbal modifiers of participials	175
6.6.	Predicate ellipsis following polarity particles	176
6.6.1.	<i>Ellipsis after igen ‘yes’</i>	177
6.6.2.	<i>Ellipsis after nem ‘not’</i>	181
6.7.	Summary	184
6.8.	Bibliographical notes	185

6.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the contexts in which Hungarian allows for a predicate to be elided. In section 6.2, predicate ellipsis following auxiliaries and semi-lexical verbs will be reviewed. In section 6.3, predicate ellipsis following lexical verbs will be covered. Section 6.4 will detail ellipsis following verbal modifiers, section 6.5. will give examples of preverbal modifiers of participials, while section 6.6 gives an overview of predicate ellipsis following polarity particles. The elided material will be indicated by ~~strikeout~~ in many examples provided for reasons of clarity, but not all.

6.2. Ellipsis following auxiliary and semi-lexical material

6.2.1. Ellipsis of infinitival predicates

Infinitival predicates can be missing in Hungarian following finite auxiliaries. Of the three auxiliaries identified by Kenesei (2001), *fog* ‘future’ and *szokott* ‘habitual’ freely allow ellipsis of their complements, cf. the examples in (460).

- (460) a. Péter most éppen alszik. Mindig ilyenkor szokott ~~aludni~~.
 Péter now just sleep.3Sg always this.time Habit.3Sg sleep.Inf
 ‘Péter is sleeping right now. He always does around this time.’
- b. Tegnap PÉTER aludt el az előadáson. Ma ÉN fogok
 yesterday Péter sleep.Past.3Sg Prt the lecture.Sup today I Fut.1Sg
~~elaludni — az előadáson.~~
 Prt.sleep.Inf the lecture.Sup
 ‘Yesterday, it was Péter who happened to fall asleep during the lecture. Today I will.’
- c. Péter már elaludt, és én is mindjárt el fogok ~~aludni~~.
 Péter already Prt.sleep.Past.3Sg and I also soon Prt Fut.1Sg sleep.Inf
 ‘Péter has fallen asleep already and I will soon, too.’

While (460a) contains only a single-word predicate, (460b) clearly shows that the elided material corresponds to a verb phrase, also including the temporal modifier. (460c) furthermore shows that ellipsis does not block verbal particle climbing (the placement of verbal modifiers before a finite auxiliary): the verbal particle can and in fact must be placed before the finite form in all sentences where it would occupy that position in non-elliptical clauses as well.

Unlike *fog* ‘future’ and *szokott* ‘habitual’, the third auxiliary in Kenesei’s classification, *talál* ‘happen’, does not allow ellipsis after it, regardless of the presence of verbal particle-climbing out of the elided predicate:

- (461) a. Péter időnként el talál aludni az előadáson. *Néha én is el
 Péter sometimes Prt happen.3Sg sleep.Inf the lecture.Sup sometimes I also Prt
 talállok ~~aludni~~.
 happen.1Sg sleep.Inf
 ‘Péter sometimes happens to fall asleep during the lecture. I also sometimes happen to.’

- b. Tegnap PÉTER talált elaludni az előadáson. *Ma ÉN
 yesterday Péter happen.Past.3Sg Prt.sleep.Inf the lecture.Sup today I
 találtam ~~elaludni az előadáson.~~
 happen.Past.1Sg Prt.sleep.Inf the lecture.Sup
 ‘Yesterday, it was Péter who happened to fall asleep during the lecture. Today it was me who happened to.’

Infinitival predicates can also be elided after semi-lexical verbs, such as *akar* ‘want’, *szeretne* ‘would like’ or modals like *kell* ‘need’, *lehet* ‘may’. As (462a) indicates, the elided predicate corresponds to the entire verb phrase, the verb and its internal arguments (which can also receive a sloppy reading as the translation indicates); the interpretation of (462b) shows that temporal modifiers can be captured in the ellipsis site as well.

- (462) a. Péter mindig kölcsönadja a könyveit nekem, míg Pali sosem
 Péter always Prt.give.3Sg the book.Poss.3Sg.Acc 1Sg.Dat while Pali not never
 akarja ~~kölcsönadni a könyveit nekem.~~
 want.3Sg Prt.lend.Inf the book.Poss.3Sg.Acc 1Sg.Dat
 ‘Péter always lends his books to me, but Pali never wants to (lend Péter’s books/ his own books to me).’
- b. Péter aludt délután, de nekem nem kellett ~~aludni délután.~~
 Péter sleep.Past.3Sg afternoon but 1Sg.Dat not need.Past sleep.Inf afternoon
 ‘Péter slept in the afternoon, but I did not need to (sleep in the afternoon).’

While arguments or adjuncts of the verb phrase can undergo ellipsis, they can also survive ellipsis and appear outside the elided predicate, in some cases to the right of the finite form (cf. Section 4.3., Chapter 4). In (463b), the pronouns *én* and *neki* are pronounced with contrastive accent.

- (463) a. Péter aludt délután, és én is fogok majd északa ~~aludni.~~
 Péter sleep.Past.3Sg afternoon and I also Fut.1Sg then night sleep.Inf
 ‘Péter slept in the afternoon, and I will also do at night.’
- b. Péter küldött képeslapot nekem. ÉN is fogok ~~küldeni képeslapot~~
 Péter send.Past.3Sg postcard.Acc 1Sg.Dat I also Fut.1Sg send.Inf postcard.Acc
 NEKI.
 3Sg.Dat
 ‘Péter sent a postcard to me and I will also (send a postcard) to him.’

The surviving remnant of ellipsis can also occur to the left of the auxiliary/semi-lexical verb, in the form of a *wh*-phrase, a topic, a relative pronoun or a focused constituent:

- (464) a. Nem tudom, kivel beszéljek erről a problémáról.
 not know.1Sg who.Ins talk.Subj.1Sg this.Del the problem.Del
 Te kivel szoktál ~~beszélni erről a problémáról?~~
 you who.Ins Habit.2Sg talk.Inf this.Del the problem.Del
 ‘I don’t know who to talk to about this problem. Who do you usually talk to?’

- b. Péterrel beszéltem, de Marival nem fogok ~~beszélni~~.
 Péter.Ins talk.Past.1Sg but Mari.Ins not Fut.1Sg talk.Inf
 ‘I talked to Péter, but I won’t with Mari.’
- c. Többet aludtam ma, mint amennyit máskor szoktam ~~aludni~~.
 more sleep.Past.1Sg today than how.much.Acc otherwise Habit.1Sg sleep.Inf
 ‘I have slept more today than I usually do on other days.’
- d. Azt tudom, hogy JÁNOS kit akar, hogy fölvegyünk. De
 that.Acc know.1Sg Compl János who.Acc want.3Sg Compl Prt.hire.Subj.1Pl but
 azt nem tudom, hogy ANNA kit fog ~~akarni, hogy fölvegyünk~~.
 that.Acc not know.1Sg Compl Anna who.Acc Fut.3Sg want.Inf Compl Prt.hire.Subj.1Pl
 ‘I know who János wants us to hire. But I don’t know who Anna will (want us to hire).’

Infinitival predicates can be elided not just after finite auxiliaries and semi-lexical verbs, but also after non-finite semi-lexical verbs. Consider the example in (465b). Note that auxiliaries do not have infinitival forms, so corresponding examples with infinitives cannot be constructed:

- (465) a. Az edzésen Péter nem fog akarni úszni. Lehet, hogy Mari sem
 the training.Sup Péter not Fut.3Sg want.Inf swim.Inf possible Compl Mari also.not
 fog ~~akarni—úszni~~.
 Fut.3Sg want.Inf swim.Inf
 ‘During the training, Péter will not want to swim. Possibly, Mari will not, either.’
- b. Az edzésen Péter nem fog akarni úszni. Lehet, hogy Mari sem
 the training.Sup Péter not Fut.3Sg want.Inf swim.Inf possible Compl Mari also.not
 fog akarni ~~úszni~~.
 Fut.3Sg want.Inf swim.Inf
 ‘During the training, Péter will not want to swim. Possibly, Mari will not want to, either.’

Concerning the identity relation between the elided predicate and its antecedent, the two do not need to have identical tense specifications. The antecedent verb can be infinitival (466a) or tensed (466b), licensing the ellipsis of an infinitival predicate (cf. Section 4.3. in Chapter 4). Neither is the word order necessarily identical in the antecedent and the elliptical clause: while in the antecedent the modifier *sokat* follows the verb it modifies, it precedes it in the elliptical clause in (466b).

- (466) a. Péter HOLNAP fog sokat aludni, én pedig MA fogok
 Péter tomorrow Fut.3Sg much.Acc sleep.Inf I however today Fut.1Sg
~~sokat—aludni~~.
 much.Acc sleep.Inf
 ‘It will be tomorrow that Péter sleeps a lot. I will do so today.’
- b. Péter TEGNAP aludt sokat, én pedig MA fogok ~~sokat—aludni~~.
 Péter yesterday sleep.Past.3Sg much.Acc I however today Fut.1Sg much.Acc sleep.Inf
 ‘It was yesterday that Péter slept a lot. I will do so today.’

6.2.2. Ellipsis of *lenni* ‘be.Inf’

The copula verb *lenni* ‘be.Inf’ behaves differently from lexical predicates when it comes to contexts in which it can be elided after auxiliaries and semi-lexical verbs.

When *lenni* is elided together with its lexical (adjectival, nominal, locative, etc.) predicate after auxiliaries or semi-lexical verbs, elision is only possible if the antecedent contains *lenni* in infinitival form as well. Ellipsis is not allowed if the antecedent has a finite copula. Observe the contrast between the examples in (467)–(470), which shows that infinitival *lenni* can be elided if its antecedent is the infinitival *lenni* (467a), (468a), (469a), (470a) but not if its antecedent is a finite form, be that the future *lesz* ‘be.Fut’ (467b), the past form *volt* ‘be.Past.3Sg’ (467c), or the present form *vagy* ‘be.2Sg’ (468b), the zero copula in third person (469b), or its overt form *van* (470b).

- (467) a. Juli az EGYETEMEN akar tanár lenni, én pedig egy KÖZÉPISKOLÁBAN
 Juli the university.Sup want.3Sg teacher be.Inf I however a secondary.school.Ine
 akarok ~~tanár lenni~~.
 want.1Sg teacher be.Inf
 ‘Juli wants to be a teacher at the university, and I want (to be a teacher) in a secondary school.’
- b. *Juli az EGYETEMEN lesz tanár, én pedig egy KÖZÉPISKOLÁBAN
 Juli the university.Sup be.Fut.3Sg teacher I however a secondary.school.Ine
 akarok ~~tanár lenni~~.
 want.1Sg teacher be.Inf
 ‘Juli will be a teacher at the university, and I want (to be a teacher) in a secondary school.’
- c. *Juli az EGYETEMEN volt tanár, én pedig egy KÖZÉPISKOLÁBAN
 Juli the university.Sup be.Past.3Sg teacher I however a secondary.school.Ine
 akarok ~~tanár lenni~~.
 want.1Sg teacher be.Inf
 ‘Juli was a teacher at the university, and I want (to be a teacher) in a secondary school.’
- (468) a. Te REGGEL szoktál álmos lenni, én pedig DÉLBEN
 you morning Habit.2Sg sleepy be.Inf I and noon.Ine
 szoktam ~~álmos lenni~~.
 Habit.1Sg sleepy be.Inf
 ‘You are sleepy in the morning and I am at noon.’
- b. *Te REGGEL vagy álmos, én pedig DÉLBEN
 you morning be.2Sg sleepy I and noon.Ine
 szoktam ~~álmos lenni~~.
 Habit.1Sg sleepy be.Inf
 ‘You are sleepy in the morning and I am at noon.’

160 *Predicate ellipsis*

- (469) a. Juli REGGEL szokott álmos lenni, én pedig DÉLBEN szoktam
 Juli morning Habit.3Sg sleepy be.Inf I and noon.Ine Habit.1Sg
~~álmos lenni.~~
 sleepy be.Inf
 ‘Juli is sleepy in the morning and I am at noon.’
- b. *Juli REGGEL Ø álmos, én pedig DÉLBEN szoktam ~~álmos lenni.~~
 Juli morning be.3Sg sleepy I and noon.Ine Habit.1Sg sleepy be.Inf
 ‘Juli is sleepy in the morning and I am at noon.’
- (470) a. Juli SOKAT szokott otthon lenni, én pedig KEVESET szoktam
 Juli much.Acc Habit.3Sg at.home be.Inf I and little.Acc Habit.1Sg
~~otthon lenni.~~
 at.home be.Inf
 ‘Juli is at home a lot and I am (at home) a little.’
- b. *Juli SOKAT van otthon, én pedig KEVESET szoktam ~~otthon lenni.~~
 Juli much.Acc be.3Sg at.home I and little.Acc Habit.1Sg at.home be.Inf
 ‘Juli is at home a lot and I am (at home) a little.’

The following examples show that the observed pattern also obtains if the auxiliary preceding the elided predicate is not in turn preceded by a contrastively focused element:

- (471) a. Vasárnap Juli keveset szokott otthon lenni. Én is keveset szoktam
 Sunday Juli little.Acc Habit.3Sg at.home be.Inf I also little.Acc Habit.1Sg
~~otthon lenni.~~
 at.home be.Inf
 ‘Juli spends little time at home on Sundays. I also spend little time at home.’
- b. Vasárnap Juli keveset van otthon. *Én is keveset szoktam ~~otthon lenni.~~
 Sunday Juli little.Acc be.3Sg at.home I also little.Acc Habit.1Sg at.home be.Inf
 ‘Juli spends little time at home on Sundays. I also spend little time at home.’
- (472) a. Juli ilyenkor mérges szokott lenni. Én viszont nem akarok
 Juli such.Tmp angry Habit.3Sg be.Inf I and not want.1Sg
~~mérges lenni.~~
 angry be.Inf
 ‘Juli is usually angry when this happens. I don’t want to be.’
- b. Juli ilyenkor mérges. *Én viszont nem akarok ~~mérges lenni.~~
 Juli such.Tmp angry I and not want.1Sg angry be.Inf
 ‘Juli is angry when this happens. I don’t want to be.’

All the examples above improve to full grammaticality if ellipsis elides a larger chunk, i.e. it eliminates everything after the contrastive focus (the elliptical phenomenon called gapping, see Section 4.8. in Chapter 4), negation or an *is*-phrase (called stripping):

- (473) a. Juli REGGEL szokott álmos lenni, én pedig DÉLBEN
 Juli morning Habit.3Sg sleepy be.Inf I and noon.Ine
~~szoktam álmos lenni.~~
 Habit.1Sg sleepy be.Inf
 ‘Juli is sleepy in the morning and I am at noon.’
- b. Vasárnap Juli keveset van otthon. Én is keveset ~~vagyok~~ otthon.
 Sunday Juli little.Acc be.3Sg at.home I also little.Acc be.1Sg at.home
 ‘Juli spends little time at home on Sundays. I also spend little time at home.’

In cases where the copula elides to the exclusion of its lexical predicate, deletion of the copula is degraded even under full morphological identity. The following examples containing ellipsis of *lenni* are all ungrammatical, regardless of whether the antecedent contains the infinitival *lenni* or a finite form.

- (474) a. Juli mindig FÜRGE szokott lenni ebéd után. *Én ÁLMOS szoktam ~~lenni~~.
 Juli always brisk Habit.3Sg be.Inf lunch after I sleepy Habit.1Sg be.Inf
- b. Juli mindig FÜRGE ebéd után. *Én ÁLMOS szoktam ~~lenni~~.
 Juli always brisk lunch after I sleepy Habit.1Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli is always brisk after lunch. I am usually sleepy.’
- (475) a. Juli ORVOS akar lenni. *Én CSILLAGÁSZ akarok ~~lenni~~.
 Juli doctor want.3Sg be.Inf I astronomer want.1Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli wants to be a doctor. I want (to be) an astronomer.’
- b. Juli ORVOS lesz. *Én CSILLAGÁSZ akarok ~~lenni~~.
 Juli doctor be.Fut.3Sg I astronomer want.1Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli will be a doctor. I want (to be) an astronomer.’
- (476) a. Juli nem szokott mérges lenni. *Én mérges szoktam ~~lenni~~.
 Juli not Habit.3Sg angry be.Inf I angry Habit.1Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli isn’t usually angry. I am.’
- b. Juli vasárnap nem szokott otthon lenni. *Én otthon szoktam ~~lenni~~.
 Juli Sunday not habit.3Sg at.home be.Inf I at.home habit.1Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli isn’t usually at home on Sundays. I am.’

This latter pattern is fully grammatical if ellipsis applies to a larger constituent, eliding the auxiliary and *lenni* after focus or negation.

- (477) a. Juli mindig FÜRGE szokott lenni ebéd után. Én ÁLMOS ~~szoktam lenni~~.
 Juli always brisk Habit.3Sg be.Inf lunch after I sleepy Habit.1Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli is always brisk after lunch. I am sleepy.’
- b. Juli ORVOS akar lenni. Én CSILLAGÁSZ ~~akarok lenni~~.
 Juli doctor want.3Sg be.Inf I astronomer want.1Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli wants to be a doctor. I an astronomer.’
- c. Juli orvos akar lenni. De házi orvos nem ~~akar lenni~~.
 Juli doctor want.3Sg be.Inf but general practitioner not want.3Sg be.Inf
 ‘Juli wants to be a doctor. But she does not want to be a general practitioner.’

6.3. Ellipsis following finite lexical verbs (V-stranding ellipsis)

The predicate can also be elided in Hungarian to the exclusion of the finite verb, a pattern which is referred to as *V-stranding* ellipsis in Lipták (2012, 2013), see also Kenesei et al. (1998), Surányi (2009a,b). There are two pragmatic-syntactic environments in which V-stranding can occur: (i) in contexts with emphatic polarity, which will be referred to as *polarity contexts*, (ii) in contexts with no emphasis on the polarity of the clause, which will be referred to as *non-polarity contexts*. The first two sections below provide examples for these types and the third section presents evidence for the elliptical nature of the missing material.

6.3.1. *V-stranding in polarity contexts*

Polarity contexts comprise those contexts in which the polarity of a clause is emphatically asserted, contrasted, questioned or forms the new information of the utterance. Typical polarity contexts are in polar question–answer pairs (478), (479), echo assertions in the terminology of Farkas (2009), Farkas and Bruce (2010), such as confirmation of polarity (480B1), (481B1) or the reversal of the polarity of assertions (480B2), (481B2). In all such contexts, it is possible to elide a predicate to the exclusion of the verb. This pattern is the so-called V-stranding pattern of ellipsis. In (479B2) and (480B2), *de* encodes the ‘reverse’ function that indicates switching to the opposite polarity relative to that of the antecedent, see Farkas (2009), Farkas and Bruce (2010).

(478) A: János találkozott a szomszédokkal?

János meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins

‘Did János meet the neighbours?’

B1: Igen, találkozott ~~velük~~.

yes meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘Yes, he did.’

B2: Nem, nem találkozott ~~velük~~.

no not meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘No, he did not.’

(479) A: János nem találkozott a szomszédokkal?

János not meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins

‘Did János not meet the neighbours?’

B1: Nem, nem találkozott ~~velük~~.

no not meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘Yes, he did not.’

B2: De, találkozott ~~velük~~.

but meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘No, he did.’

(480) A: János találkozott a szomszédokkal.

János meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins

‘János met the neighbours.’

B1: Igen, találkozott ~~velük~~.

yes meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘Yes, he did.’

B2: Nem, nem találkozott ~~velük~~.

no not meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘No, he did not.’

(481) A: János nem találkozott a szomszédokkal.

János not meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins

‘János did not meet the neighbours.’

B1: Nem, nem találkozott ~~velük~~.

no not meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘That’s right, he did not meet them.’

B2: De, találkozott ~~velük~~.

but meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘No, he did.’

V-stranding ellipsis is also attested in sentences in which we find a polarity contrast between two non-identical clauses, such as (482).

(482) János nem találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari találkozott ~~velük~~.

János not meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins

‘János did not meet the neighbours, but Mari did.’

In line with the word order requirements of affirmative clauses, verb stranding ellipsis in affirmative clauses always retains the verbal modifier to the left of the verb if the verb has such a modifier. The verbal modifier can also be stranded alone, see Section 6.4 below for details and illustrative data.

(483) A: Felhívta Bea a szüleit tegnap?

Prt.call.Past.3Sg Bea the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday

‘Did Bea call her parents yesterday?’

B1: Felhívta.

Prt.call.Past.3Sg

‘She did.’

B2: *Hívta.

call.Past.3Sg

‘She did.’

In negative clauses, where the preverbal modifier is to the right of the verb, the preverbal modifier can survive ellipsis and show up to the right of the verb or can delete together with the rest of the predicate. Note that the latter option is somewhat degraded for some speakers.

164 *Predicate ellipsis*

- (484) A: Felhívta Bea a szüleit tegnap?
 Prt.call.Past.3Sg Bea the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday
 ‘Did Bea call her parents yesterday?’
- B1: Nem, nem hívta fel.
 no not call.Past.3Sg Prt
 ‘No, she did not.’
- B2: %Nem, nem hívta.
 no not call.Past.3Sg
 ‘No, she did not.’

It is important to note that V-stranding is only allowed in finite clauses. Non-finite verbs cannot participate in it:

- (485) a. A: Megpróbálta Mari meghívni a szomszédokat?
 Prt.try.Past.3Sg Mari Prt.invite.Inf the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘Did Mari try to invite the neighbours?’
- B: *Megpróbálta meghívni őket.
 Prt.try.Past.3Sg Prt.invite.Inf they.Acc
 ‘She tried to invite (them).’
- b. A: Elment Mari meghívni a szomszédokat?
 Prt.go.Past.3Sg Mari Prt.invite.Inf the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘Did Mari go to invite the neighbours?’
- B: *Elment meghívni őket.
 Prt.go.Past.3Sg Prt.invite.Inf they.Acc
 ‘She went to invite (them).’

6.3.2. *V-stranding in non-polarity contexts*

V-stranding can also occur in contexts where the polarity of an elliptical clause is identical to that of an antecedent, i.e. where the polarity is neither contrastive nor emphatic. This kind of V-stranding has been identified by Surányi (2009a,b) and shows dialectal/idiolectal differences (Lipták 2013): unlike V-stranding in polarity contexts, it is not allowed by all speakers (cf. (486a,b)). Exceptional in this respect are stranded copulas, and verbs with locative arguments, which are allowed by all speakers (cf. (486c,d)).

- (486) a. János hozzáértette a műszereket a vezetékhez. %Mari is
 János Prt.touch.Past.3Sg the instrument.Pl.Acc the wire.All Mari also
 hozzáértette a ~~műszereket~~ a ~~vezetékhez~~.
 Prt.touch.Past.3Sg the instrument.Pl.Acc the wire.All
 ‘John touched the instruments to the wire. Mari also did.’

- b. Bea felhívta Zolit és Bélát tegnap. %Ili is felhívta
 Bea Prt.call.Past.3Sg Zoli.Acc and Béla.Acc yesterday Ili also Prt.call.Past.3Sg
~~Zolit és Bélát tegnap.~~
 Zoli.Acc and Béla.Acc yesterday
 ‘Bea called Zoli and Béla yesterday. Ili also did (i.e. call Zoli and Béla yesterday).’
- c. Huba volt már Kínában. Én is voltam már—Kínában.
 Huba be.Past.3Sg already China.Ine I also be.Past.1Sg already China.Ine
 ‘Huba has been to China already. I have, too.’
- d. Huba járt már Kínában. Én is jártam már—Kínában.
 Huba go.Past.3Sg already China.Ine I also go.Past.1Sg already China.Ine
 ‘Huba has been to China already. I have, too.’

V-stranding in this context is similar to V-stranding in polarity contexts in that there is evidence for the elision of an entire predicate. As (486b) shows, the temporal modifier is understood to be part of the ellipsis site, suggesting that the entire predicate is elided. Note also that ellipsis after non-finite verbs is ruled out, cf. (485) above:

- (487) a. Mari ment meghívni a szomszédokat. *Péter is ment
 Mari go.Past.3Sg Prt.invite.Inf the neighbour.Pl.Acc Péter also go.Past.3Sg
 meghívni ~~őket.~~
 Prt.invite.Inf they.Acc
 ‘Mari went to invite the neighbours. Péter also went to.’
- b. Mari megpróbálta meghívni a szomszédokat. *?Péter is megpróbálta
 Mari Prt.try.Past.3Sg Prt.invite.Inf the neighbour.Pl.Acc Péter also Prt.try.Past.3Sg
 meghívni ~~őket.~~
 Prt.invite.Inf they.Acc
 ‘Mari tried to invite the neighbours. Péter also tried.’

Further, among the speakers who consider V-stranding in non-polarity contexts grammatical, there is variation in the acceptability of examples where the elided predicate contains material that is referentially *non-identical* to the parallel entity in the antecedent clause. Such readings are expected to be well-formed if the missing predicate undergoes deletion, but only a subset of speakers allow for such examples. To illustrate, in (488a) for example, the missing object is trivially non-identical in reference to the object of the antecedent clause and some speakers find this example ungrammatical. The same applies to (488b–c), where the set of four questions answered by Miklós need not be the same as the set of four questions answered by Bea. While some speakers consider these examples grammatical with the indicated reading, others do not.

- (488) a. János megevett egy banánt. %Mari is megevett egy—banánt.
 János Prt.eat.Past.3Sg a banana.Acc Mari also Prt.eat.Past.3Sg a banana.Acc
 ‘János ate a banana. Mari also did (eat a banana).’

- b. Miklós megválaszolt legalább négy kérdést. %Bea is
 Miklós Prt.answer.Past.3Sg at.least four question.Pl.Acc Bea also
 megválaszolt ~~legalább négy kérdést.~~
 Prt.answer.Past.3Sg at.least four question.Acc
 ‘Miklós answered at least four questions. Bea also did (answer at least four questions).’
- c. Miklós válaszolt legalább négy kérdésre. %Bea is
 Miklós answer.Past.3Sg at.least four questions.Sub Bea also
 válaszolt ~~legalább négy kérdésre.~~
 answer.Past.3Sg at.least four question.Sub
 ‘Miklós answered at least four questions. Bea also did (answer at least four questions).’

6.3.3. Evidence for ellipsis in V-stranding

Evidence for the elliptical nature of the missing material in V-stranding in both polarity and non-polarity contexts comes from various observations.

First, the missing material can contain otherwise obligatory internal arguments that cannot be silenced by other means, such as *pro*-drop. Plural object pronouns cannot be dropped, for example (cf. (489)), but they can be missing in V-stranding (490):

- (489) Bea meg akarta kérdezni a szüleit valamiről.
 János Prt want.Past.3Sg ask.Inf the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc something.Del
 Tegnap felhívta *(őket).
 yesterday Prt.call.Past.3Sg they.Acc
 ‘János wanted to ask his parents about something. Yesterday he called them.’

- (490) A: Bea felhívta a szüleit tegnap?
 Bea Prt.call.Past.3Sg the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday
 ‘Did Bea call her parents yesterday?’
- B: Felhívta őket ~~tegnap.~~
 Prt.call.Past.3Sg they.Acc yesterday
 ‘She did.’

The same can be shown about oblique arguments that cannot be dropped (491) but can appear to be missing in V-stranding (492):

- (491) János meg akarta kérdezni a szüleit valamiről.
 János Prt want.Past.3Sg ask.Inf the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc something.Del
 Tegnap találkozott *(velük).
 yesterday Prt.meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins
 ‘János wanted to ask his parents about something. Yesterday he met them.’
- (492) A: János találkozott a szüleivel kedden?
 János meet.Past.3Sg the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Ins Tuesday.Sup
 ‘Did János meet his parents on Tuesday?’

- B: Igen, találkozott ~~velük~~ ~~kedden~~.
 yes meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins Tuesday.Sup
 ‘Yes, he did (i.e. he did meet his parents on Tuesday).’

Furthermore, as the translation in (492) shows, the answer necessarily includes the temporal modifier of the missing predicate as well. B can only be understood as a statement that János met his parents on Tuesday, and it cannot mean, for example, that he has met his parents but not on Tuesday, or that he has met other people.

Second, V-stranding ellipsis allows for omission of subjects that can otherwise not undergo pro-drop. To consider the relevant case, note that Hungarian allows for pro-drop in subject position in all number and person combinations (reflected in the agreement morphology on the verb). Semantically plural individuals are necessarily referred to by a plural *pro*, which triggers plural subject agreement on the predicate. In the following situation, where János and Mari are the topic of the conversation, it is only possible to refer back to them using a plural *pro* form, which necessarily means plural conjugation on the verb. A singular form of the verb cannot be used with this meaning:

- (493) *Talking about János and Mari, you know what happened?*
 a. #Találkozott *pro*_{Sg}. b. Találkoztak *pro*_{Pl}.
 meet.Past.3Sg meet.Past.3Pl
 ‘He/she met.’ ‘They met.’

Under V-stranding, however, it is possible to use a singular verb when the antecedent of the subject is formally singular but semantically plural. Coordinated singular DP subjects are a case at hand: although they are semantically plural, in postverbal position they obligatorily trigger singular agreement and do not allow for plural agreement on the verb (cf. É. Kiss 2012).

- (494) A: Találkozott János és Mari?
 meet.Past.3Sg János and Mari
 ‘Did János and Mari meet?’
 B: Találkozott.
 meet.Past.3Sg
 ‘They did.’
- (495) A: Tegnap nem találkozott János és Mari.
 yesterday not meet.Past.3Sg János and Mari
 ‘János and Mari did not meet.’
 B: De, találkozott.
 but meet.Past.3Sg
 ‘That’s not right, they did.’

That the singular verb in (494B), (495B) is well-formed, referring to the semantically plural subject ‘János and Mari’, indicates that the non-overt subject in these replies is not represented by a *pro*, but corresponds to the elided syntactically singular phrase *János és Mari*. If these responses involved *pro*-drop, we would expect, upon

parallelism with (493), that the singular conjugation on the verb should be ruled out, contrary to fact.

The third argument for ellipsis and against a *pro*-drop analysis is that the process of omission must be maximal: it is not possible to omit some but not all constituents of the predicate, a phenomenon observed by Kenesei et al. (1998).

(496) A: Meghívta János a szomszédokat a házavatóra?
 Prt.invite.Past.3Sg János the neighbour.Pl.Acc the housewarming.Sub
 ‘Did János invite the neighbours to the housewarming?’

B1: *Meghívta János.
 Prt.invite.Past.3Sg János

B2: *Meghívta a házavatóra.
 Prt.invite.Past.3Sg the housewarming.Sub

Last but not least, evidence for ellipsis can be gained through reference to the lexical identity of the missing predicate. V-stranding ellipsis has a particular earmark that is cross-linguistically constant in this respect: the stranded lexical verb must have the exact same verb stem as its antecedent (see Goldberg 2005 among others). This means that verbs cannot be exchanged under V-stranding even if their meaning is similar, such as the verbs *rak* and *tesz*.

(497) A: Betette János a poharakat a szekrénybe?
 Prt.put.Past.3Sg János the glass.Pl.Acc the closet.Ill
 ‘Did János put the glasses into the closet?’

B: ?*Berakta.
 Prt.put.Past.3Sg
 ‘Yes, he did.’

This restriction, however, is somewhat mitigated by the presence of an answer particle next to the verb.

(498) A: Betette János a poharakat a szekrénybe?
 Prt.put.Past.3Sg János the glass.Pl.Acc the closet.Ill
 ‘Did János put the glasses into the closet?’

B: ?Igen, berakta.
 yes Prt.put.Past.3Sg
 ‘Yes, he did.’

Lexical identity is also not required for contrastively focused lexical verbs, which allow ellipsis of the post-focal material (cf. Section 4.4.1. in Chapter 4.)

(499) Én VETTEM drága autót, te meg ELADTÁL.
 I buy.Past.3Sg expensive car.Acc you and Prt.sell.Past.3Sg
 ‘I BOUGHT an expensive car, and you SOLD one.’

6.4. Ellipsis following verbal modifiers: particle stranding ellipsis

In the realm of ellipsis, Hungarian also has what looks like a reduced variant of the V-stranding pattern. In this reduced V-stranding, the verb is missing and the sole remnant of ellipsis is a verbal modifier, such as a verbal particle (Surányi 2009, Lipták 2012). This kind of ellipsis occurs in polarity contexts only, and mostly occurs with verbal particles for which reason it will be referred to as particle stranding below.

6.4.1. *The contexts of particle stranding*

Particle stranding with finite verbs can occur in two contexts. One concerns polar question-answer pairs. As the following shows, a yes/no question can be answered positively with a single particle. The stranded particle can be preceded by a contrastive topic.

(500) A: Felhívta Bea a szüleit tegnap?
Prt.call.Past.3Sg Bea the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday
'Did Bea call her parents yesterday?'

B: Fel.
Prt
'She did.'

(501) A: Felhívták a gyerekek az anyjukat?
Prt.call.Past.3Pl the kid.Pl the mother.Poss.3Pl.Acc
'Did the kids call their mothers?'

B: Peti fel (de Balázs nem).
Peti Prt but Balázs not
'Peti did (but Balázs did not).'

While ordinary positive polarity questions are grammatical antecedents for particle stranding, alternative questions (in which both positive and negative polarity alternatives are spelled out in full clauses) are not – note that V-stranding is perfectly well-formed in this context (502B1):

(502) A: Felhívta Bea a szüleit tegnap vagy nem hívta fel
Prt.call.Past.3Sg Bea the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday or not call.Past.3Sg Prt
őket?
they.Acc
'Did Bea call her parents yesterday or did she not call them?'

B1: Felhívta.
Prt.call.Past.3Sg
'She did.'

B2: *Fel.
Prt

In addition to polar question-answer contexts, particle stranding can be used in echo assertions, echoing a statement with positive polarity (503).

- (503) A: Bea felhívta a szüleit tegnap.
 Bea Prt.call.Past.3Sg the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday
 ‘Bea called her parents yesterday.’
- B: Igen, fel.
 yes Prt
 ‘She did.’

Importantly, particle stranding can never be used in contexts where positive polarity is not emphatic or is not echoing an assertion. Particle stranding fails in such contexts as the following:

- (504) Bea felhívta a szüleit tegnap. *Mari is fel.
 Bea Prt.call.Past.3Sg the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday Mari also Prt
 ‘Bea called her parents yesterday. Mari too.’

Evidence for ellipsis affecting the missing material in these constructions can be construed on the basis of the same types of arguments as reviewed in section 6.3.3 above. First, the missing material in these clauses can contain material that cannot be pro-dropped. Second, the ellipsis process is necessarily maximal. Third, the stranded verbal particles must be lexically identical to their antecedent. The latter property can be illustrated by the following two examples. The verbal particles *össze* and *szét* have identical meanings in combination with the verb *tör* ‘break’, nevertheless they cannot be exchanged under particle stranding (505). The same applies to the exchange of *fejbe* ‘head.Ine’ and *kupán* ‘cup.Sup’, which have identical meanings in combination with *vág* ‘hit’ and are uninterchangeable under particle stranding:

- (505) A: Összetörte János a poharakat?
 Prt.break.Past.3Sg János the glass.Pl.Acc
 ‘Did János break (up) the glasses?’
- B: Össze. / *Szét.
 Prt Prt
 ‘He did.’

- (506) A: Fejbe vágott János téged?
 head.Ine hit.Past.3Sg János you.Acc
 ‘Did János hit you on the head?’
- B: Fejbe. / *Kupán.
 head.Ine cup.Sup
 ‘He did.’

Note that this restriction on the identity of the particles is also operating in the case of V-stranding ellipsis but gives a milder violation than particle stranding.

- (507) A: Összetörte János a poharakat?
 Prt.break.Past.3Sg János the glass.Pl.Acc
 ‘Did János break (up) the glasses?’

B: Összetörte. / ??Széttörte.
Prt.break.Past.3Sg Prt.break.Past.3Sg
'He did.'

An important restriction on particle stranding is that it is strictly confined to contexts in which its antecedent has positive polarity. It cannot be used as a response to a polar question or statement with negative polarity, in other words, it cannot be used to reverse the polarity of the antecedent. As the next two examples indicate, in this respect it is clearly different from V-stranding, which can be used in these contexts.

(508) A: Bea nem hívta fel a szüleit tegnap.
Bea not call.Past.3Sg Prt the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday
'Bea didn't call her parents yesterday.'

B1: De, felhívta.
but Prt.call.Past.3Sg
'She did.'

B2: *De, fel.
but Prt
'She did.'

In the same way, particle-stranding cannot be used to contrast the polarity of two non-identical clauses, which V-stranding can:

(509) a. *Bea nem hívta fel a szüleit tegnap, de Mari fel.
Bea not call.Past.3Sg Prt the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday but Mari Prt
'Bea did not call her parents yesterday, but Mari did.'

b. Bea nem hívta fel a szüleit tegnap, de Mari felhívta.
Bea not call.Past.3Sg Prt the parent.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Acc yesterday but Mari Prt.call.Past.3Sg
'Bea did not call her parents yesterday, but Mari did.'

6.4.2. The parallelism requirement in particle stranding

Particle stranding is furthermore subject to a parallelism condition, which requires the presence and parallel syntactic position of a particle in the preceding clause. Firstly, particle stranding can only apply if the stranded particle has an antecedent to begin with.

(510) A: Mondtad Péternek, hogy nem megyünk?
say.Past.2Sg Péter.Dat Compl not go.1Pl
'Did you tell Péter we are not going?'

B: *Megmondtam Péternek, hogy nem megyünk.
Prt.say.Past.1Sg Péter.Dat Compl not go.1Pl
'I did.'

Secondly, particle stranding is only possible if the antecedent particle is in the preverbal position in the antecedent cause, too. This effectively rules out particle stranding in clauses with progressive aspect, where the verbal modifier is in postverbal position.

(511) A: Épp mentél fel a lépcsón, amikor hívtalak?
 just go.Past.2Sg Prt the stairs.Sub when call.Past.1Sg
 ‘Were you going up the stairs when I called?’

B1: *Épp fel.
 just Prt
 ‘I was.’

B2: Épp mentem.
 just go.Past.1Sg
 ‘I was.’

Provided there is an antecedent particle in parallel preverbal position, particle stranding is well-formed in simple clauses and also in complex clauses, affecting particles that are in derived position in a higher clause than their original one. As the next example indicates, in such cases particle stranding elides the matrix verb and its clausal complement.

(512) A: Fel akarod, hogy mondjak?
 Prt want.2Sg Compl resign.Subj.1Sg
 ‘Do you want me to resign?’

B: Igen, fel ~~akarom, hogy mondjal~~.
 yes Prt want.1Sg Compl resign.Subj.2Sg
 ‘Yes, I do (want you to resign).’

6.4.3. *The types of preverbal elements in particle stranding*

Concerning the types of preverbal elements that can participate in particle stranding, the most frequent are verbal particles, which have been amply illustrated above. The stranded particle can be a simple or a phrasal verbal modifier (for the latter see (506) above). There is one systematic exception that particle stranding cannot do: it cannot strand reduplicated verbal modifiers (Piñón 1991, Lipták and Saab 2019). Such verbal modifiers are possible in Hungarian when reduplicated before the verb and indicate iterativity of the action (513A). As (513B1) indicates, reduplicated particles cannot occur in particle stranding. Note that the non-iterated version is also degraded in these contexts.

(513) A: Julcsi be-benézett a szomszédba.
 Julcsi Prt-Prt.look.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Ine
 ‘Julcsi kept popping into the neighbours.’

B1: *Igen, be-be.
 yes Prt-Prt
 ‘Yes, she did.’

B2: ?Igen, be.
 yes Prt
 ‘Yes, she did.’

(514) A: Hogy tartotta Péter az előadást? Állandóan meg-megállt?
 how keep.Past.3Sg Péter the lecture.Acc continuously Prt-Prt.stop.Past.3Sg
 ‘How did Péter present the lecture? Did he stop continuously?’

B1: *Igen, meg-meg.
 yes Prt-Prt
 ‘Yes, he did.’

B2: ?Igen, meg.
 yes Prt
 ‘Yes, he did.’

In distinction to iterated preverbal particles, compound verbal modifiers, composed of two distinct particles such as *fel-le* ‘up and down’, *ki-be* ‘out and in’, *ide-oda* ‘here and there’ on the other hand can be stranded:

(515) A: Hogy tartotta Péter az előadást? Folyamatosan össze-vissza
 how keep.Past.3Sg Péter the lecture.Acc continuously Prt-Prt
 beszélt?
 speak.Past.3Sg
 ‘How did he present the lecture? Did he talk nonsense?’

B: Igen, össze-vissza, (és piszkálta az orrát).
 yes Prt-Prt and pick.Past.3Sg the nose.Poss.3Sg.Acc
 ‘Yes, he did (and he was picking his nose).’

Other categories of verbal modifiers, such as incorporated objects, depictives or resultative secondary predicates cannot take part in the particle stranding pattern with the interpretation of polarity emphasis. Such preverbal modifiers can be the sole remnant of ellipsis (with the rest of the predicate elided), but their interpretation is that of a contrastive focus phrase, and not that of affirmative polarity of the clause. Consider *pirosra fest* ‘red.Sub paint’, in (516) or *fát vág* ‘tree.Acc cut’ in (517). The questions in A can receive a polarity reading, or one in which the verbal modifier is interpreted contrastively. The only interpretation available for the answer in B, however, is the contrastive focus reading. The answer cannot be taken to indicate positive polarity of the clause.

(516) A: Mit csinálsz? Pirosra fested az ajtót?
 what.Acc do.2Sg red.Sub paint.2Sg the door.Acc
 ‘What are you doing? Are you painting the door red (as opposed to other colours)?’/‘Are you engaged in painting the door red?’

B: PIROSRA.
 red.Sub
 ‘Yes, it is red that I am painting the door.’/#‘Yes, I am (engaged in painting the door red).’

- (517) A: Mit csinál Zoli? Fát vág az erdőben?
 what do.3Sg Zoli tree.Acc cut.3Sg the forest.Ine
 ‘What is Zoli doing? Is he felling trees (as opposed to other things)? / Is he engaged in tree-felling in the forest?’
- B: FÁT.
 tree.Acc
 ‘It is trees he is felling.’/‘He is.’

In examples where the contrastive focus reading is pragmatically odd in a given context, the verbal modifier cannot appear as a sole constituent in an answer:

- (518) A: És mi lett a történet vége? Pisti barátokra lett
 and what become.Past.3Sg the story end.Poss.3Sg Pisti friend.Pl.Sub find.Past.3Sg
 végül?
 finally
 ‘And what was the end of the story? Did Pisti make friends in the end?’
- B: #BARÁTOKRA.
 friend.Pl.Sub
 ‘He did.’

6.4.4. *Agreement (mis)matches with adpositional particles in particle stranding*

Finally, adpositional particles that express pronominal arguments of the verb or are associated with an overt 3rd person argument (agreeing in number and person with the adposition) (Surányi 2009a,b, É. Kiss 1998, 2002, Lipták 2018) show further restrictions under particle stranding. Stranding adpositional particles of this sort can show mismatches in number/person if the mismatch affects the difference between 2nd and 1st persons (note that in these cases, there is no associated argument present).

- (519) A: Rád nézett János? B: Rám ~~nézett~~ János.
 Sub.2Sg look.Past.3Sg János Sub.1Sg look.Past.3Sg János
 ‘Did János look at you?’ ‘He did.’

A mismatch between 3rd person and 1st/2nd person, however, is not allowed, as (520) illustrates, where the adpositional particle (anti-) agrees with the 3rd person plural argument of the verb. As the (B1) example shows, particle stranding is allowed if the answer is exactly identical to the question and contains a 3rd person plural nominal argument after the verb. As (B2) shows, particle stranding is not allowed if the adposition is inflected for 3rd person plural and, correspondingly, there is no nominal argument elided.

- (520) A: Ránézett a lányokra János?
 Sub.3Sg.look.Past.3Sg the girls.Sub János
 ‘Did János look at the girls?’
- B1: Ránézett a lányokra János.
 Sub.3Sg.look.Past.3Sg the girls.Sub János

B2: *Rájuk ~~nézett~~——János.
 Sub.3Pl look.Past.3Sg János
 ‘He did.’

It is important to note that this kind of restriction only affects the elliptical process called particle stranding, as the V-stranding pattern is not restricted in this way: mismatching cases are well-formed in either combination.

(521) A: Ránézett a lányokra János?
 Sub.3Sg.look.Past.3Sg the girls.Sub János
 ‘Did János look at the girls?’

B1: Ránézett ~~a lányokra~~——János.
 Sub.3Sg.look.Past.3Sg the girls.Sub János

B2: Rájuk nézett János.
 Sub.3Pl look.Past.3Sg János
 ‘He did.’

6.5. Ellipsis after preverbal modifiers of participials

Particle stranding ellipsis can also eliminate a predicate in Hungarian when the stranded particle belongs to a participial verb. There are two contexts where this can happen.

One is the *-vA* participle type (see Bartos 2009 for an overview). A prerequisite for this kind of ellipsis is that the particle of the *-vA* participle be syntactically independent of the participial verb in the sense that it can occur at a distance from it. Such particles at a distance can be found in contexts where the *-vA* participle associates with a copula and the particle belonging to the *-vA* participle verb appears before the copula in neutral clauses.

- (522) a. Béla be van rúgva.
 Béla Prt be.3Sg drink.Part
 ‘Béla is drunk.’
- b. A tartozás ki van fizetve.
 the debt Prt be.3Sg pay.Part
 ‘The debt is paid.’

In such contexts, particle stranding can apply in polarity contexts questioning/echoing the polarity of the finite assertion. The stranded particle can be left as a sole remnant in the answer to a polarity question for example.

- (523) a. A: Béla be van rúgva?
 Béla Prt be.3Sg drink.Part
 ‘Is Béla drunk?’
- B: Be ~~van~~——rúgva.
 Prt be.3Sg drink.Part
 ‘He is.’

- b. A: Ki van fizetve a tartozás?
 Prt be.3Sg pay.Part the debt
 ‘Is the debt paid?’
 B: ~~Ki van fizetve a tartozás.~~
 Prt be.3Sg pay.Part the debt
 ‘It is.’

Particle stranding is only possible if the *-vA* participle (+copula) function as the main predicate of the clause. In cases where the *-vA* participle is a modifier of another lexical predicate, particle stranding is impossible.

- (524) A: Béla berúgva jött haza?
 Béla Prt.drink.Part come.Past.3Sg home
 ‘Did Béla get home drunk?’
 B: *~~Berúgva jött haza.~~
 Prt.drink.Part come.Past.3Sg home
 ‘He did.’

The second type of contexts where particle stranding can apply to a participle of a participle verb is the case of *-hAtÓ* ‘-able’ participles (see Lipták and Kenesei 2017). *-hAtÓ* participles, similarly to *-vA* participles, can form the main predicate of the clause when combining with a copula. In such contexts, when the *-hAtÓ* participial has a particle, the particle can participate in particle stranding in polarity contexts. Consider the next illustrative examples.

- (525) a. A: Megbízható volt János a feladattal?
 Prt.entrust.able be.Past.3Sg János the task.Ins
 ‘Was János entrustable with the task?’
 B: ~~Megbízható volt János a feladattal.~~
 Prt.entrust.able be.Past.3Sg János the task.Ins
 ‘He was.’
 b. A: Kifizethető a tartozás több részletben is?
 Prt.pay.able the debt more installment.Ine also
 ‘Is it possible to pay the debt in more than one installment?’
 B: ~~Kifizethető a tartozás több részletben is.~~
 Prt.pay.able the debt more installment.Ine also
 ‘It is.’

6.6. Predicate ellipsis following polarity particles

In Hungarian, predicates can also be missing after polarity particles *igen* ‘yes’ and *nem* ‘not’. While the two particles seem to have a parallel function, that of indicating polarity, they have many distinctive properties when they introduce ellipsis of a predicate. The next two sections give a characterization of both. As will be clear from the discussion in Section 6.6.1, the overt predicate and the polarity particle *yes* are in

complementary distribution. For this reason, the examples will be listed without struck-through material, i.e. without indication of the predicate that is missing in them.

6.6.1. *Ellipsis after igen 'yes'*

In Hungarian, a finite or non-finite predicate can be missing after the polarity particle *igen*. This particle, which will be termed 'ellipsis-inducing *igen*' (and glossed as *yes*) for the sake of the discussion, is homophonous with the positive response particle meaning 'yes' (see Farkas 2009), which occurs in answers to polar questions (*Esik? Igen*. 'Is it raining? Yes.')

but has a different syntactic distribution. First, ellipsis-inducing *igen* appears in polarity contexts where the predicate is anaphoric and is necessarily non-overt. As the examples in (526) show, (526a) is identical in meaning to (526b), and according to the evidence in (526c), *igen* is only allowed if the predicate *találkozott a szomszédokkal* is not present. *Igen* and an overt predicate are in complementary distribution.

- (526) a. János nem találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari találkozott velük.
 János not meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari met.Past.3Sg they.Ins
 'János did not meet the neighbours, but Mari did meet them.'
- b. János nem találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari igen.
 János not meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari yes
 'János did not meet the neighbours, but Mari did meet them.'
- c. János nem találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari (*igen) találkozott velük.
 János not meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari yes met.Past.3Sg they.Ins
 'János did not meet the neighbours, but Mari did meet them.'

Strictly speaking, the complementary distribution observed in (526) is only there in case of finite predicates. Ellipsis-inducing *igen* can also occur where the missing predicate is infinitival. In these cases, however, for some speakers, the predicate cannot be spelled out in its place. *Igen* is the only option in these constructions.

- (527) a. Jó lenne Jánost nem meg hívni, de Marit igen.
 good be.Cond János.Acc not Prt invite.Inf but Mari.Acc yes
 'It would be good not to invite János but to invite Mari.'
- b. %Jó lenne Jánost nem meg hívni, de Marit meghívni.
 good be.Cond János.Acc not Prt invite.Inf but Mari.Acc Prt.invite.Inf
 'It would be good not to invite János but to invite Mari.'

- (528) a. Próbálj meg magadra nem gondolni, de másokra igen.
 try.Subj.2Sg Prt yourself.Sub not think.Inf but others.Sub yes
 'Try not to think about yourself, but to think about others.'
- b. %Próbálj meg magadra nem gondolni, de másokra gondolni.
 try.Subj.2Sg Prt yourself.Sub not think.Inf but others.Sub think.Inf
 'Try not to think about yourself, but to think about others.'

The fact that *igen* occurs in polarity contexts (as defined in Section 6.3.1. above) is shown in the next examples. *Igen* can occur as answer to a yes/no question, as a response to the polarity of a statement (529a,b), but is disallowed if it does not contrast with the polarity of the antecedent clause (529c).

- (529) a. A: János meghívta a szomszédokat?
 János Prt.invite.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 B: A balszomszédot igen.
 the left.neighbour.Acc yes
 ‘He did, the left neighbour.’
- b. A: János nem hívta meg a szomszédokat.
 János not invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘János did not invite the neighbour.’
 B: De, a balszomszédot igen.
 but the left.neighbour.Acc yes
 ‘But he did, the left neighbour.’
- c. János meghívta a szomszédokat. *Mari is igen.
 János Prt.invite.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Acc Mari also yes
 ‘János invited the neighbours. Mari also.’

The contrastive polarity that *igen* spells out always contrasts with the highest negation in an antecedent clause. In clauses with a single negation, this negation is the one that occurs before the verb (530a). When the antecedent is a clause with two negations, one above and one below a focus constituent, *igen* can only contrast with the polarity of the highest negation, i.e. it must scope higher than the focus (530b).

- (530) a. Tegnap nem JÁNOS hívta meg a szomszédokat. Ma igen.
 yesterday not János invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc today yes
 ‘Yesterday it was not János who invited the neighbours. Today it was.’
- b. Tegnap nem JÁNOS nem hívta meg a szomszédokat. Ma igen.
 yesterday not János not invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Past.Acc today yes
 ‘Yesterday it was not János who did not invite the neighbours. Today it was János who did **not** invite the neighbours.’, ‘Yesterday it was not János who did not invite the neighbours. #Today it was **not** János who did invite the neighbours.’

Ellipsis-inducing *igen* is furthermore always accompanied on its left by what looks like a contrastive topic or an A-bar moved constituent in the high left periphery. Accordingly, the constituent to the left of *igen* can be a referential entity (531a), and can be followed by particles that typically follow contrastive topics (531b):

- (531) a. A szomszédokkal nem találkozott János, de a házmesterrel igen.
 the neighbour.Pl.Ins not meet.Past.1Sg János but the janitor.Ins yes
 ‘János didn’t meet the neighbours, but he did the janitor.’
- b. Mari ne menjen el, te viszont igen.
 Mari not go.Subj.3Sg Prt you however yes
 ‘Mari should not go, but you should.’

Igen can also be preceded by non-referential operator material as well, such as relative pronouns of all kinds (532a–c).

- (532) a. Kész vannak a gyerekek? Aki igen, az kimehet.
 ready be.3Pl the kid.Pl Rel.who yes that Prt.go.Mod.3Sg
 ‘Are the kids ready? Those who are, may go out.’
- b. [?]Levi többet eszik, amikor nem sportol, mint amikor igen.
 Levi more.Acc eat.3Sg when not sport.3Sg than when yes
 ‘Levi eats more when he does not do sports, than when he does.’
- c. Megoldottad a házi feladatokat? Amit igen, azt megnézem.
 Prt.solve.Past.2Sg the homework.Pl.Acc Rel.what.Acc yes that.Acc Prt.see.1Sg
 ‘Did you do the homework? I will look at the ones you did.’

The data in (532), together with examples like (530a), incidentally provide the strongest evidence that *igen* in the phenomenon under discussion is followed by ellipsis of a predicate phrase. As these show, it is possible to extract the internal arguments from the predicate that is missing after *igen*. If the predicate was represented by some other means (e.g. as an anaphoric pronoun), such extraction should yield an ungrammatical result, contrary to fact.

Importantly, the material that precedes *igen* cannot be a focus (cf. (533)), a question phrase or a quantifier (cf. (534)), and neither can it be an *is*-phrase (535):

- (533) A: JÁNOS vagy MARI hívta meg a szomszédokat?
 János or Mari invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘Was it János or Mari who invited the neighbours?’
- B: *MARI igen.
 Mari yes
 ‘Mari did.’
- (534) a. Világos, hogy ki nem akar lemondani. *Kevésbé világos, hogy ki igen.
 clear Compl who not want.3Sg Prt.resign.Inf less clear Compl who
 yes
 ‘It is clear who does not want to resign. It is less clear who does.’
- b. Ki akar lemondani? *Mindenki igen?
 who want.3Sg Prt.resign.Inf everyone yes
 ‘Who wants to resign? Everyone does?’
- (535) János meghívta a szomszédokat. *Mari is igen.
 János invite.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Acc Mari also yes
 ‘János invited the neighbours. Mari also.’

In line with the above, *wh*-constituents that occur to the left of ellipsis-inducing *igen* can only receive an interpretation of referential topic pronouns, and not that of question words (see Lipták 2001). *Hol* ‘where’ and *ki* ‘who’ can occur in this way, with the meaning of the indefinite *sometimes* and *some people* respectively.

(536) A: Jár Péter az előadásokra?

go.3Sg Péter the lecture.Pl.Sub
 ‘Does Péter attend the lectures?’

B1: Hol igen, hol nem.

where yes where not
 ‘Sometimes yes, sometimes not.’

B2: *Hol igen.

where yes
 ‘Sometimes yes.’

(537) A: Járnak a diákok az előadásokra?

go.3Sg the student.Pl the lecture.Pl.Sub
 ‘Do the students attend the lectures?’

B1: Ki igen, ki nem.

who yes who not
 ‘Some do, others do not.’

B2: *Ki igen.

who yes
 ‘Some do.’

As the B2 examples above indicate, such topic interpretation is only available if these pronouns are used in pairs, in clauses coordinated with contrastive polarity.

Ellipsis-inducing *igen* is furthermore a clause-final element, no other material belonging to the clause can show up to its right:

(538) a. *János nem találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari igen a házmesterrel.

János not meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari yes the janitor.Ins
 ‘János did not meet the neighbours, but Mari did the janitor.’

b. Kész vannak a gyerekek? *Aki igen az ebéddel, az kimehet.

ready be.3Pl the kid.Pl Rel.who yes the lunch.Ins that Prt.go.Mod.3Sg
 ‘Are the kids ready? Those who are (ready) with the lunch, may go out.’

Ellipsis-inducing *igen* is not only a main clause phenomenon, it can occur in finite subordinate clauses as well:

(539) A: János meghívta a szomszédokat?

János Prt.invite.Past.3Sg the neighbours.Acc
 ‘Did János invite the neighbours?’

B1: Úgy hallottam, hogy a balszomszédot igen.

so hear.Past.1Sg Compl the left.neighbour.Acc yes
 ‘I heard he did, the neighbour on the left.’

B2: Mindenki állítja, hogy a balszomszédot igen.

everyone claim.3Sg Compl the left.neighbour.Acc yes
 ‘Everyone is of the opinion that he did, the neighbour on the left.’

B3: Olyan hírek keringnek, hogy a balszomszédot igen.
 such news circle.3Pl Compl the left.neighbour.Acc yes
 ‘News got out that he did, the neighbour on the left.’

The clause whose polarity *igen* contrasts with, however, cannot itself be embedded in a relative clause that is an independent argument:

(540) *Aki nem ment át a vizsgán, irigyli azt, aki igen.
 Rel.who not go.Past.3Sg Prt the exam.Sup envy.3Sg that.Acc Rel.who yes
 ‘Who did not pass the exam envies those who did.’

6.6.2. Ellipsis after *nem* ‘not’

The negative polarity particle, *nem* ‘not’ can also introduce ellipsis. Contrary to *igen*, however, it shows a different syntactic distribution.

First, *nem* is not in complementary distribution with an overt predicate: it can precede an overt predicate or occur in a clause without a predicate:

- (541) a. János találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari nem találkozott velük.
 János meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari not meet.Past.3Sg they.Ins
 ‘János met the neighbours, but Mari did not meet them.’
- b. János találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari nem.
 János meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari not
 ‘János met the neighbours, but Mari did not.’

Nem can also precede infinitival predicates overtly or occur without such an infinitive.

- (542) a. Jó lenne Jánost meghívni, és Marit nem meghívni.
 good be.Cond János.Acc Prt.invite.Inf and Mari.Acc nem Prt.invite.Inf
- b. Jó lenne Jánost meghívni, és Marit nem.
 good be.Cond János.Acc Prt.invite.Inf and Mari.Acc not
 ‘It would be good to invite János and to not invite Mari.’

Unlike *igen*, *nem* followed by ellipsis can occur not only in polarity contexts (as answer to a yes/no question, as a response to a positive statement) (cf. (543)) but also in clauses where there is no emphasis on the polarity. The crucial example is (544b) (compare with the ungrammaticality of (529c) above). Note that *sem* is the form of negation corresponding to an affirmative *is*-phrase, cf. (473).

- (543) A: János meghívta a szomszédokat?
 János Prt.invite.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘Did János invite the neighbours?’
- B: A balszomszédot nem.
 the left.neighbour.Acc not
 ‘No, he didn’t the left neighbour.’

- (544) a. A: János nem hívta meg a szomszédokat.
 János not invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘János did not invite the neighbours.’
 B: Nem, a balszomszédot nem.
 no the left.neighbour.Acc not
 ‘That’s right, he did not the left neighbour.’
- b. János nem hívta meg a szomszédokat. Mari sem.
 János not invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc Mari also.not
 ‘János did not invite the neighbours. Mari did not either.’

Another important difference between *igen* and *nem* concerns their requirements of what appears to their left. While *igen* needs a contrastive topic or a topic-like A-bar moved constituent to its left, *nem* can be preceded by a contrastive topic, a topic-like A-bar moved constituent, a question phrase or quantifier (note that negative quantifiers require a different form of negation, *sem*):

- (545) a. A szomszédokkal találkozott János, de a házmesterrel nem.
 the neighbour.Pl.Ins meet.Past.1Sg János but the janitor.Ins not
 ‘János met the neighbours, but he did not the janitor.’
- b. Kész vannak a gyerekek? Aki nem, az maradjon itt.
 ready be.3Pl the kid.Pl Rel.who not that remain.Subj.3Sg here
 ‘Are the kids ready? Those who are not, should remain here.’
- c. Világos, hogy ki akar lemondani. Kevésbé világos, hogy ki nem.
 clear Compl who want.3Sg Prt.resign.Inf less clear Compl who not
 ‘It is clear who wants to resign. It is less clear who does not.’
- d. Ki akar lemondani? Senki sem?
 who want.3Sg Prt.resign.Inf nobody not
 ‘Who wants to resign? Nobody does?’

What *nem* cannot be preceded by is a contrastive focus constituent, as the following examples show.

- (546) a. A: JÁNOS vagy MARI nem hívta meg a szomszédokat?
 János or Mari not invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘Was it János or Mari who did not invite the neighbours?’
 B: *MARI nem.
 Mari not
 ‘Mari did not.’
- b. A: Ki nem hívta meg a szomszédokat?
 who not invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘Who did not invite the neighbours?’
 B: *MARI nem.
 Mari not
 ‘Mari did not.’

Nem can be preceded by a constituent on the other hand if that constituent is a contrastive topic:

(547) A: Ki nem hívta meg a szomszédokat?
 who not invite.Past.3Sg Prt the neighbour.Pl.Acc
 ‘Who did not invite the neighbours?’

B: Hát, Mari nem.
 well Mari not
 ‘Well, Mari did not (it could be that others did).’

In a same vein, as was indicated in the previous section, paired question words with an indefinite reading can appear before *nem* (see (536)–(537) above):

(548) A: Jár Péter az előadásokra?
 go.3Sg Péter the lecture.Pl.Sub
 ‘Does Péter attend the lectures?’

B1: Hol igen, hol nem.
 where yes where not
 ‘Sometimes yes, sometimes not.’

B2: *Hol nem.
 where not
 ‘Sometimes not.’

Finally, *nem* can follow complementizers or coordinators, as the following examples demonstrate. In (550a), *nem* introduces ellipsis of a predicate in disjunctive *vagy ... vagy ...* ‘either ... or...’ clauses, something that is impossible with *igen* (550b).

(549) A: János meghívta a szomszédokat?
 János Prt.invite.Past.3Sg the neighbours.Acc
 ‘Did János invite the neighbours?’

B: Úgy hallottam, hogy nem.
 so hear.Past.1Sg Compl not
 ‘I heard he did not.’

(550) a. Vagy elment Péter, vagy nem.
 or Prt.go.Past.3Sg Péter or not
 ‘Péter either left or not.’

b. *Vagy nem ment el Péter, vagy igen.
 or not go.Past.3Sg Prt Péter or yes
 ‘Péter either did not leave, or he did.’

In some properties, *nem* is similar to *igen* when introducing ellipsis of a predicate. Concerning its clause-finality, ellipsis-inducing *nem* must be final in its clause, too, just like *igen*.

- (551) a. *János találkozott a szomszédokkal, de Mari nem a házmesterrel.
 János meet.Past.3Sg the neighbour.Pl.Ins but Mari not the janitor.Ins
 ‘János met the neighbours, but Mari did not the janitor.’
- b. Kész vannak a gyerekek? *Aki nem az ebéddel, az maradjon.
 ready be.3Pl the kid.Pl Rel.who not the lunch.Ins that stay.Subj.3Sg
 lit. ‘Are the kids ready? Those who are not with the lunch, should stay.’

Also, ellipsis-inducing *nem* can be embedded, just like *igen*. It can also be found inside relative clauses, as in the following examples.

- (552) A: János meghívta a szomszédokat?
 János Prt.invite.Past.3Sg the neighbours.Acc
 ‘Did János invite the neighbours?’
- B1: Úgy hallottam, hogy a balszomszédot nem.
 so hear.Past.1Sg Compl the left.neighbour.Acc not
 ‘I heard he did not, the neighbour on the left.’
- B2: Mindenki állítja, hogy a balszomszédot nem.
 everyone claim.3Sg Compl the left.neighbour.Acc not
 ‘Everyone is of the opinion that he did not, the neighbour on the left.’
- B3: Olyan hírek keringnek, hogy a balszomszédot nem.
 such news circle.3Pl Compl the left.neighbour.Acc not
 ‘News got out that he did not, the neighbour on the left.’
- (553) Aki már befejezte a feladatot, segít majd annak, aki még nem.
 rel.who already Prt.finish.Past.3Sg the exercise.Acc help.3Sg then that.Dat Rel.who
 yet not
 ‘Those who have already finished their exercise will help those who have not yet finished.’

6.7. Summary

Hungarian allows for a predicate to be elided. Infinitival predicates can be missing following finite auxiliaries. Of the three auxiliaries, *fog* ‘future’ and *szokott* ‘habitual’ freely allow ellipsis of their complements. When the infinitival form of the copula *lenni* is elided together with its lexical (adjectival, nominal, locative, etc.) predicate after auxiliaries or semi-lexical verbs, elision is only possible if the antecedent contains *lenni* in infinitival form as well.

For the pattern of *V-stranding* ellipsis there are two pragmatic-syntactic environments in which V-stranding can occur: (i) in contexts with emphatic polarity, which was referred to as *polarity contexts*, (ii) in contexts with no emphasis on the polarity of the clause, which was referred to as *non-polarity contexts*.

The two polarity particles *igen* ‘yes’ and *nem* ‘not’ seem to have a parallel function, that of indicating polarity, but they have many distinctive properties when they introduce ellipsis of a predicate. The overt predicate and the polarity particle *yes* are in complementary distribution. Ellipsis-inducing *igen* can also occur where the

missing predicate is infinitival. In these cases, however, the predicate cannot be spelled out.

Ellipsis-inducing *igen* is a clause-final element, no other material belonging to the clause can show up to its right. It can occur in finite subordinate clauses as well.

The constituent to the left of *igen* can be a referential entity and can be followed by particles that typically follow contrastive topics. *Igen* can also be preceded by non-referential operator material, such as relative pronouns of all kinds.

The polarity particle *nem* ‘not’ is not in complementary distribution with an overt predicate: it can precede an overt predicate or occur in a clause without a predicate. *Nem* can also precede infinitival predicates overtly or occur without such an infinitive.

Nem followed by ellipsis can occur not only in polarity contexts (as an answer to a yes/no question, as a response to a positive statement), but can also occur in clauses where there is no contrast on the polarity.

While *igen* needs a contrastive topic or a topic-like A-bar moved constituent to its left, *nem* can be preceded by a contrastive topic, a topic-like A-bar movement constituent, a question phrase or a quantifier (negative quantifiers require a different form of negation, *sem*). *Nem* can follow complementizers or coordinators.

In some properties, *nem* is similar to *igen* when introducing ellipsis of a predicate: ellipsis-inducing *nem* must be final in its clause, too, just like *igen*. Also, ellipsis-inducing *nem* can be embedded, just like *igen*.

6.8. Bibliographical notes

Predicate ellipsis is a reasonably well-studied phenomenon in Hungarian. There are dedicated studies about predicate ellipsis when it comes to the morphosyntactic and inflectional characteristics of the phenomenon in both forward and backward contexts, see Bartos (2000a, 2000b, 2001) and Bánréti (1992, 2001, 2007). Interpretational characteristics of the phenomenon are discussed in Gyuris (2001).

Certain types of verb-stranding ellipsis, such as answers to polar and constituent questions was described in great detail in Kenesei et al. (1998). Surányi (2009a, 2009b) addresses the theoretical implications of this phenomenon for the analysis of verb raising in the Hungarian clause. Dedicated studies on the existence of verb-stranding ellipsis and ellipsis after *igen* can be found in Lipták (2013). Particle stranding ellipsis was explicitly studied in Lipták (2012); particle stranding ellipsis with participials was mentioned in Lipták and Kenesei (2017); the impossibility of particle stranding with reduplicated particles in Lipták and Saab (2019) and agreement (mis)matches in particle stranding with adpositional particles in Lipták (2018).

