

Identifying identity conditions in and outside ellipsis: a case study of Hungarian

Anikó Lipták
Leiden University

The aim of this talk is to revisit the so-called Lexical Identity Condition (aka *verbal identity condition*) in Hungarian. The Lexical Identity Condition characterizes V-stranding ellipsis across languages (see Goldberg 2005, Schoorlemmer & Temmerman 2012, McCloskey 2017 among others), prescribing lexical identity for the choice of the overt verb used in an elliptical clause.

The condition is defined in (1) (from Goldberg 2005, p. 171: 26) and illustrated in (2) (from Holmberg 2016, p. 58: 12).

(1) THE LEXICAL IDENTITY CONDITION (*LIC*) on V-stranding ellipsis

The antecedent- and target-clause main verbs of VP ellipsis must be identical, minimally, in their root and derivational morphology.

- (2) Q: Hajotti-ko Marja ruukun? *Finnish*
broke₁-Q Marja the.pot
'Did Marja break the pot?'
- A: Hajotti. / * Rikkoi.
broke₁ broke₂
'Yes.'

I will show that despite the fact that the Lexical Identity Condition is generally understood to be the effect of head movement out of an ellipsis site, to be precise the special status of head movement as a PF phenomenon (Temmerman and Schoorlemmer 2012), Hungarian V-stranding phenomena provide no evidence that head movement causes an ellipsis-specific identity condition in this domain.

I discuss two types of Hungarian V-stranding ellipsis, which occur in responses to questions raising polar alternatives, reviewing the structural properties of these elliptical constructions and the identity relation between the antecedent and the stranded item.

I will show that one of the two types, namely V-stranding ellipsis stranding an entire verb, does not exhibit the Lexical Identity Condition in contexts in which the affirmative/negative discourse move is independently marked, despite head movement out of the ellipsis site being involved in the derivation. This suggests that the identity requirement that rears its head in responses without polarity particles is not triggered by head movement out of the ellipsis site either, but is rather a pragmatic requirement on echoic responses.

The other type of stranding ellipsis on the other hand, stranding only the preverb in an elliptical response, does exhibit the Lexical Identity Condition in the same polar contexts, and this condition clearly does not have a pragmatic source. I will argue that in preverb-stranding the ban on lexical mismatches is due to the preverb being interpreted in the same position as the verb, and ultimately has nothing to do with the movement type out of the ellipsis site, either.

References

- Goldberg, Lotus. 2005. *Verb-Stranding VP-Ellipsis: A Cross-Linguistic Study*. PhD diss., McGill University.
- Holmberg Anders. 2016. *The syntax of yes and no*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- McCloskey, James. 2017. Ellipsis, polarity and the cartography of Verb-Initial Orders in Irish. Ms, UCSC.
- Schoorlemmer, Erik and Tanja Temmerman. 2012. Head movement as a PF- phenomenon. Evidence from identity under ellipsis. In Jaehoon Choi (ed), *Proceedings of the 29th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. 232-240.