

- b. Mari ismer valaki-t, de nem tudom ki-(*t) az/ő.
 Mary knows someone-ACC, but not know.I who-(*ACC) that/(s)he
 ‘Mary knows someone, but I don’t know who they are.’

A possible, but conceptually unappealing explanation is to propose that copular sources are allowed only in one type of clausal ellipsis: in adjectival sluices (1), but not in regular sluices (6a). On the contrary, our proposal explains the facts without appealing to construction-specific constraints, and is rather independently motivated by properties of the language: the existence of, and restrictions on, pro-drop and null copula.

4. APPARENT CASE MISMATCHES ARE NOT ELLIPTICAL. We argue that cases like (1) arise from the combination of a null subject (Dalmi, 2014) and a null copula (É. Kiss, 2002; Hegedűs, 2013), which conspire to give the illusion of an ellipsis configuration (i.e. *pseudosluicing*):

- (7) Mari ismer néhány magas lány-t, de nem tudom milyen magas-ak **BE_{null} pro**. (= (1))
 Mary knows some tall girl-ACC, but not know.I how tall-PL

Further support for our analysis comes from structures where the copula needs to be spelled out. Null copulas in adjectival predicates are **restricted to 3rd person and present tense** (i.a. É. Kiss, 2002). As can be seen in e.g. adjectival questions, copulas are absent in the present (8), but obligatory in the past tense (9):

- (8) Milyen magas-ak **(*van-nak)** a lány-ok? (9) Milyen magas-ak ***(volt-ak)** a lány-ok?
 how tall-PL be.PRES-PL the girl-PL how tall-PL be.PAST-PL the girl-PL
 ‘How tall are the girls?’ ‘How tall were the girls?’

The presence/absence of the copula in the non-elliptical wh-question determines if apparent adjectival sluices without case-matching (i.e. *pseudosluicing*) are allowed. This correctly predicts that patterns change when a past reading is enforced: either accusative marking (10) or the copula (11) is obligatory (cf. 7):

- (10) M. megölt néhány magas lány-t 1880-ben, de nem tudom milyen magas-ak-**at**.
 M killed some tall girl-ACC 1880-INESSIVE, but not know.I how tall-PL-ACC
 (11) M. megölt néhány magas lány-t 1880-ben, de nem tudom milyen magas-ak ***(voltak)**.
 M killed some tall girl-ACC 1880-INES., but not know.I how tall-PL be.PAST.PL
 Both: ‘Mary killed some tall girls in 1880 but I don’t know how tall.’

Similarly, a null copula is not allowed in persons other than 3rd (non-elliptical questions demonstrating this omitted for space reasons), which again predicts the unavailability of the *pseudosluicing* configuration. While null copula (and therefore *pseudosluicing*) are possible with 3rd person (12 and 7), they are ruled out in 2nd person (13). Thus the **3rd-2nd person contrast** parallels the **present-past tense contrast**.

- (12) Magas-**nak** képzem a lányokat de nem tudom valójában milyen magas-ak **(*van-nak)**
 tall-DAT imagine.I the girls but not know.I in.reality how tall-PL be.PRES-PL
 ‘I imagine the girls (to be) tall but I don’t know how tall (they actually are).’
 (13) Magas-**nak** képzellek de nem tudom valójában milyen magas ***(vagy)**.
 tall-DAT imagine.I→you but not know.I in.reality how tall be.PRES
 ‘I imagine you (to be) tall but I don’t know how tall you actually are.’

Sluicing, where the remnant adjective bears DAT is allowed for both persons (12, 13). Those examples (omitted for space) would mean: ‘...but I don’t know how tall I imagine you to be’. We derive case-marked sentences (including (10)) from a wh-source, followed by clausal ellipsis and NPE, as in (4)-(5b).

5. CONCLUSIONS. In this paper we show that **non-isomorphic sources are not possible in Hungarian ellipsis**. (Apparent) adjectival sluices can arise from **two different configurations**, yielding different number and case marking. On the one hand, true cases of clausal ellipsis arise only from isomorphic wh-questions (see 4 and 5b). These show case-matching and number/case marking on the adjective, as is predicted by properties of NPE in Hungarian. On the other hand, apparent mismatching sluices are not in fact derived from ellipsis, but from the combination of two independent properties of the language: pro drop and copula drop (see 7). Thus our proposal dispenses with the need to posit two different sources of ellipsis within the same language, and contributes to the discussion about the structure inside the ellipsis site, showing that copular sources cannot be sources for ellipsis.