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THE TWO MAIN GOALS OF THIS PAPER
1. Diagnosing sluicing: how can we determine what the defining characteristics of sluicing are in typologically unrelated languages?
2. Sluicing as a diagnostic: what can a typologically refined theory of sluicing tell us about the syntax of wh-movement?

MAIN GIST OF THE ANALYSIS
The characteristics of sluicing in a language \( L \) are determined by the characteristics of overt wh-movement in \( L \).

PART ONE: DIAGNOSING SLUICING

1. The puzzle: a new type of ellipsis in Hungarian relatives

1.1 Kornél AZT A LÁNYT hívta meg, akit ZOLTÁN. Kornél that-A the girl-A invited PV who-A Zoltán
'The girl who Kornél invited was the one who Zoltán did.'

\( \rightarrow \) relative deletion (RD) deletes a relative clause but for the relative pronoun and one more constituent

1.2 Kornél AZT A LÁNYT hívta meg, akit ZOLTÁN Kornél that-A the girl-A invited PV who-A Zoltán hívott meg invited PV
'The girl who Komöl invited was the one who Zoltán did.'

\( \rightarrow \) note: RD—or anything like it—is completely unattested in Germanic or Romance:

1.3 a. * John invited the girl who Bill. (English)
   b. * Jan heeft het meisje uitgenodigd dat Piet. (Dutch)
   c. * Jean a invité la fille que Pierre. (French)
   d. * Ho comprato ad Anna il libro che a Maria (Italian)

\( \rightarrow \) note: RD—or anything like it—is completely unattested in Germanic or Romance:

1.4 The characteristics of sluicing in a language \( L \) are determined by the characteristics of overt wh-movement in \( L \).

PART TWO: SLUICING AS A DIAGNOSTIC
6 Sluicing as a probe into the syntax of single wh-movement
7 Sluicing as a probe into the syntax of multiple wh-movement
8 The broader picture: non-ellipsis as a diagnostic for ellipsis
9 Conclusions
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questions: - Is RD sui generis (i.e. a new type of deletion) or can it be reduced to one of the already known ellipsis processes?
- How can we tell? What are good diagnostics for detecting the various types of ellipsis?
2 Ruling out VP-ellipsis

basic idea of this section:
RD deletes a larger chunk of the clausal structure than merely VP (or a VP-related projection; for VP-ellipsis in Hungarian, see Bartos 2000). Hence, RD ≠ VPE.

➔ VPE does not delete auxiliaries, but RD does:

RD
(4) Kornél meg szokta hívni azt a lányt, akit Zoltán.
Kornél PV HABIT invite that-A the girl who-A Zoltán
'Kornél usually invites the same girl that Zoltán does.'

VPE
(5) Kornél meg szokta hívni azt a lányt, akit
Kornél PV HABIT invite that-A the girl who-A
Zoltán szokott.
Zoltán HABIT
'Kornél usually invites the same girl that Zoltán does.'

➔ The VPE-remnant is the subject >> the RD-remnant can be any category:

RD
(6) AZT A FIÚ hívta meg, aki Marival lakik,
that theboy invited PV who Mari-WITH lives,
s nem AZT, aki OLGÁVAL
and not that-A who Olga-WITH
'It was the boy who lives with Mari that I invited and not the one who lives with Olga.'

VPE
(9) * John talked to Mary about the girl who to John did [e].

➔ VPE allows for adverbial modification, but RD does not:

RD
(10) Kornél fel szokta hívni azt a lányt,
Kornél PV HABIT invite that-A the girl-A
akit Zoltán is <naponta>.
who-A Zoltán also daily
'Kornél usually invites the girl whom Zoltán invites daily.'

VPE
(11) Kornél fel szokta hívni azt a lányt, akit Zoltán
Kornél PV HABIT invite that-A the girl-A
akit Zoltán is <naponta> fel szokott <naponta>.
also daily PV HABIT daily
'Kornél usually invites the girl whom Zoltán invites daily.'

➔ With non-contrasting tenses, RD is preferred over VPE (cf. MAXELIDE):

(12) Kornél AZT A LÁNYT hívta meg, akit Zoltán fog.
Kornél that-A the girl-A invited PV who-A Zoltán FUT
'The girl who Komel invited was the one who Zoltán will.'

(13) Kornél AZT A LÁNYT fogja meghívni,
Kornél that-A the girl-A invite-INF
akit Zoltán (?fog).
who-A Zoltán FUT
'The girl who Komel will invite is the one who Zoltán will.'
(14) a. They studied a language, but I don't know which [e].
   b. ?? They studied a language, but I don’t know which they did [e].
   (Merchant to appear)

⇒ VPE allows for strict and sloppy readings, but RD only for strict:

(15) János szokott mesélni az anyjának arról a lányról,
    jános habit tell-inf the mother-d that-about the girl-about
    akiről Béla is szokott.
    who-about Béla also habit
    János usually tells his mother about the girl, whom Béla also tells
    about to János' mother.'
    János usually tells his mother about the girl, whom Béla also tells
    about to Béla's mother.'

(16) János szokott mesélni az anyjának arról a lányról,
    jános habit tell-inf the mother-d that-about the girl-about
    akiről Béla is.
    who-about Béla also
    János usually tells his mother about the girl, whom Béla also tells
    about to János' mother.'
    #János usually tells his mother about the girl, whom Béla also tells
    about to Béla's mother.'

conclusion: Hungarian RD is not a instance of VPE

3 An unexpected result: Hungarian RD = sluicing

⇒ section 2: RD involves clausal (i.e. TP-)deletion rather than VP-deletion ⇒
   this means it is more like sluicing than like VPE

problem: Lobeck (1995:54-62) and Merchant (2001:54-61) claim that
   sluicing only deletes the IP-complement of an interrogative
   wh-complementizer, i.e. sluicing is restricted to wh-questions

question: to what extent is the restriction to wh-contexts a reliable
diagnostic of sluicing?

Merchant’s (2001, 2004) implementation of the restriction: [e]

(17) a. the syntax of [e]: E[wh*+Q°*]
    b. the phonology of [e]: φP → Ø / E __
    c. the semantics of [e]: [E] = λp : e-GIVEN (p) [p]

⇒ the syntax of the [e]-feature (cf. (17)a) ensures that sluicing only targets
   the IP-complement of the null C° found in constituent questions

problem: wh-movement in Hungarian targets not specCP, but specFocP (= a
   focus position in the high middle field of the clause) (É. Kiss
   1987) => [e] can only trigger ellipsis of the IP-complement of the
   C° found in constituent questions

prediction: English-style sluicing should be disallowed in Hungarian yet:

(19) János meghívtott egy lányt, de nem tudom kit.
    John invited a girl but I don’t know who.
    John invited a girl, but I don’t know who.

proposal: the behavior of wh-elements in simple constituent questions
determines the syntactic properties of [e]
(20) a. the syntax of \([E]\) in English: \(E_{[\text{wh}^h, \text{wh}^q]}\)
b. the syntax of \([E]\) in Hungarian: \(E_{[\text{wh}^q]}\)

result: English sluicing deletes the complement of (the highest) \(C^o\), while Hungarian sluicing deletes the complement of \(Foc^o\)

(21)

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{English} & \text{Hungarian} \\
\hline
\text{CP} & \text{CP} \\
\text{wh} & \text{wh} \\
\{+[wh,-Q]\} & \{+[wh,-Q]\} \\
\text{C}^o & \text{C}^o \\
\{+[wh,-Q]\} & \{+[wh,-Q]\} \\
\text{Foc}^P & \text{Foc}^P \\
\{+[Foc]\} & \{+[Foc]\} \\
\text{IP} & \text{IP} \\
\text{---} & \text{---} \\
\end{array}
\]

conclusion: by relativizing the content of the \([E]\)-feature across languages, Hungarian relative deletion can successfully be analyzed as sluicing

(22)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{thon} \\
\{+[Foc]\} \\
\text{Foc}^P \\
\{+[Foc]\} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{---} \\
\end{array}
\]

\text{corollary:} the restriction to wh-phrases is no longer a reliable diagnostic for sluicing the syntax of overt wh-movement in a language determines the syntactic properties of \([E]\), which in turn determines what kind of remnants can occur in sluicing

4 Towards a cross-linguistic typology of sluicing

(23) THE WH/SLUICING-CORRELATION

The syntactic features that the \([E]\)-feature has to check in a certain language are identical to the strong features a wh-phrase has to check in a regular constituent question in that language.

\(\rightarrow\) this predicts there should be —at least— three types of languages:

(24) Typology of wh-movement and sluicing constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of wh-movement</th>
<th>type of ([E])-feature</th>
<th>sluicing with a wh-remnant (wh-sluicing)</th>
<th>sluicing with a focus remnant (focus sluicing)</th>
<th>sample language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>movement to specCP</td>
<td>(E_{[\text{wh}^h, \text{wh}^q]})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement to specFocP</td>
<td>(E_{[\text{wh}^q]})</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wh-in-situ</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type I: English

wh-sluicing

(25) Someone read that book, but I don't know who.

focus sluicing

(26) * John fired someone and I think that Bill.
Type II: Hungarian

wh-sluicing
(27) Valaki olvasta azt a könyvet, de nem tudom ki. someone read that a book but not I know who
'Someone read that book, but I don’t know who.'

focus sluicing
(28) János kirugott valakit, és azt hiszem, hogy Bélát. J. fired someone and it-A I think that Béla
'János fired someone and I think it was Bill.'

Type III: Japanese

wh-sluicing
(29) Dareka-ga sono hon-o yon-da ga, watashi-wa dare ka someone NOM that book-A read-PAST but I-TOP who C°
know.not
'Someone read that book, but I don’t know who.'

focus sluicing
(30) John-ga dareka-o kubinisita rasii kedo, boku-wa Bill someone.NOM fired seem but I-TOP Bill
to omou. think
'It seems John fired someone and I think it was Bill.'


(31) … [CP dare, [t̬ t̬ sono hon-o yon da] ka] who that book-A read-PAST C°
'… who read that book.'

(32) … [IP pro dare de/da-ru] ka] who be-PRES C°
'…who it is.'

5 Predictions of the analysis

5.1 Other left-peripheral material

→ if Hungarian sluicing does not delete the complement of the highest C°-head, other left-peripheral material (e.g. complementizers or topics) should be able to occur in between the matrix verb and the sluiced wh-phrase

(33) János meghívott egy lányt, de nem tudom hogy kit. John invited a girl-A but not I know that who-A
'John invited a girl, but I don’t know who.'

(34) Tudom, hogy a diákok és a tanárok is meghívtak know-1SG that the students and the teachers also invited
someone, but not I know that the students whom
'I know that the students and the teachers each invited someone, but I don’t know who the students invited.'

5.2 Focus sluicing and multiple wh-movement languages

Bošković (2002): in multiple wh-movement languages, only the first wh-phrase moves to check a [wh]-feature. The others move for a different reason, typically to check a [focus]-feature (cf. also Stjepanović 2003).

→ if sluicing tracks the overt syntax of wh-questions, multiple wh-movement languages should be prime examples of Type II-languages, i.e. they should display focus sluicing:
Romanian (Hoyt & Theodorescu to appear)

(35) Am aflat că cineva a plecat, dar nu past.1sg learned that someone past.3sg left but no știu dacă Ion.

know.1sg ifIon

'I found out that someone left, but I don't know if it was Ion.'

Russian (Grebenyova 2006)

(36) A: Ty skazala čto on budet uvažat’ Mašu?
you said that he will respect Maša-A

'Did you say that he will respect Maša?'

B: Net. Ja skazala čto IVANA.

no I said that Ivan-A

'No. I said that (he will respect) IVAN.'

Polish (K. Migdalski p.c.)

(37) Wiedziałem, że Janek kogoś zaprosił ale nie knew.1 that Janek someone invited but not wiedziałem że Billa.

knew.1 that Bill-A

'I knew Janek invited someone, but I didn’t know that it was Bill.'

Czech (R. Šimík p.c.)

(38) Věděl jsem, že Honza někoho pozval, ale knew.aux.1sg that Honza someone-A invited but nevěděl jsem, že Martina.

not.knew aux.1sg that Martina-A

'I knew Honza invited someone, but I didn’t know that it was Martin.'

Serbo-Croatian (B. Arsenijević p.c., T. Milić p.c., M. Mareš p.c.)


jovan aux invited someone I.think that aux Bil-A

'Jovan invited someone. I think that it was Bill.'

PART TWO: SLUICING AS A DIAGNOSTIC

6 Sluicing as a probe into the syntax of single wh-movement

prediction made by our account:
if a language has overt movement of wh-phrases to specFocP, it should also allow focus sluicing

case in point: Italian


argument: wh and focus are in complementary distribution

(40) * Che cosa, A GIANNI hai detto?

INTENDED: 'What did you tell GIANNI?'

(41) * A GIANNI che cosa hai detto?

INTENDED: 'What did you tell GIANNI?'

Van Craenenbroeck (2006): Italian wh-movement targets specCP

argument: focus is always to the right of the complementizer che, while wh (in doubly filled COMP filter violating dialects) is always to its left

(42) Credo <che> NANE <*che> i gabia visto, no Piero.

'I think that Nane that they have seen not Piero

(43) Me domando <*che> chi <che> Nane ga visto al marcà.

'I wonder who Nane saw at the market.' (Venetian, C. Poletto p.c.)
testing the prediction:

(44) * Savevo che Nane gaveva invidà qualcheduni ma non knew.1SG that N. had invited someone but not so know.1SG Piero.

INTENDED: ‘I knew that Nane had invited someone, but I didn’t know it was Piero.’

(Venetian, C. Poletto p.c.)

result: the fact that Italian (and varieties of Italian) do not allow focus sluicing strongly suggests that wh-movement in this language doesn’t target a focus position (pace Rizzi 1997, Stoyanova 2008)

7 Sluicing as a probe into the syntax of multiple wh-movement

central debate in the literature on multiple wh-movement:
can a [wh]-feature be checked more than once?

YES: Pesetsky (2000): the [wh]-feature on C can undergo multiple checking (cf. also Rudin 1988)

NO: Bošković (2002): the [wh]-feature on C is universally checked at most once; only focus movement (and in some cases scrambling) can lead to multiple wh-fronting

prediction made by our account:
for a language to display focus sluicing, at least one wh-phrase must undergo overt focus movement → focus sluicing can be used as a diagnostic for distinguishing between the two theories

case in point: Bulgarian

Rudin (1988): all wh-phrases move to specCP to check a [wh]-feature

(45) [CP wh<wh> wh<wh> wh<wh> C°<wh> [IP ... ]]

Bošković (2002): all wh-phrases move to specCP; the first checks a [wh]-feature, the rest a [focus]-feature

(46) [CP wh<wh> wh<focus> wh<focus> C°<wh> focus C°<focus> [IP ... ]]

Lambova (2001): there are two dialects of Bulgarian:
- in dialect A, all wh-phrases move to specCP; the first checks a [wh]-feature, the rest a [focus]-feature
- in dialect B, one wh-phrase moves to specCP to check a [wh]-feature, the others move to specFocP to check a [focus]-feature

(47) a. dialect A: [CP wh<wh> wh<focus> wh<focus> C°<wh> focus C°<focus> [IP ... ]]
   b. dialect B: [CP wh<wh> C°<wh> wh<focus> focus C°<focus> [focus wh<focus> wh<focus> focus C°<focus> ... ]]

test for distinguishing the two dialects: parenthetical intervention
dialect A

(48) * Koj, kazvash, kakvo koga e kupil?
   who you say what when aux bought
   ‘Who bought what when, you say?’

dialect B

(49) Koj, kazvash, kakvo koga e kupil?
   who you say what when aux bought
   ‘Who bought what when, you say?’
predictions with respect to focus sluicing:
1. Rudin: all of Bulgarian should disallow focus sluicing ([E_wuh])
2. Bošković: all of Bulgarian should allow focus sluicing (two types of [E]:
   [E_wuh(uFoc)] and [E_foc])
3. Lambova: all of Bulgarian should allow focus sluicing (two types of [E]:
   [E_wuh(uFoc)] and [E_foc])

testing the predictions
dialect A: no focus sluicing
(50) Znaeh che Ivan e pokanil njakoj, no ne znaeh, knew that Ivan has invited someone but not knew che Boris. that Boris
   Intended: ‘I knew that Ivan has invited someone, but I didn’t know that it was Boris.’
dialect B: focus sluicing is fine
(51) Znaeh che Ivan e pokanil njakoj, no ne znaeh, knew that Ivan has invited someone but not knew che Boris. that Boris
   Intended: ‘I knew that Ivan has invited someone, but I didn’t know that it was Boris.’
results: - in the dialect of Bulgarian that doesn’t split up the cluster (dialect A) all wh-phrases move to specCP, and they all check a [wh]-feature (as claimed by Rudin)
   - in the dialect of Bulgarian that splits up the cluster, one wh-phrase checks a [wh]-feature in specCP, while the others check a [focus]-feature in specFocP (as argued for by Lambova)
conclusions: - the distribution of focus sluicing within Bulgarian suggests that [wh]-features can be multiply checked
   - when the wh-phrases do not form a cluster, focus sluicing is always available

8 The broader picture: non-ellipsis as a diagnostic for ellipsis

our theory so far: the non-elliptical overt syntax of wh-phrases in a language L determines the sluicing options in L

question: is this more generally the case, i.e. is non-ellipsis always a reliable diagnostic for predicting the behavior of elliptical constructions?

→ no: sometimes they proceed in parallel, sometimes they don’t

8.1 Multiple wh-sluicing

observation: all languages with multiple wh-movement in non-elliptical syntax allow for multiple wh-sluicing1

Bulgarian
(52) Njakoj e razljal ne što, no ne znam koj kakvo. someone aux spilled something but not know who what
   ‘Someone spilled something, but I don’t know who what.’

Romanian (Hoyt and Theodorescu to appear)
(53) Ion a dat cuiva ceva, si vrea sa Ion aux given someone something and I.want SUBJ stiu cui ce. know who-D what
   ‘Ion has given something to someone, and I want to know what to whom.’

1 Though see Lambova (2002:59-60) for the claim that the splitting dialect of Bulgarian disallows multiple sluicing. Our informant from this dialect did not agree with this judgment, however. Clearly, more empirical research is needed.
Hungarian

(54) Tudom, hogy János adott mindenkinek valamit, de nem tudom, kinek mit.
'I know that János gave everyone something, but I don't know who to whom.'

Serbo-Croatian (Stepanović 2003)

(55) Neko je vidio nekog, ali ne znam ko koga.
'Somebody saw someone, but I don't know who whom.'

Polish (Szczegelniak 2008)

(56) Jan napisał jakiś list do jakiegoś ucznia ale nie wiem jaki.
'Jan wrote some letter to some student but I don't know which student.'

Russian (Grebenyova 2006)

(57) Každyj priglasil kogo-to na tanec, no ja ne pomnju kogo.
'Everyone invited someone to a dance but I don't remember whom.'

moreover: the readings found in multiple sluicing parallel those found in multiple wh-fronting (see also Grebenyova 2006 for Russian)

multiple fronting in Hungarian can only have Multiple Pair reading:

(58) * Ki kinek küldött egy üzenetet?
Who to whom? = 'Tell me about everyone who he/she sent a message to.'

wh-in-situ gives rise to Single Pair reading:

(59) Ki küldött egy üzenetet kinek?
'There was someone who sent a message to someone else. Who to whom?'

multiple sluicing is only compatible with the Multiple Pair scenario:

(60) * Valaki hagyott egy üzenetet valakinek.
'Someone left a message to someone. I don’t know who to whom.'

conclusion: the possibility of having multiple sluicing in a language is determined by its having multiple wh-fronting (see Lasnik 2006 for discussion of apparent counterexamples)
8.2 Multiple focus sluicing

**Observation:** in Serbo-Croatian, Polish and Russian multiple focus fronting is allowed and so is multiple focus sluicing.

**Serbo-Croatian** (B. Arsenijević p.c., Tanja Milicev p.c., M. Marijana p.c.)

(62) **TU KNJIGU** MARIJI je Jovan dao.
that book Marija-D aux Jovan given
Jovan gave THAT BOOK to MARIJA.’

(63) Jovan je dao nesto nekome, i mislim
Jovan aux given something someone and think.I
da je KNJIGU MARIJI.
that aux book Marija-D

**Polish** (B. Citko, G. Korbecka p.c.)

(64) TAMĄ KSIĄŻKĘ MARII Jan dał.
that book-A Maria-D Jan gave
Ján gave THAT BOOK to MARIA.’

(65) ? Jan dał coś komuś i myślę, że KSIĄŻKĘ
Jan gave something someone and I think that book
Maria-D
Maria-D
Ján has given something to someone and I think that a BOOK to MARIJA.’

→ once again, ellipsis (in this case multiple focus sluicing) patterns like non-ellipsis (multiple focus fronting)

**Observation:** in Hungarian and Romanian multiple focus fronting is not allowed but multiple focus sluicing is

**Hungarian**

(66) Q: What did János give to someone?
A: * EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK adott János.
a book Mari-D gave János
INTENDED: 'János gave a BOOK to MARI.'

(67) János adott valamit valakinek, és azt hiszem,
János gave something someone-D and that I think
hogy EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK.
that a book Mari-D
'János gave something to someone and I think he gave a BOOK to MARI.’

**Romanian** (C. Constantinescu, A. Fălăuş, Dafina Raţiu p.c.)

(68) Q: Deci Petre a văzut-o pe Ilona?
so Petre has seen-cl ACC Ilona
'Did Peter see Ilona?’

A: ?* Nu, ION pe MĂRIA a văzut-o!
no ION ACC Maria has seen-cl
INTENDED: ‘No, ION saw MĂRIA.’

(69) Nu sunt sigură cine de ciné s-a îndrăgostit, dar
not am sure who of whom REFLEX-has enamored but
bănuiesc că ION de MARIA.
I.suspect that Ion of Maria
'I am not sure who fell in love with whom, but I think that ION with MARIA.’

→ here, ellipsis (multiple focus sluicing) does not track non-ellipsis (multiple focus fronting) → these facts are very reminiscent of so-called ‘ellipsis-induced repair effects’: movement is fed by ellipses (cf. Merchant 2008, Lasnik & Merchant 2004)

**Proposal:** the reason why Hungarian and Romanian disallow multiple focus fronting is essentially phonological: nothing is allowed to intervene between a fronted focus and the finite verb → in case of multiple focus fronting, the right-most focus intervenes between V and the other foci.
→ this is corroborated by the fact that even in single focus fronting
Hungarian and Romanian require adjacency between the focused XP and
the finite verb, while Serbo-Croatian, Russian and Polish do not:

**Hungarian**

(70) * Azt hiszem, hogy PÉTER Mari {hívta meg/meghívta}.

**Polish**

(71) Myślę, że PIOTRA Maria zaprosiła.

→ in short, there is a correlation between the absence of multiple focus
fronting and the adjacency requirement between a fronted focus and a
verb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>multiple focus</th>
<th>obligatory focus – verb adjacency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fronting</td>
<td>sllicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: correlation between the absence of multiple focus fronting and focus-V adjacency

**implementation:**
- in all the languages mentioned in Table 1, multiple focus movement takes
place in narrow syntax
- in Hungarian and Romanian the phonological restriction on fronted foci
forces all but one of these movement chains to be spelled out at the foot

**however:** when ellipsis elides the finite verb, the phonological restriction
is trivially satisfied, and multiple focus fronting is allowed

**a sample derivation**

**option #1: no ellipsis, no multiple fronting**

(72) * EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK adott János.

a book Mari-D gave János

INTENDED: 'I think that Mari invited P

**narrow syntax**

(73) [FocP EGY KÖNYVET [FocP MARINAK [TP adott János EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK]]]

**PF: deletion of higher copy**

(74) [FocP EGY KÖNYVET [FocP MARINAK [TP adott János EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK]]]

**option #2: ellipsis feeds multiple fronting**

(75) (… és azt hiszem hogy) EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK.

and it-A I.think that a book Mari-D

‘… and I think that he gave a book to MARL’

**narrow syntax**

(76) [FocP EGY KÖNYVET [FocP MARINAK [TP adott János EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK]]]

**PF (I): TP-ellipsis**

(77) [FocP EGY KÖNYVET [FocP MARINAK [TP adott János EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK]]]

**PF (II): (trivial) deletion of lower copies**

(78) [FocP EGY KÖNYVET [FocP MARINAK [TP adott János EGY KÖNYVET MARINAK]]]
9 Conclusions

1. The restriction of English sluicing to wh-questions is not a reliable test for diagnosing sluicing cross-linguistically.

2. The types of sluicing attested in a language L track the overt syntax of wh-movement in L.

3. As a result, sluicing can be used as a probe into the syntax of wh-movement.

4. Discrepancies between non-elliptical and elliptical syntax are due to the fact that ellipsis can repair certain (PF-)deficient configurations.
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