

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SPECIALIZED
SECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC
OF UZBEKISTAN**

FERGHANA STATE UNIVERSITY

**FACULTY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE**

This is submitted for

**BACHELOR'S DEGREE
DIPLOMA PAPER**

Theme: "Ellipsis and its types in English"

By: KakhharovaGulkhumor

Group 13.52

Supervisor:

M. Umaralieva

Ferghana-2017

Contents:

INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL VALUES OF ELLIPSIS IN THE LANGUAGE TEACHING.	
1.1. The characteristic peculiarities of ellipsis.....	9
1.2. The structure of ellipsis.....	14
1.3. Different types of ellipsis in the language teaching.....	19
CHAPTER II. PRACTICAL PECULIARITIES OF ELLIPSIS IN DIFFERENT STYLES	
2.1. A range of utilization of ellipsis in the Publicist style.....	27
2.2. The Acquisition research on ellipsis.....	31
2.3. The Significant features of ellipsis in Foreign Language learning under the example of literature.....	39
CONCLUSION	53
BIBLIOGRAPHY	56

Introduction

To achieve real scientific achievement the door to the world should be wide open. To be fully mindful of these it is important to master foreign languages.

Islom Karimov

After reaching the Independence the Republic of Uzbekistan has developed a successful way for an own model of development, taking into account the specific social and political customs in the country. One of the most crucial cases for the gradual growth of any country is having dysfunctional education system. As the education system ensures the information of a highly developed that must be able to live in a highly, with social and political life. By 1997 on the basis of the National Model of development there had been improved a successful way for the national programme for Personal Training which defined conceptional ways and concrete details, mechanisms for radical reforming the education system and personal training. The programme is the normative scientific basis for reforms. Starting from 1997 it is being put into practice stage by stage. The document paves the way for radical reforms in the structure and content of education system of the National Programme, we need to change some ways of teaching the English language under school conditions as the old approaches no longer meet the requirements of the last year. The historic changes took place in Uzbekistan since there have been gotten. Independence and sovereignty after September 1991 in Independent Uzbekistan many political, economical, and social spheres have changed. As the result, the very time of getting Independence the first president of the republic I.A. Karimov attended to change Educational System in 1997, the Educational System and personal training so high developed before Independence no longer meets requirements of democratic and market changes happened in the Republic today. It should be noted that the National Programme of Personal

training had some unique features. The reforms are carried out on an extensive scale and are supported scientifically.¹As the first President I.A. Karimov emphasized in his book “Uzbekistan along the road of Independence and progress”. There are four path of reform and development is based: adherence to universal human values consolidation and development of the nation’s spiritual heritage freedom for the individuals realization patriotism. The highest objective of reformation in Uzbekistan is to revive those traditions, fill them with new content and set up all necessary conditions achieving peace and democracy, prosperity, cultural advancement freedom of conscience and intellectual maturity for every person on earth. According to the requirement on the National Programme of Personal Training and reforming of highest education in the republic of Uzbekistan it is important to make effective changes in the system of Higher Education. ²As Karimov I.A highlighted “Our young generation must be quick-cutter, wiser, healthier and of course must be happier than us. In order to achieve “Harmoniously developed generation” educators should use all the suitable aids

The actuality of the work. Choosing the topic of the research paper is the difficult process. It is hard to reach the only conclusion on choosing the topic of the research paper. The idea of writing the diploma topic was based on the topic which is problematic, need for the solution and interesting for the reader. It was good to select the topic connected with the teaching ellipsis at school as I was having experimental work. As the level of the learners at school is clear as for their form and it is easy to have observations in the different levels and ages. Learners have got the different attitude and interest for the learning language. The teacher who has the first year experimenting teaching, it is obvious that they need for the more to learn and more to do.

¹I.A.Karimov “There is no future without history” Tashkent 1997, p. 47

²I.A.Karimov “Harmoniously developed generation is a basis of progress of Uzbek

The key to get succeed in the first year teaching is only observations, getting feedbacks and knowing ellipsis in the teaching process and then having the analysis of it. This diploma work is dedicated for the teaching ellipsis problems and their solutions and research based on the practical teaching ellipsis at school. And it will be proved as for the exact details and dates, of course with the help of the questionnaire, surveys and problem solving materials.

The aim of the diploma work is to analyze the difficulties of teaching ellipsis at school and to suggest the solutions and key factors for these kinds of problems, especially from the point of view of the first year experiencing teacher.

To achieve this aim the following tasks have been set:

1. To define the term ellipses and to investigate the characteristic peculiarities of ellipsis, the structure of ellipsis;
2. To analyze ellipses and its types in teaching process;
3. To find the ways of teaching ellipses and swot up on the structure of ellipsis;
4. To research a range of utilization of ellipsis in the Publicist style.

The object and subject of the theme. The subject of this research is defining ellipses and its types and object matter is using ellipses for reducing to use continuational repetition in the classroom.

The novelty of the diploma work is that if teachers are advised to reduce their time of talking in the classroom interaction, then it means that they have to use ellipsis to play. Involving all of the learners in the interactive activities is their main job, they must apply some of the teaching strategies to get all of the students to talk. However, teachers during interaction should avoid a continual interruption. Through the present research, I aim at investigating the relationship between the opportunities for production that arise in a communication setting and the development of the speaking. Thus, my main aim is to contribute to my understanding of how and to what extent conversation in the classroom could help the students at school, college, lyceum to activate their speaking without continual

continuation. In human discourse there is much that is communicated without being explicitly stated. The grammar of natural language provides a broad array of mechanisms for such implicit communication. One example of this is verb phrase ellipsis, in which a verb phrase is elided, its position marked only by an auxiliary verb. Such elliptical constructions are generally easily and unambiguously understood. In this proposal I will attempt to explain how this is accomplished

Practical value of the graduation work. Suggested ellipses-based activities can be implemented in teaching students with any foreign language level.

Research methods. Literature review, interview, observation methods were used to achieve research results.

The structure of diploma work is divided into 2 sections; the theoretical framework section and the practical framework section. Chapter 1 of this diploma work deals with ellipsis from the competence point of view. Chapter 1 offers a review of some of the proposals for VPE in the literature; in particular, I concentrate on some proposals related to the issue of the identity restrictions and of the strict and sloppy readings under ellipsis. Some resources which address the different available readings under ellipsis. Other grammarians also noted cases of partial syntactic identity between antecedent and gap and all of them are given under the examples, and also There are a number of the differences in verbal morphology under ellipsis in this chapter.

In Chapter 2, I define an lucid information based on grammars; thus, showing the possibility of creating a computational model based on minimalist principles. This chapter consists some information that is focused on utilization of human sentence with the extensions and other experiments on comprehension based on pupils level, but modifying the operations proposed there, in order to account for incremental structure building, displaced elements, coordination, and ellipsis. I finish with some conclusions in the last chapter. I collected and reanalyzed some information that introduces a proposal for VPE in coordinate structures. Assuming that lexical insertion is a late process in the derivation, I

analyze ellipsis as a Null Lexicalization process (rather than deletion or interpretation), account for strict and sloppy readings as emerging at different stages with helping of new technique in teaching process that is aimed to introduce any sentence by omitting words and pupils should understand the meaning of omitted sentences with the derivation of a syntactic structure—if the elided VP is interpreted before lexical items are inserted the sloppy reading obtains; on the contrary, if it is interpreted after lexical insertion, then it is assigned the strict reading—and reanalyze the identity issue as a condition on syntactic categories resolution also involves operations at the LF level, hence this work contains some different types of ellipses and offer an explanation for locality restrictions based on the presence/absence of an auxiliary, low attachment of coordinates, and spell-out operations.

As it is said:” Teaching is learning”- it is the best motivating factor can be for this diploma work. But the solutions and suggestions will be shown and analyzed in this research work exactly. They will be supported with the concrete facts and data in order to fulfill the research paper. For learners who are studying English in a non-English speaking setting, it is very important to experience real communicative situations in which they will learn how to express their own views and opinions, and to develop their oral fluency and accuracy which are very essential for the success of FL communication with the helping of ellipsis. In classroom , teaching ellipsis is necessary and useful as an educational strategy to enhance learning. The concept of using ellipsis in classroom interaction plays a significant role in the process of second language learning. In fact the considerable interest in the role of specialists on linguistic on ellipsis in the context of learning became an important factor for the researchers of this field, because it creates opportunities for the classroom community to develop knowledge. As far as the speaking is concerned, I will try to shed some light on this which is considered the most desirable to be mastered by the vast majority of SL learners.

The understanding of the role of ellipsis through interaction in the classroom

context in enhancing the speaking comes from the understanding of its main types: teacher-learner interaction and learner-learner interaction, where negotiation of meaning and the provision of feedback are highlighted. Knowing the rules of using ellipsis involves the verbal exchanges between learners and teachers; however, teachers should know that the learners need to do most of the talk to activate their speaking, since this requires practice and experience to be developed.

Chapter I. Theoretical values of Ellipsis in the language teaching

1.1 The peculiarities of ellipsis and its types in the language teaching.

Theoretical accounts of ellipsis struggle. One reason is that the elided material of many instances of ellipsis often does not qualify as a constituent, the constituent being the fundamental unit of syntactic analysis associated with phrase structure grammars. What this means is that formal accounts of ellipsis must seek some way of accounting for the fact that many of the ellipsis mechanisms enumerated above can elide word combinations that do not qualify as any recognizable unit of syntax.

One widespread approach to the challenge is to assume movement. What happens is that remnants are moved out of a greater constituent first so that the greater constituent can then be elided in full. By assuming movement first and ellipsis second, a theory of syntax can be maintained that continues to build on the constituent as the fundamental unit of syntactic analysis.

A more recent approach states that the challenges posed by ellipsis to phrase structure theories of syntax are due to the phrase structure component of the grammar. In other words, the difficulties facing phrase structure theories stem from the theoretical prerequisite that syntactic structure be analyzed in terms of the constituents that are associated with constituency grammars. If the theory departs from phrase structures and acknowledges the dependency structures of dependency grammars instead, the ability to acknowledge a different sort of syntactic unit as fundamental opens the door to a much more parsimonious theory of ellipsis. This unit is the catena. The assumption is now that ellipsis mechanisms are eliding catenae, whereby many of these catenae fail to qualify constituents. In this manner, the need to posit movement to "rectify" much of the ellipsis data disappears. Use an ellipsis to show that some text is missing, usually from a quotation - do not surround it with spaces. ...*I shall fight on the beaches...I shall never surrender...*
It is a truth universally acknowledged...

There is no need to add square brackets around an ellipsis.

[...] *I shall fight on the beaches* [...]

Use an ellipsis to indicate a pause for comic or other effect - follow the ellipsis with a space in this case, as it stands in place of a comma or full stop.

You don't have to be mad to work here... but it helps!

Note that, if used either in place of omitted text at the end of a clause/ sentence or to indicate a pause for effect, a full stop/comma should not follow the ellipsis. However, an exclamation mark or a question mark can and should follow the ellipsis if required.

Are you...?

Did he say that...?

Use an ellipsis to indicate a trailing off in speech or thought.

I could do this...or maybe that

Full stop, exclamation mark and question mark use one - but only one - of these at the end of every sentence.

What time did you leave last night?

I home at 5 o'clock.

Go home now!

Do not use a full stop at the end of titles, even if they make a sentence, but, if a title ends with an exclamation mark or question mark, do include it.

All's Same that Ends Same is my favourite play.

'Will You Love Me Tomorrow?' was a hit for the Shanelles

'Help!' was covered by Bananarama in 1989.

Do not use a full stop, or preceded, by an ellipsis.

Behind him stood a figure. ...It was ghostly grey.

Use a full stop, not a question mark, at the end of a reported question - only use a question mark for a direct question (whether in quotation marks or not).

He asked if I wanted to go home that morning.

'Do you want to go home this morning?' he asked.

He asked if I wanted to go home?

Use a full stop, not an exclamation mark, at the end of a reported imperative.

Wait for me! - He asked me to wait for him..

This my assignment deals with a variety of syntactic constructions that can be grouped under the name of verbal ellipsis. I look at different elliptical structures in English; to be precise, Verb Phrase Ellipsis (henceforth VPE), Gapping, and Pseudogapping....

They are exemplified below in and respectively:

- (1) *a. Mary loves red wine, and Susan does too.*

He reads the newspaper on the Internet, while she doesn't.

- (2) *John cooked some paella, and Peter a wonderful pasta.*

- (3) *a. Ann did not excuse his father, but she will her mother.*

The teacher talked about the problem with the parents after she did with the kid.

The obvious common feature of all elliptical structures is that some elements of the sentence are not present; they have been omitted. In sentence , the whole verb phrase in the second conjunct *Susan does too* is omitted. Clearly, the meaning of that sentence is: "Mary loves red wine, and Susan loves red wine", even if the second verb phrase is not overt. In sentence , another example of VPE, the verb phrase *read the newspaper* is missing from the subordinate clause. In gapping structures, like , the verb is omitted (and optionally some arguments or adjuncts as Same); in the case of, what Peter was taken to do is to cook a wonderful pasta. In , an example of pseudogapping, only the verb *excuse* is omitted, the argument *her mother* is not. In both the verb and the argument *about the problem* are absent. Traditionally, from the competence side of generative linguistics, there have been two different ways of analyzing ellipsis: the Deletion Hypothesis and the Interpretation Theory I introduce the basic main ideas for each approach here. According to the former, an elliptical sentence like above, repeated here as, is base generated as in with a fully realized VP. A deletion rule applies and as a result is

obtained: both the verb and the argument *about the problem* are absent. Traditionally, from the competence side of generative linguistics, there have been two different ways of analyzing ellipsis: the Deletion Hypothesis and the Interpretation Theory. I introduce the basic main ideas for each approach here. According to the former, an elliptical sentence like above, repeated here as, is base generated as in with a fully realized VP. A deletion rule applies and as a result is obtained:

Mary loves red wine, and Susan does too.

*Mary loves red wine, and Susan **loves red wine** too.*

Mary loves red wine, and Susan does too.

The application of this rule of deletion is constrained by syntactic identity. Since the first and the second conjunct are structurally identical, deletion may apply and delete the second verb phrase. Syntactic identity guarantees recoverability of deletion, in other words, that the deleted material can be recovered at the interpretive level, and that the sentence is assigned the correct interpretation. The Interpretation Theory, However, claims that a sentence like is base generated with an empty category occupying the position of the second verb phrase, as in ; this empty category is later on interpreted, giving as a result

(1) *Mary loves red wine, and Susan does [e] too.*

Mary loves red wine, and Susan loves red wine too.

There are two problems that deletion theories face: the syntactic identity condition that constrains deletion is questionable in examples where only partial identity seems to be met, at least on the surface ; and identity seems to be operative at levels other than the surface syntactic level :

(2) *Peter **worked** a lot yesterday, and tomorrow he will **work** too.*

(3) *I have finished all my readings, and you have finished all **your** readings too.*

(4) *Paul visited his friends, and Peter did visit **his** friends too.*

In examples and the elided VP is not identical to antecedent VP. In the first

case, the verb in the antecedent is the past form *worked*, while the verb in the elision site is *work*. In the second case, the pronoun in the antecedent clause is the first person pronoun *my*, but in the elision site I find the second person form *your*.

The sentence in (1) exemplifies what has been called a sloppy reading under ellipsis—one in which the pronoun in the elision site is interpreted as referring to the subject in that clause, rather than the subject in the antecedent clause. It shows that identity could be at work not only at the syntactic level, but also at other levels, since the dependency that the elided pronoun establishes inside its own clause has to be parallel to the dependency of the pronoun in the antecedent clause.

The Interpretative approach faces the following problems: if the elided VP is structurally empty, then how are grammatical relations going to be satisfied? How will the subject of the elided clause, for example, receive a theta-role? Also, it has been shown that there are ellipsis sentences in which there is a trace inside the elided VP that needs to be bound, and that these traces are subject to island constraints, which argues in favor of having a structured VP:

John knows who Bill criticized ... and Mary knows who Sue did t...

John read everything which Bill did ...

John read everything which Bill believes the claim that he did..

In Chapter 3, where the proposal for VPE is introduced, I adopt an approach along the lines of deletion, i.e. I assume that the elided VP is fully structured, and that ellipsis occurs under syntactic identity. Based on the idea of late lexical insertion, I address those cases where sloppy readings obtain (example (1) above), and also those where partial syntactic identity seems to be at work and¹ I suggest that ellipsis takes place under identity of syntactic categories, and that this condition is met before lexical items are part of the derivation.

¹ It has been proposed that lexical insertion is a late process in the derivation, in other words, lexical items are not part of the derivation from the beginning, (Marantz (1993), and Otero (1998)).

1.2. The Structure of Ellipsis

Ellipsis has been a major topic in linguistics since the first formal analyses of natural language are developed. This fascination comes in part because its behavior and constraints on its use suggest the presence of hidden structures and one of the major questions currently debated in ellipsis research is whether or not ellipsis sites contain hidden syntactic structure. This fundamental question has divided researchers into two camps. In contrast, many teachers believe that it is possible to treat ellipsis as purely a semantic phenomenon. But in the last few years several mixed proposals have been put forward. One of the first hybrid proposals was argued that necessitate theorizing about how this ‘silence’ is interpreted. There is little consensus about how ellipsis should be analyzed, what its actual function is, or even the very basic question of what constructions belong to the category. But many exciting ideas are being currently debated and this is reflected in this issue. Semantic, syntactic and pragmatic, contribute and, more importantly, interact in the interpretation and generation of elliptical utterances. Further, I strongly encouraged submissions that looked at empirical data, with an eye to encouraging research that would be useful when incorporating ellipsis into Natural Language Processing applications. I specifically solicited contributions focusing on:

- implemented ellipsis resolution algorithms that incorporate information from more than one linguistic module
- appropriate generation of ellipsis
- studies of ellipsis in dialogue and the relation of ellipsis to discourse structure
- formalized treatments of ellipsis that incorporate semantic, pragmatic and discourse structural information
- corpus studies of elliptical phenomena
- elicitation tasks that give insights into interpretation or generation of elliptical phenomena

Our intentions are in many ways fulfilled, and this is reflected in the content of the papers that are chosen for this special issue. These papers all present original

research that addresses several of the major issues being debated in ellipsis research today.

In this paper I could find an orientation to each of the four papers selected and explain how they address some of the major areas of controversy in current work on ellipsis. I also compare their approaches and results. Finally in the last section I discuss the research questions raised in our original call for papers that are not addressed at the workshop and which have not received much attention elsewhere. Here I see clear directions for future work that can help refine the ongoing debate.

Syntax constrains ellipsis only when the construction containing ellipsis is related via a rhetorical relation of parallelism or contrast to the rest of the discourse. When the elliptical construction expresses another discourse relation such as explanation, syntactic constraints no longer limit the felicity of the ellipsis. There are some arguments that demands instead for a distinction based on the type of syntactic relation involved. Elided constituents, since they are not pronounced, are argued to be unaffected by syntactic constraints stemming from morphophonological properties. Other syntactic constraints, such as those involved in case theory, will however affect ellipsis and account for some of the restrictions on ellipsis. Several researchers have gone even further. Other famous grammarians show that the interpretation of nominal anaphors and elliptical comparatives can be accounted for through the interaction of violable constraints that are syntactic, semantic as same as pragmatic in nature. These mixed proposals have moved away from a unary account that attempts to do everything with syntax, or everything with semantics, and instead are open for different linguistic modules influencing elliptical constructions at the same time. It was exactly this type of cross-modular interaction that was the focus of the contributions in this volume, some of which also incorporate other modules than the ones mentioned above.

This fundamental issue as to whether syntax or semantics alone is sufficient to explain elliptical behavior is directly addressed in Famous grammarian (this issue). Famous grammarian's paper, Pseudogapping. Its syntactic analysis and cumu-

lative effects on its acceptability, reviews the previous syntactic approaches that all argued that pseudogapping was the result of movement followed by deletion. But one of famous grammarians thoroughly summarizes a number of contradictory empirical observations about pseudogapping and concludes that none of the current proposals can account for this body of facts. He instead suggests a pro-form semantic approach based and similar to work which doesn't require movement and instead treats the realized do as an anaphor.

Famous grammarians' paper comprehensively lists features that distinguish pseudogapping from gapping and VP-ellipsis that are unaccounted for in current research. But its main contributions are empirical ones. Famous grammarians do both a corpus study of pseudogapping in English and a similar construction in English, and a judgement study of native English speakers as to the felicity of pseudogapping sentences by presenting subjects with manipulated sentences with different relevant features, e.g. comparative or simply coordinating, or examples with or without the presence of a predicate remnant. Famous grammarians found that pseudogapping prefers comparative contexts without remnants, and that examples with coordination and a remnant are judged much worse than examples that only contained one of these structures, which are in turn worse than pseudogapping examples with neither. Cumulative effects like these are not handled same in current approaches to syntax, but as scientists point out have been found for gapping in work contribution 'Performing aggregation and ellipsis using discourse structures' technically takes a syntactic deletion approach to ellipsis, although the dependency trees these authors use should perhaps better be characterized as pre-syntactic representations since they do not express linear word order. Thus they follow the analysis first introduced by one of specialists on linguistics under this view, ellipsis is the deletion of lexical material by the speaker. However, the authors didn't choose the deletion approach because of deeply rooted theoretical conviction, but for more practical reasons - this method, not uncommon in Natural Language Generation systems, works same for creating

natural, less redundant text, do acknowledge that certain types of ellipsis are more sensitive to syntactic constraints such as island constraints than others, and therefore treat the various types of ellipsis as different constructions subject to different constraints.

Unfortunately many approaches to “aggregation”, the NLG term for processes that, among other things, create elliptical utterances from nonelliptical ones, are often just mechanical steps within the generation process, and the hard questions of why and when ellipsis is grammatical, or even felicitous, are not answered. Our workshop desiderata was in part a reaction to this missing work. This gap by going beyond merely mechanically manipulating syntactic structure. Their implementation uses rhetorical structure to constrain the felicity of the application of the deletion rules, an original contribution. In this way they incorporate discourse and contextual information. Their work includes an in depth study of rhetorical structure marking cue phrases in English. In effect, syntactic aggregation in their system must be licensed by rhetorical structure. This is clearly a necessary constraint on syntactic aggregation, because, as results from work by Grammarians have shown, eliding structures can sometimes void potential rhetorical interpretations that are possible in the unelided form. For example, applying gapping to two conjuncts that are ambiguously in a causal or parallel rhetorical relation removes the causal reading, which in many cases can be the intended reading.

However, rhetorical relations are the same a very coarse tool for capturing discourse structure and not all types of reduced utterances can be generated by appealing to syntactic manipulations. Fragments or sub-sentential units cannot be generated this way. Other’s paper, ‘Optimizing elliptical utterances in dialogue’, examines just these types of utterances, with a novel information structure-based method that captures contextual effects. Another researchers point out that naming these short utterances ‘fragments’ or ‘sub-sentential units’ gives the wrong connotations, as they are fully interpretable utterances within their context of use.

She explicitly states that she follows in not considering fragments to be fragmentary or derived by deletion. Her analysis incorporates the results of an empirical study of the use of short or elliptical utterances or fragments in naturally produced dialogue. Having studied natural examples, that is then able to generate questions and answers in dialogue, making reference only to information structural categories such as Focus, base and ground. This is an innovative pragmatic approach; few researchers have formalized in such detail the way in which the relation between the information content of an utterance and the discourse context affects the form of the utterance. The focus is placed on how speakers select what material can be left unarticulated while the same preserving recoverability given the context. That does all of this in an optimality theory analysis, concentrating on non-syntactic constraints and persuasively demonstrating that felicitous ellipsis generation the same need to make reference to information structure.

But are these short utterances a form of ellipsis? Their proper treatment is another major source of current debate, and recently a collection of papers was published on just this topic that's examples share enough characteristics with traditional cases of ellipsis that it seems sensible to study them within this research. Further, since that's approach makes some specific predictions about when reduced forms are appropriate give a specific context, it seems a promising way to begin discussing the licensing conditions of more traditional forms of ellipsis.

Both and That look at ellipsis from the perspective of generation. Even though their objects of analysis and their intended results are very different, it is same eliminating to compare them to each other. Diploma work is work from the perspective of text generation, and looks at how syntactically described processes can be applied to make more natural sentences. The naturalness of the resulting sentences is believed to arise in part because the elided version removes redundancy. Could, However, this redundancy and its felicitous removal instead be described in the pragmatic terms of information structure of that's analysis? This might lead to an even more accurate account of why the aggregated sentences seem

to be more natural. Further I know from corpus studies of ellipsis such as that ellipsis doesn't get applied in all cases where it structurally could. Some of these exceptions may be because of rhetorical constraints like the ones explored in but some may be for information structural reasons. How these pragmatic considerations interact with ellipsis are exciting questions for future research. The fourth paper of this special issue, 'negation and speech act operators', also presents examples where pragmatic information systematically influences the interpretations available. One grammarian discusses the interaction of discourse constraints with semantic and syntactic ones, by arguing that whether the negation in gapped sentences takes wide scope over the entire coordination, or whether it is interpreted in each conjunct individually actually depends on the type of speech act that the gapped utterance is being used for. Wide scope negation is argued only to be available in denials or similar speech acts, and distributed scope in other cases. This is a particularly interesting analysis because it shows how pragmatic factors can explain an otherwise confusing set of syntactic and semantic facts. One grammarian's analysis, which looks closely at the phenomenon in English, further the importance of studying ellipsis in a variety of languages, because the anomaly of the wide scope readings are most clear when other facts for English are considered.

1.3. Different types of ellipsis in the language teaching

There are numerous widely acknowledged types of ellipsis. Nine of them are mentioned and briefly below: gapping, stripping, VP-ellipsis, pseudogapping, answer fragments, sluicing, N-ellipsis, comparative deletion, and null complement anaphora. One should note that there is no unanimity among experts that all nine of the mechanisms should indeed qualify as ellipsis. Most experts would agree, however, that most of the nine are in fact ellipses. The discussion below takes their status as ellipses largely for granted.

The example sentences below employ the convention whereby the elided material is indicated with subscripts and smaller font size

Verb phrase ellipsis (also VP-ellipsis or VPE) is a particularly frequent form of ellipsis in English. VP-ellipsis elides a non-finite VP. The ellipsis must be introduced by an auxiliary verb or by the particle *to*.

John can play the guitar; Mary can play the guitar too. - VP-ellipsis

He has done it before, which means he does it again. - VP-ellipsis

An aspect of VP-ellipsis that is unlike gapping and stripping is that it can occur forwards or backwards. That is, the ellipsis can precede or follow its antecedent:

The man who wanted to order the salmon did order the salmon. - VP-ellipsis

The man who wanted to order the salmon did order the salmon. - VP-ellipsis

Of the various ellipsis mechanisms, VP-ellipsis has probably been studied the most and it is therefore relatively understood. Verb phrase ellipsis is a phenomenon in English which permits a speaker to omit a verb phrase from an utterance when its meaning is recoverable from context. Ellipsis has been a phenomenon of interest within the linguistics literature for decades, in part because it involves multiple interacting components of the grammar—among these phrase structure, co-reference, focus, and intonation, but also because a core set of basic data has, over the years, proven especially recalcitrant to analysis.

The sentence in excerpted from a news article, is a prototypical example, in which conjoined clauses form the ‘antecedent’ and the ‘target’ clauses involved in the ellipsis. The target clause, here the second conjunct, contains a verb phrase headed by the auxiliary verb ‘did’. The verb phrase complement to that auxiliary has been elided. The meaning of the elided verb phrase is supplied by the antecedent. Despite the ‘missing’ verb phrase in the target, the ellipsis in is understood to have the interpretation in where the target verb phrase is indicated in brackets.

Although the bulk of the literature on ellipsis has focused on conjoined ellipses like this one, ellipses can occur in a variety of syntactic configurations and across a broad range of discourse contexts antecedent and target need not, for example, occur in the same sentence. This is demonstrated in where the antecedent

clause (containing the verb ‘modify’) occurs in a separate sentence preceding the ellipsis. “The conventional wisdom used to be that you couldn’t modify the immune response of an infected individual” by calculating them with synthetic viral proteins.

Antecedent and target may even be uttered by different participants within the discourse, as in

Sen. Lieberman: Do I understand that the Soviets deny that that was an explosion that—Dr. Erlick: Yes, they do.

What all of these examples share in common is a dependency between an elided verb phrase and some antecedent clause in the preceding context. The precise nature of this dependency, however, has been much debated. The evolution of the deletion model of verb phrase ellipsis reflects the development of one model of the syntax/semantics interface over a span of some thirty years; it also reflects the changing theoretical commitments of the Chomskyan approach to grammar. In general, the deletion analyses described below are not specific to verb phrase ellipsis, but instead have been applied to a broad range of elliptical phenomena, including ‘sluicing’, ‘gapping’, and other verbal anaphors. The earliest analyses of ellipsis modeled it as a deletion phenomenon, one which converted an input string like into an output string like

- (1) *The driver [reported the incident], and the pedestrian did [report the incident] too.*
- (2) *The driver [reported the incident], and the pedestrian did [] too.*

Rules proposed to describe the deletion transformation posited a licensing condition which involved deep structure identity between two verb phrases and marked the deletion transformation as optional. One of specialists on linguistic theory pursued the idea that the level at which the identity condition must apply to license deletion is LF- Logical Form. As described in the previous chapter, appealing to LF, a ‘covert’ level of representation distinct from both surface structure and deep structure, supported a principled distinction between affix

mismatch, which does not block the deletion transformation, and syntactic mismatch, which in some cases does. The deletion model of ellipsis was subsequently updated to conform to the theoretical assumptions of the Principles and Parameters theory and later the Minimalist Program. The current ‘PF Deletion’ model of ellipsis, as it is called, shares with one of specialists on linguistic model the assumption that an ellipsis site is associated with syntactic structure at Logical Form. Where one of specialists on linguistic account described a deletion transformation affecting surface structure, However, contemporary PF Deletion accounts instead describe a blocking effect which suppresses the Phonological Form (PF) of the ellipsis That is, under one of specialists on linguistic account, the elided verb phrase is absent at surface structure, having been deleted; under the PF deletion account, the verb phrase is never really gone—it just isn’t pronounced.² Phonological form is analogous, in this respect, to surface structure, in that it is the level at which the ellipsis is detectable. The blocking or deletion process responsible for the ellipsis, however, was not modeled as a syntactic transformation, but was instead treated as an interface phenomenon involving LF and PF. This move offered a potentially unified analysis of both ellipsis and accenting, which was explored in further detail by grammarian work addressed sluicing primarily, but was also applied to verb phrase ellipsis. In that account, the identity condition licensing deletion was formulated as a strictly semantic relationship of ‘mutual entailment’. Because contemporary deletion accounts do not model a simple deletion under identity transformation, but instead posit an identity constraint at one level of representation which licenses suppression/deletion at another level, the predictions of those accounts regarding the possibility of mismatch between antecedent and target are dependent on the details of the implementation of the identity constraint. Under one of specialists on linguistic model, where the identity condition applies at LF, whether syntactic

²As Schwabe and Winkler point out, this revised model of ellipsis as absence of phonological form is at once ‘[close to] unrefutable’ but also ‘trivially true’.

mismatch is permitted depends on the types of representations assumed at that level. One of specialists on linguistic describes two possible representations for LF structures one encodes strictly semantic information about a predicate and its arguments. The alternative, which one of specialists on linguistic adopts, is a quasi-syntactic structure which also encodes grammatical relations like subjecthood, as a result, encoding basic predicate-argument structure. One of specialists on linguistic choice is informed by previous work which describes ellipsis in terms of identity of predication, and the resulting model licenses ellipsis only in structures with parallel predicate/argument structure. There is some ambiguity in another model, which adopts a semantic identity condition, as to whether that account admits syntactic mismatches between antecedent and target. The issue was sidestepped in another in subsequent work contrasting verb phrase ellipsis with a related structure called pseudogapping, that argued that whether a mismatch between antecedent and target is permitted depends on the level at which deletion occurs. If deletion targets a node which is below Voice-P VP is unmarked for voice, and a mismatch is possible. If, However, deletion targets a node above Voice-P, the VP is marked for voice, and a mismatch is not possible.

The relevant point for the current discussion is that in modern deletion accounts, the identity condition licensing ellipsis does not apply to syntactic structure. Rather, it applies either in the semantics or at logical form. Depending on the implementation, predictions regarding mismatch may align with ‘traditional’ syntactic accounts alternatively they may align with semantic accounts In either case, predictions are categorical, and some explanation data are very essential for counting down.

Pseudogapping. Many linguists take pseudogapping to be a particular manifestation of VP-ellipsis (not of gapping). Like VP-ellipsis, pseudogapping is introduced by an auxiliary verb. Pseudogapping differs from VP-ellipsis, However, insofar as the elided VP is not entirely gone, but rather one (or more) remnants of the VP appear. This aspect of pseudogapping gives it the outward appearance of

gapping. Pseudogapping occurs frequently in comparative and contrastive contexts: *They have been eating the apples more than they have ^{been eating} the oranges.* – *Pseudogapping I will feed the chickens today if you ^{feed} the chickens tomorrow.* – *Pseudogapping.* Pseudogapping is more restricted in distribution than VP-ellipsis. For instance it can hardly occur backwards, i.e. the ellipsis can hardly precede its antecedent. Further examples:

Would you want to say that to me, or would I ^{want to say that} to you? - *Pseudogapping*
They could read this book more easily than they could ^{read} that book.

Another noteworthy trait of pseudogapping (and one that supports the view that it is a type of VP-ellipsis) is that it is absent from languages related to English.

Answer ellipsis involves question-answer pairs. The question focuses an unknown piece of information, often using an interrogative word (e.g. *who*, *what*, *when*, etc.). The corresponding answer provides the missing information and in so doing, the redundant information that appeared in the question is elided, e.g.

Q: Who has been hiding the truth? Arthur ^{has been hiding the truth.} - *Answer fragment*

Q: What have you been trying to accomplish? A: I have been trying to accomplish ^{This darn crossword.} - *Answer fragment*

The fragment answers in these two sentences are verb arguments (subject and object NPs). The fragment can also correspond to an adjunct, e.g.

Q: When does the circus start? A: ^{The circus starts} Tomorrow. - *Answer fragment*

Q: Why has the campaign been so crazy? A: ^{The campaign has been so crazy} Due to the personalities. - *Answer fragment*

Answer ellipsis occurs in most if not all languages. It is a very frequent type of ellipsis that is omnipresent in everyday communication between speakers.

Sluicing usually elides everything from a direct or indirect question except the question word. It is a frequent type of ellipsis that appears to occur in most if not all languages. It can operate both forwards and backwards like VP-ellipsis, but unlike gapping, stripping, answer fragments, and pseudogapping, e.g.

John can play something, but I don't know ^{what he can play.} - *Sluicing*

When he can call I don't know, but John can definitely call. - Sluicing

The sluicing with these two sentences has occurred in indirect questions. Sluicing in direct questions is with the following two examples:

A: Something unusual happened. B: What happened? - Sluicing

A: He has been working on the problem. B: When has he been working on the problem? -

Sluicing has been studied intensely in the past decade and can be field as a relatively same understood ellipsis mechanism, although the theoretical analysis of certain aspects of sluicing remains controversial.

Noun ellipsis (also N-ellipsis, N'-ellipsis, NP-ellipsis, NPE, ellipsis in the DP) occurs when the noun and potentially accompanying modifiers are omitted from a noun phrase. Nominal ellipsis occurs with a limited set of determinatives in English (cardinal and ordinal numbers and possessive determiners), whereas it is much freer in other languages. The following examples, nominal ellipsis with cardinal and ordinal numbers:

Fred did three onerous tasks because Susan had done two onerous tasks. - nominal ellipsis

The first train and the second train have arrived. - nominal ellipsis

And the following two sentences illustrate nominal ellipsis with possessive determiners:

I heard Mary's dog, and you heard Bill's dog. - N-ellipsis

If Doris tries my chili, I will try hers chili. - N-ellipsis

Comparative deletion occurs in comparative clauses introduced by *than* in English. The expression in the comparative clause is elided that corresponds to the expression focused by a comparative morph such as *more* or *-er* in the antecedent clause, e.g.

More people arrived than I expected people would arrive. - Comparative deletion

She ordered more beer than I could drink beer. - Comparative deletion

Doris looks more satisfied than Doreen looks satisfied. - Comparative deletion

William has friends in more countries than you have friends in countries. -

Comparative deletion is different from many of the other optional ellipsis mechanisms insofar as it is obligatory. The non-elliptical versions of these sentences are unacceptable.

Null complement anaphora elides a complete complement, whereby the elided complement is a finite clause, infinitive phrase, or prepositional phrase. The verbal predicates that can license null complement anaphora form a limited set (e.g. *know, approve, refuse, decide*). Interestingly, the elided complement cannot be a noun phrase.

Q: Do you know what happened? A: No, I don't know what happened. - Null complement anaphora

Q: Do you approve of the plan? A: No, I don't approve of the plan. - Null complement anaphora

They told Bill to help, but he refused to help. - Null complement anaphora

They offered two ways to spend the day, but I couldn't decide between them. - Null complement anaphora

of the various ellipsis mechanisms, null complement anaphora is the least studied. In this regard, its status as ellipsis is a point of debate, since its behavior is not consistent with the behavior of many of the other ellipsis mechanisms.

Chapter II. Practical Peculiarities of ellipsis in different styles

2.1. A range of utilization of ellipsis in the Publicist style.

The ellipsis is the economist of the language, enabling us to avoid the unnecessary repetition of words. Thus : *I was to take the east path and Steve was to take the west path* becomes – I was to take the east path and Steve, the west.

Ellipses are common to both formal and informal English, but there is an important difference. In formal English the omitted words in the elliptical sentence must be ones that would appear twice in the full sentence. In our example, these are the words *was to take* and *path* – *I was to take the east path and Steve was to take the west path*. In formal English, then, we are allowed to omit only what would otherwise be duplicated. There is no such requirement with informal English; words are simply left out – *Seems like a good idea. (Elliptical sentence)*

It seems like a good idea to me. (Full sentence; no duplication of omitted word) A few more examples might help reinforce the point .
Formal English. *He was, and remains, the greatest footballer ever. (Elliptical sentence).*

He was the greatest footballer ever, and remains the greatest footballer ever. (Full sentence with duplication)

I believe that this party can, and will, win the next election. (Elliptical sentence)

I believe that this party can win the next election and will win the next election. (Full sentence with duplication).

Informal English

Fancy a pint? (Elliptical sentence)

Do you fancy a pint? (Full sentence; no duplication)

What if we repeat the experiment using only half the quantity of drug? (Elliptical sentence)

What would happen if we repeat the experiment using only half the quantity of drug? (Full sentence; no duplication)

Note that, in formal English, the omission of unduplicated words results in grammatical errors and, while these are rarely so serious as to confuse readers, perfectionists can feel annoyed with themselves when the errors are pointed out – *She has, and always will be, an incurable optimist. (Incorrect)*

If we cut out the inessential *and always will be*, we are left with the rather odd – *She has an incurable optimist.* What the writer has done is to exceed her allowance of word omissions. The full sentence, with the duplications underlined, would be –

*She has been an incurable optimist and always will be an incurable optimist but the writer has also omitted the unduplicated been. Corrected, the elliptical sentence reads – *She has been, and always will be, an incurable optimist.* Finally, the only place for unduplicated ellipses in formal English is in quotations, where a series of dots [...] indicates the words that the quoting writer has chosen to omit –*

The days that followed the flight of James saw even greater confusion in England than the months which preceded the Restoration... Then there had been too many claimants to legal authority; now there was no legal authority at all.

The full passage of specialists on linguistic, with the ellipsis underlined, reads –

The days that followed the flight of James saw even greater confusion in England than the months which preceded the Restoration or those which ushered in the Civil War. Then there had been too many claimants to legal authority; now there was no legal authority at all.

If the first word following an ellipsis begins a sentence in the quoting author's passage of specialists on linguistic but not in the original, its initial is capitalized in square brackets – *The days that followed the flight of James saw even greater confusion in England than the months which preceded the Restoration.... there was no legal authority at all.* The use of dots to indicate unfinished spoken

sentences is a feature of narrative and informal English only – ‘Well! I mean...’ (G. M. Trevelyan, *England Under the Stuarts*, Methuen, London, 1977, p.

Ellipsis was already mentioned as a characteristic feature of the block language. As newspaper headlines use the linguistic utterances of this language variety, ellipsis is quite a common phenomenon that characterizes ellipsis as "the omission of elements which are recoverable from the linguistic context or the situation". The missing word or words can be inserted "without changing the meaning and without producing an ungrammatical structure". Its main purpose is to condense the same meaning into a smaller number of words. They also differentiate three categories concerning the position of ellipsis within the sentence: initial, medial and final ellipsis. Only two types, however, appeared among the analyzed headlines- medial and initial, that is why the third type is not described any further.

Medial ellipsis is usually related to the omission of the operator, generally, it can be said that medial elements in a clause are ellipted. Concerning headlines, it means that in the utterances with this type of ellipsis auxiliary verbs are the most frequent elements which are omitted. It goes sayings also says that this type of ellipsis is more common in American English.

Initial ellipsis. Not only an auxiliary verb, but also subject is omitted in utterances with initial ellipsis. Such words are usually at the beginning of the clause and they are regarded as words with a low information value (e.g. *I stood up and shook his hand*. - the subject *I* is omitted in the second clause.) Moreover, that distinguishes three categories of ellipsis in terms of its recoverability- situational, structural and textual. As just situational and structural ellipsis are found in the corpus, textual is not more considered.

Situational ellipsis says that "typically situational ellipsis is initial, especially taking the form of omission of subject and/or operator" (e.g. *See you tomorrow*.- *I* and *will* omitted at the beginning of the clause.). As they further remark, the precise interpretation of such utterances is only possible with the

knowledge of the extralinguistic context. It means that there are several possibilities how to interpret such clauses and only with the knowledge of some further information, this interpretation would be correct.

Structural ellipsis. For this type of ellipsis, the most important knowledge is that of grammatical structures (e.g. *I guess you are Mark.- that* is omitted between *guess* and *you*). Quirk et al. remark that this type is often confined to written language and it involves "the common omission of determiners, operators, and other closed-class words in block language".

Analysis of ellipsis collected headlines. All headlines included in the corpus can be divided into two major groups according to their structure- sentential (those with a regular sentence structure- major sentences) and non-sentential headlines (the headlines with an irregular sentence structure- minor sentences). The first group includes all headlines that contain a subject and a predicate. The second one consists of headlines without a predicate, often just with a non-finite verb phrase or in the form of a phrase. Many authors who are concerned with journalism or headline writing are in agreement that a good headline needs both a subject and a verb to convey information properly. Consistent with this, only sentential headlines could be regarded as correct. Though, there are many non-sentential headlines which attract the readers' attention more and which are matching better with the article. The material searched for the purpose of this paper consists of 200 newspaper headlines that are chosen randomly from 6 different British newspapers- The Sun, the Daily Mirror and the Daily Mail, The Times, The Guardian and the Daily Telegraph. Furthermore, these newspapers can be generally divided into two groups- tabloid and broadsheet newspapers. Each group is represented equally by 100 headlines. As the used material is limited, it cannot exemplify all features of newspaper headlines. It just tries to exemplify some of the general characteristic features which are introduced in the first part. Firstly, two types of newspapers are introduced, and secondly, individual grammatical features are exemplified in for the complete analysis see the appendix.

Tabloid newspapers. The Sun, the Daily Mirror and the Daily Mail are representatives of so called tabloid newspapers, or as Evans says popular papers with a large circulation and mass appeal one of the characteristics of this type of press is its format. It is smaller than broadsheet newspapers and it is likely to highlight sensational crime stories, gossip columns repeating scandalous innuendos about the personal lives of celebrities and sports stars.

2.2. The Acquisition research on ellipsis

Acquisition research on ellipsis has focused mainly on verb phrase and noun phrase ellipsis (VPE and NPE from now on), and only one study looked at the acquisition of sluicing. Before discussing results from experimental studies on the acquisition of ellipsis, it is interesting to look at some examples from spontaneous speech data provided in the literature. It stands out that young children are already quite capable of dealing with ellipsis and that child directed speech contains a lot of elliptical structures, probably because for children ‘shorter is easier’ Looking at corpus data from children I see that, for example, a 2-year-old already produces structures containing NPE, as evidenced by Nina

Mother: Whose hat is that?

Child: Mrs. Wood's_ .

However, production of a structure does not imply comprehension or full control over the structure at hand, and looking at corpus data from Sarah when she was 4 years old I see that ellipsis in child directed speech can also lead to communication failure:

(1) *Mother: Do you want some milk or do you want some juice?*

Child: I milk juice [?]

Mother: huh?

Child: milk juice

Mother: No, you can either have one or the other. You can't have both.

Child: milk juice

The child is obviously confused by the first question of her mother, but when the

mother tries to help, she uses an elliptical sentence which does not make it any clearer for the child. The mother's phrase "No you can either have one or the other. You can't have both" should be reconstructed by the child as: "No, you can either have one of the milk or the juice or the other of the milk and the juice. You can't have both the milk and the juice." It appears the child is not yet capable of doing this at this age. While ellipsis is frequent in children's language input and they produce some simple forms of ellipsis already from the age of 2, mastering all elliptical structures and being able to reconstruct previous linguistic information from the discourse might not be so simple for young children.

Looking at the literature on how children deal with discourse integration in other domains than elliptical structures, it has been argued that discourse integration is quite a late achievement in language development. Research from that children up until the age of six rather use deictic information than anaphora resolution to interpret definite noun phrases and pronouns in a story context. They thus prefer to use visual information over discourse information. This and other converging evidence has led a number of researchers to claim that differences between child and adult language use arise not because of a difference in syntactic ability but because of a difference at the interface between syntax and discourse. But, as Santos points out, other studies question this idea and show that adult L2 learners make some of the same mistakes as the children in the above mentioned studies, showing that these mistakes cannot be due to a delay of pragmatic development.

Since the beginning of the 1990s quite a number of experimental studies have looked into children's comprehension and production of VPE and NPE in order to determine the acquisition path of elliptical structures in more detail. At the same time these studies further investigate the relation between the acquisition of syntax and the acquisition of semantics and discourse integration, precisely because elliptical structures "appear to straddle the interface between syntax and pragmatics"

At the acquisition of VPE in relation to the acquisition of another related structure, called verb phrase anaphora (VP A). These structures only differ slightly from each other, but have a different distribution, for example with regard to voice. Experiments. The only previous acquisition experiment that looked at sluicing was a grammaticality judgment task. Comprehension of sluicing has never been tested in children. The goal of our study is to see if preschool children apply the same restrictions when they interpret the ellipsis site in sluicing sentences as adults, and produce sluicing sentences in an adult-like way. I developed a novel paradigm for testing comprehension and production, focusing on sluicing in coordinated sentences in English of the type in someone pushes a car but I see not who. Someone is pushing a car, but I can't see who. All test items had this form and they all used the same question word 'who' as introducer of the sluice. Interpretation was tested with a picture-selection task and production with an elicitation task.

The sluicing items all involve embedding (*see* takes a complement clause) so I developed a pretest to make sure the participants could handle embedded structures. The pretest has the same setup as the comprehension experiment, so the first two items of the pretest effectively functioned as training items for the comprehension experiment. This way the pretest was used both to make sure the children understood the task as same as to make sure they could interpret simple embedded sentences that describes the participants and general procedure for both experiments. The specific methods, materials, and procedures for the comprehension and production experiment are given respectively.

Production experiment. For the production experiment, I developed an elicitation task with the goal of eliciting the second half of a coordinated sluicing sentence of the type used in the comprehension experiment. With this experiment I wanted to find out if children are able to produce sluicing sentences, and with the setup of the experiment I could also test if they preferred to use elliptical sentences over full non-elliptical counterparts. To get children to produce sluicing sentences

is not easy, but I believe the experiment I developed served the task same. The production experiment was modeled after the sentences used in the comprehension experiment, specifically the sluicing sentences with negation, i.e. where the agent cannot be seen. To produce a sentence in the form of ‘yes, but I can’t see who’ is quite natural in a context where someone expects the child to see who is performing the action and the child needs to correct that assumption. I created this context in the form of a card game: the children are expected to tell the experimenter who is doing what on the picture cards. In every round of the game, the children are given three pictures, and asked three questions, all relating to one of the pictures. The third question was the critical one targeting a sluicing sentence. Example pictures and accompanying questions with the target answers are given. The first two questions are about the pictures where the agents are visible and these function to create a context where the child is able to give an answer and tell the experimenter who is doing what. These two questions always preceded the critical question about the third picture, which was intended to elicit a sluicing sentence, because this time the agent was hidden behind a curtain and the child could not tell who was performing the action. ³For the critical items the eight verbs of the comprehension experiment are used, resulting in eight test items.

At the beginning of the experiment, the children are told that they would participate in another game (they all already participated in the comprehension experiment prior to participating in the production experiment), and that in this game they are the ones to say something about the pictures, just as the puppet had done in the previous game. In the previous game the puppet would sometimes say that he could see something, but he also sometimes said that he could not see something.⁴ Then the experiment was introduced as a card game and practice

³ It was brought to our attention by Marlies Kluck that the answers to the filler questions, (37) and (38), are considered to be elliptical sentences by some of the ellipsis literature. These structures are called fragment answers in the literature and are sometimes argued to be a form of sluicing too (Merchant 2004).

⁴ The fact that the puppet said that he could not see something proved to be important for the children. In trial runs of the production experiment it became clear that children at this age do not like to admit they cannot see something, and without

cards are shown to the children. The experimenter told the children that in the actual game the children are to hold the cards so that the experimenter could not see them. However, the experimenter wanted to know what was on the card, so the child should tell the experimenter who was doing something on the cards.

With a practice item the children are specifically trained to answer the two questions in the way displayed in and instead of only with ‘yes’. It is only in this way that the sluicing answer to the third question comes naturally. The experimenter asked one of the questions and let the child answer spontaneously, then correcting the answer to ‘yes, a man/woman’. This was practiced until the children got it (usually after two or three practice questions). Then the picture with the curtain covering the agent was introduced and the experimenter told the child what he should answer to a question about such a picture in the following way:

“If you see a picture like this, where you cannot see the person, and I ask the question ‘is someone pulling a boat?’, you can answer by saying: yes, but I cannot see who is pulling a boat. ’Can you repeat this answer?’”

This was practiced by the children, and they all repeated this full non-elliptical answer to the critical question. Note that this practice item does not involve a sluice, but the full non-elliptical answer, so no sluices are trained. After the practice items the experiment started. If the children forgot to answer the questions as practiced the experimenter would remind them to answer in the way of or , but no extra feedback was given on the critical questions.

Results. Everyone in the group responded at ceiling on the comprehension task and produced mainly sluices in the production task.⁵ After analyzing the results from the pretest, 5 children are excluded from analysis because they had made two or more mistakes with the embedded wh- questions.⁶ In the following

this specific instruction they would instead guess whether it was a man or a woman standing behind the curtain.

⁵ The adult data for the production task made it very evident how natural it was to use sluicing sentences instead of the full counterparts in this experiment. The children were trained to answer with a non-elliptical sentence to the critical question, and the same introduction was given to the adults. However, when presenting adults with this non-elliptical answer they all immediately commented that it would be unnatural for them to use, and that they would rather give the sluiced version.

⁶ The other exclusion criterion was 2 or more mistakes on the full counterpart control items, but this did not occur in the data.

sections the results from the comprehension and production experiment are discussed, using the data of the 25 children who passed the pretest. The age of this group ranged from 5-6 with a mean age of 6.

Results comprehension experiment. In the comprehension task, the possible answers are the same action and object, the picture with a different object, and the picture with a different action. That shows the picture choices per condition. The results of the comprehension and production experiment give a clear picture: English children with an average age of 5 comprehend sluices in an adult-like way, and they are also able to produce sluicing sentences correctly. In the adult grammar the directly preceding linguistic discourse serves as antecedent to recover the meaning of the ellipsis site in a sluicing sentence. The comprehension experiment was developed to see if children obey this same restriction when they interpret sluicing sentences or whether they are more liberal, allowing partial recovery of the preceding antecedent (by choosing same verb with different object, or different verb with same object pictures). Our results strongly indicate that children are as restricted as adults. The fact that all children responded at ceiling indicates that they strongly prefer an adult-like interpretation of the sluicing sentences above the other options presented in . The non-target answers in the comprehension experiment visually provided other objects and actions that could in principle have been used to the ellipsis site, but they understood perfectly that they are not supposed to do that.

The production results are also quite striking, because they show that the children really preferred to produce sluicing sentences over full non-elliptical counterparts. In the training session of the production experiment the children are told to give the full answer: “yes, but I can’t see who is pulling a boat.” This is the non-elliptical counterpart of the sluicing sentence I tried to elicit, and during the training session all the children repeated this sentence. The fact that most of them proceeded to answer the test items with sluices indicates that they believe (subconsciously of course) an elliptical sentence is better suited as an answer in

this context. This corresponds to the responses received from the adult control group who immediately commented that they could produce the non-elliptical sentence, but that it would be quite unnatural for them to do so.

Connecting the results found in our study to the results found in previous work on other types of ellipsis, I see that studies on VPE and NPE found that children are quite proficient in interpreting and producing elliptical structures for sluicing in English children. Using a grammaticality judgment task, he found that his youngest age group, with an age range similar to ours of 4-5, did not accept sluicing sentences as grammatical. But, as discussed previously, his methodology does not test comprehension of sluicing sentences, but tries to elicit meta-linguistic knowledge. The task is rather artificial, and it is not clear that children at this age are capable of showing such knowledge. Our task on the other hand tests interpretation and production in a natural and playful way, because the experiments resemble children's games. Based on the children's poor results on non-elliptical control items, that concluded that children at this age have trouble with sluicing, because they have not yet acquired question embedding in non-elliptical sentences. Somebody is painting a picture, but I don't know who is painting a picture. However, our pretest with embedded questions of the type in that almost all children at this age are capable of interpreting embedded questions, questioning Wood's conclusion even more.. 'I see who washes a plate.'

As discussed in a number of studies on discourse integration outside of elliptical structures casted doubt on the idea that children up to the age of six are capable of integrating discourse information. Our results show that children under the age of six are quite capable of giving precedence to the verbal discourse context instead of visual information when interpreting this type of anaphora, the reconstruction of the ellipsis site in a sluicing sentence. Based on the results of studies on other types of ellipsis, such as NPE and VPE, that also found that children around the age of 4 use the verbal discourse in resolving the ellipsis site, I hypothesized that children would also do this with the ellipsis site in sluicing sentences, and that is precisely

what I have found.

The question that comes up next is what do younger children do? This is something future research should look into; with the experimental paradigms I developed this can now be done. During the sessions with the children it became clear they had no trouble with the experimental method and I believe children from the age of 5 can be tested with these materials. When I know at what age children begin to understand and produce sluicing sentences, I can further determine the acquisition path for ellipsis by including sluicing next to NPE and VPE. This acquisition path for ellipsis represents the results found showing that children first acquire NPE and then VPE. Looking at how much structure is elided in these ellipsis types I expect sluicing to be acquired later than VPE.

Our method should show that children prefer an adult-like interpretation of sluicing sentences, but it cannot show that they would never allow a non-adult like interpretation. A follow-up experiment could use the same test sentences and pictures, but then in a truth value judgment paradigm. By presenting the children and seeing if they accept a sluicing sentence for such a picture, I can tell if they are also able to reject non-target interpretations.

Other interesting points for future research include testing sluicing in other languages, and looking at different sluicing structures. By looking at different types of sluicing, for example sentences like *Are an adverb is included in the antecedent clause, see I can determine more precisely how much structure is reconstructed by children.*

Someone is reading a book out loud, but I can't see who.

Do children behave adult-like and reconstruct the entire antecedent including the adverbial phrase 'out loud', or do they (at first) reconstruct only the verb and its object? In section 1 four different theoretical analyses of sluicing and ellipsis are discussed, see Numerous arguments for all four of these approaches have been put forward in the literature. At this stage, it was not our goal to distinguish between these analyses with our experimental data, but this is an interesting angle for

follow-up experiments. If the underlying structure of an ellipsis site in sluicing is indeed an embedded wh-question, I predict a correlation between the acquisition of sluicing and the acquisition of wh-movement. However, if there is no underlying wh-clause, but rather a null pronoun or an underlying cleft, then this link between the acquisition of sluicing and the acquisition of wh-movement is not expected.

Our results unambiguously show that ellipsis for English 5-year-old children is easy to interpret and to produce, supporting the idea that ellipsis is acquired early. Other work shows that other types of ellipsis are already produced by 2-year-olds. When theoretically analyzing elliptical structures it is not obvious that these structures should be easy for children, since they involve a number of complicated steps and their interpretation is restricted in quite specific ways. But, as showed with an example dialogue without any form of ellipsis: “Life would be impossibly inefficient without ellipsis - no conversation would be bearable without it” Children seem to pick this up quickly, even when it involves leaving out almost a whole sentence, as is the case in sluicing. Future research is needed to determine precisely at what age sluicing is acquired, but with our research I have contributed a novel paradigm for testing sluicing that can be used to further determine the acquisition path of sluicing in English and other languages.

2.3 The Significant features of ellipsis in Foreign Language learning under the example of literature.

Ellipsis is a literary device that is used in narratives to omit some parts of a sentence or event, which gives the reader a chance to the gaps while acting or reading it out. It is usually written between the sentences. Apart from being convenient, ellipsis also helps in advancing the story. The part of a sentence or an event that is left out by substituting it with ellipses is often used to either save time or use it as a stylistic element by allowing the reader in the gaps by using their imagination. Ellipsis can be dated back to Earnest Hemingway who also presented the Iceberg theory, which is also called the theory of omission.

Authors use ellipses for many reasons, similar to the diverse ways we use ellipses in written and spoken language. Authors generally use ellipsis examples in their works of literature to indicate an omission of unnecessary words or information. Authors also use examples of ellipsis to build tension when it seems as though a character or the narrator is leaving something unfinished, unsaid, or un-started. The popularity and of specialists on linguistics of ellipsis has also changed over time; it used to be more common to find ellipses standing in for proper nouns or expletives. Journalists and academicians also use ellipses in their writing to indicate that a quote has been condensed for purposes of saving space. Ellipsis

Function 1: The ellipsis shows a substantial pause of hesitation, one that allows a writer to mimic a hesitation in speech. This hesitation can show uncertainty, irony, humor, and other effects. A good example is the sentence I wrote a bit earlier:

If only I had a nickel for every time I've had this conversation. I would have . . . let me see . . . well, about two dollars. Still, that's a good many nickels!

The first ellipsis shows that I am rethinking my calculation. The second ellipsis shows that I am hesitating because I do not want to say that the total is (a mere) two dollars. Commas, while they do show pauses, would not show enough of a hesitation to express my uncertainty. Dashes—while they do show spontaneous shifts in thought—would be too sudden and assertive. I need a soft lingering, a moment to beat around the bush and to show embarrassment (even if it's feigned). That's the ellipsis!

Ellipsis Function 2: The ellipsis shows an omission of words, usually within a quotation. It says, "There is more here in the original words I am quoting, but I am leaving those words out to save space or to cut to the chase on my point. If you want to see all the words used, please feel free to look at the original source (which, of course, I've documented for you in my 'Works Cited' section, since I want you to check out the good stuff I've been reading and quoting)."

You can also use an ellipsis to show the omission of items from a very long list when you do not need to name all the items in the list to get your point across. Just

be careful not to manipulate your omissions so as to change the meaning of the original quote (a subtle linguistic deception we see often in advertising and in the news media). While efficiency and concision are important, stay true to the original writer's message. Logically enough, I call this function *an ellipsis of omission*. It is not a stylistic use of the ellipsis, but one that writers use to stay true to their original texts while saving time and space. Here's an example of an ellipsis of omission: First, here is the full text from the quote:

MLK, in his momentous "I Have a Dream" speech, proclaimed, "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

And here is how a writer might omit elements to save space or to get to the point:

MLK, in his momentous "I Have a Dream" speech, proclaimed, "I have a dream that my four little children . . . will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

See how that works?

Avoiding Ellipsis Confusion: Placing the Ellipsis in Brackets

This article has discussed the two functions of the ellipsis:

Function 1: show a stylistic hesitation within writing (stylistic ellipsis)

Function 2: show an omission of language from a quotation (ellipsis of omission)

But what happens if these two functions collide? What happens if I am omitting language from a quotation that has preexisting stylistic ellipses? How can I show the reader that some of those ellipses are mine while others are the ellipses of the original writer I'm quoting? The next article explains precisely how to make that differentiation.

Poets may also use ellipses to indicate irony or make the reader consider a certain thought or line.(see appendix 4)

Example 1

Among the famous examples of ellipsis in literature, the best would be Virginia Woolf's novel, To the Lighthouse. The book involves two parts, one before the

World War I was fought and won and the later one accounts for the events occurring afterwards. All the events that occurred in between have not been mentioned in the book. Rather it has left to the readers to deduce the events from the notable changes that have occurred in the characters' lives.

Example 2

“The potential for unintended humor in ‘compressed’ English isn’t restricted to headline writing; it goes back to the days of the telegraph. One clever (though possibly apocryphal) example once appeared in the pages of Time magazine: Cary Grant received a telegram from an editor inquiring, ‘HOW OLD CARY GRANT?—to which he responded: ‘OLD CARY GRANT FINE. HOW YOU?’ The omitted verb may have saved the sender a nickel, but the snappy comeback was worth far more.

Example 3 Test Your Knowledge of Ellipsis

1. Which of the following statements is the correct ellipsis definition?
 - A. An addition of unnecessary information.
 - B. An omission of unnecessary information.
 - C. The use of three dots as a sign of laziness.
2. Which part of the following sentence could be omitted as an example of ellipsis?
I went to the park yesterday and Joey went to the park also.
 - A. “I went”
 - B. “yesterday”
 - C. Second appearance of “to the park”
3. Consider the following quote from James Joyce’s story, “The Sisters”:
Old Cotter was sitting at the fare, smoking, when I came downstairs to supper. While my aunt was landing out my table he said, as if returning to some former remark of his : No, I wouldn’t say

Example 4 Popular Ellipsis Poem Pages

- [Short Ellipsis Poems](#)
- [Best Ellipsis Poems](#)
- [Famous Ellipsis Poems](#)
- [Ellipsis Definition](#)
- [Read Ellipsis Poems](#)
- [Long Ellipsis Poems](#)
- [Ellipsis Articles](#)
- [Ellipsis Quotes](#)
- [How many syllables are in Ellipsis](#)
- [Poem of the Day](#)

PoemTitle	Poet	Form	Used Categories
<u>Summation</u>	<u>Monihan, Rhoda</u>	Rhyme	ellipsis, celebration, friendship, humorous, introspection,
<u>PeriodPersonified</u>	<u>Holmes, PeterLewis</u>	Verse	ellipsis, humor,
<u>Punctuation</u>	<u>Ludden, Robert</u>	Freeverse	ellipsis, allusion,
<u>Caffeine</u>	<u>Rackley, Sean</u>	Acrostic	ellipsis, food, endurance,
<u>Tomoemotif</u>	<u>Beam, John</u>	Senryu	ellipsis, culture, history, name, people,
<u>AwakeningtheDream</u>	<u>Roark, Odin</u>	Freeverse	ellipsis, dream,
<u>Heavy</u>	<u>Bawden, Gracie</u>	Freeverse	ellipsis, jealousy,

My Friends in Poetry

Dear Alliteration,
First friend, foremost;
Forgetting not,
Shy Allegory,
Dressed in Allusion;
Sweet Anaphora,
How I need thee!
How I need thee!

And Assonance;
Never deep asleep,
Nor rest Refrained,
By Caesura;
Clever Chiasmus;
Who has pause to write,
And write to pause;
Cheeky Consonance,
Agreeing;
Time needs its tick-tock,
Rocked at chimes;
How Didactic,
An Ictus,
Ellipsis,
Is that?
Clink — tinkle;
Cubes in a glass;
Bourbon mist;
Hello;
Onomatopoeia is back,
From visiting,
Palindrome,
At Lake Oxoboxo,
Madam Eve,
Our favorite,
Paradox,
Not pair a ducks,
Nor Parataxis,
She quacked not;
She waddled not;
She flew not;
End stopped;

Did not,
Run into Enjambment,
Iambic,
Pentameter,
On foot nearby;
Rhyme Royal chanting;
Prose babbling,
Out of line,
Screaming;
Pathos,
Pity me;
Scan not,
My prosody;
Bravo!
The coins are tossed;
O my dear friends,
In poetry,
Therein lay,
Our Eulogy,
Paradise Lost.

Period Personified

I am the period, the rest,
The pause; that period when
Ladies wore masks of gauze

And kings, their followers
Lesser men, dabbed the dot
Full stop with pen

And in some secret microdots,
FBI and commies played, games
Of intrigue (taxpayer paid)

Then further down the page
You'll see, a broad ellipsis
... Three times me

It signifies a break or fit,
Perhaps when writer tares
Of script

But now in modern times
We see, they've gone and
Pixolated me

There on screen, no longer ink,
No pages rest by kitchen sink

So flip the leafs? No wait, just think!
Point your finger, download link

Summation

What you add up to may be less,
Than what's inside and unseen,
But your behaviour will determine,
Happiness by where you've been.

Our processes can be perceived,
By family members or role-models,
Maybe hierarchically by meaning,
But definitely by our rationals.

You can get real with them easily,
Or be as complex as meteorology,
Make a point or sensible relation,
To demand a finite sociology.

When there's a series of events,
That diverge in extrapolation,
You can associate with friends,
In commutative permutation.

They mean absolute convergence,
Rhyme with you and find time,
For an ellipsis you've allowed,
Which you'd like objectified fine.

Example 5. Examples of Ellipsis in Literature

My aunt waited until Eliza sighed and then said:

“Ah, well, he’s gone to a better world.”

Eliza sighed again and bowed her head in assent. My aunt fingered the stem of her wine-glass before sipping a little.

“Did he...peacefully?” she asked.

“Oh, quite peacefully, ma’am,” said Eliza. “You couldn’t tell when the breath went out of him. He had a beautiful death, God be praised.”

“And everything...?”

“Father O’Rourke was in with him a Tuesday and anointed him and prepared him and all.” (“The Sisters” from *Dubliners* by James Joyce)

James Joyce was used ellipsis examples masterfully. In this excerpt, the ellipses indicate a certain propriety on the part of the narrator’s aunt. The aunt does not want to specifically refer to the death of another person, and thus just asks, “Did he...peacefully?” The obvious word omitted there is “die.” In the second ellipsis, the aunt is asking whether everything was in order, particularly with the Last Rites. Eliza understands what her omission is referring to, and assures her that Father O’Rourke did indeed give him Last Rites.

Example 6

“Come to lunch someday,” Mr. McKee suggested, as we groaned down in the elevator.

“Where?”

“Anywhere.”

“Keep your hands off the lever,” snapped the elevator boy.

“I beg your pardon,” said Mr. McKee with dignity, “I didn’t know I was touching it.” “All right,” I agreed, “I’ll be glad to.”

I was standing beside his bed and he was sitting up between the sheets, clad in his underwear, with a great portfolio in his hands. Beauty and the Beast...Loneliness...Old Grocery House... Bridge....Then I was lying half asleep

in the cold lower level of the Pennsylvania Station, staring at the morning Tribune, and waiting for the four o'clock train. (*The Great Gatsby* by F. Scott Fitzgerald)

This is an extremely significant use of ellipsis from F. Scott Fitzgerald's masterpiece, *The Great Gatsby*. In this excerpt, the narrator Nick has left a party with another man, Mr. McKee. They agree to go to lunch as they are in the elevator, and Fitzgerald then separates that with an ellipsis and suddenly Nick is standing next to this man's bed, while Mr. McKee is in his underwear. The leap is surprising, and seems to omit not redundant information, but instead a very key moment in the relationship between these two men. Many scholars have taken this incident, made implicit through the use of the ellipsis, that Nick is, in fact, gay.

Example 7

The vast flapping sheet flattened itself out, and each shove of the brush revealed fresh legs, hoops, horses, glistening reds and blues, beautifully smooth, until half the wall was covered with the advertisement of a circus; a hundred horsemen, twenty performing seals, lions, tigers... Craning forwards, for she was short-sighted, she read it out... "will visit this town," she read.

(*To the Lighthouse* by Virginia Woolf)

Virginia Woolf uses an ellipsis in her novel *To The Lighthouse* in a very different way than F. Scott Fitzgerald. In this passage, the characters Mrs. Ramsay and Charles Tansley walk through town and notice details about what they see all around them. In this instance, Mrs. Ramsay has seen a poster for a traveling circus, and Charles Tansley feels slighted that she is more interested in this than in him. Woolf's novel uses much stream-of-consciousness, and the ellipses indicate jumps in their consciousness. For example, there is a whole list of animals coming through with the circus, but the ellipsis cuts off the list, indicating that there are more animals but their brains have moved on. The second ellipsis indicates an omission of the first half of Mrs. Ramsay's sentence

Example 8

Some examples of ellipsis are listed below:

- Lacy can do something about the problem, but I don't know what (she can do.)
- She can help with the housework; Nancy can (help with the housework), too.
- John can speak seven languages, but Ron can speak only two (languages.)

The words between parentheses can be omitted and the sentences can still be meaningful.

The ellipsis is one of the most misused punctuation tools. To make matters worse, it is also the most frequently misnamed punctuation symbol.

Imagine for a moment that you are the poor ellipsis. First, people force you to do a bunch of jobs that don't even remotely fit your job description, then they proceed to call you by the wrong name, or they just forget your name altogether: "Thanks for cleaning out that clogged sewer line; it must have been hard, since you were wearing that tie. Anyway, I really appreciate it, and I look forward to you doing it again next month. Hey—what's your name again? I can never remember it. How about this: I'll just call you *Sewer Guy in a Tie*, since that's what you look like."

The poor ellipsis: it must endure this treatment every day. When I speak to friends or students about the ellipsis, I am met with a confused look. I make sure to clarify, and by now I've memorized the line:

"Oh, an ellipsis is the three dots or periods you see when someone shows a hesitation in writing. You know: the *dot-dot-dot* symbol."

"Oh yeah—I see! I've just always called it *three dots*. Is that the name?—*Eclipsis?* . . ." "No, it's the *ellipsis*. There's no *k* sound."

If only I had a nickel for every time I've had this conversation. I would have . . . let me see . . . well, about two dollars. Still, that's a good many nickels!

So, to begin with, let's get the name right. It's not *eclipse*. (And, please, dear reader, no Jacob-or-Edward jokes.) It's not *three periods*. And it's certainly not *dot-dot-dot*. It's the ellipsis. Spread the word.

What the Ellipsis Does (Two Functions)

More important than knowing the name is knowing how to use the ellipsis. Many novice writers overuse this punctuation tool when they should use dashes, commas, parentheses, and even periods. They use it to show a sudden shift in thought (but that should be a dash). They use it to show a short pause (when they should use a comma). They even use it to show the completion of a statement—the very opposite of what an ellipsis represents! (And, for those who don't know, we show the completion of a statement with the simplest punctuation symbol of them all: the period.)

So, what exactly does the ellipsis do? Essentially, the ellipsis serves two functions:

Example 9. Here are some questions that you can ask yourself, when writing a sentence with an ellipsis.

1. Will my pause show the passage of time or some unfinished thought?
 2. Will the pause appear in the middle of a sentence or at the end of an unfinished thought?
 3. Insert the ellipsis leaving spaces on either side of the ellipsis in mid-sentence or just before the ellipsis at the sentence end. Add the ellipsis where it is supposed to go. Hint: don't forget to remember the questions in the last slide!
1. Days later we finally heard back from the office.
 2. "I was wondering." stammered Phillip.
 3. If only she had oh it doesn't matter now.
 4. I didn't mean to" said Sally
 5. She walked and walked and walked some more.

Answer

1. Days later ... we finally heard back from the office.
2. "I was wondering ..." stammered Phillip.
3. If only she had ... oh it doesn't matter now.
4. I didn't mean to ..." said Sally

5. She walked and walked.... and walked some more.

Example 10.

For this you will put punctuation for either a comma, dash, or ellipsis.

1. Carlos wants to visit Paris Italy Germany and China.
2. Can you guess why Rhode Island's most common nickname though it is unofficial is Little Rhody.
3. "I am sorry" whispered Dionard.
4. If I figured out oh never mind.
5. Mr. Tanner my teacher is wearing a blue shirt.
6. He said "Mr. Tanner you are very nice."
7. Olivia, my best friend, moved to New York.
8. Most voters I'm sure you'll agree with me want to be represented by someone to whom they can relate.
9. We will go to the restaurant now for we are very hungry.
10. Day later we finally got the mail.
11. Ms. Tan, Amelia's mom, has decided to pursue a degree in a field she find fascinating micro-biology.
12. She swam and swam and swam some more.
13. "Excuse me" stammered Jane.
14. Until I reach my goal I will not stop working.
15. Joel's business, he takes care of pets, is doing quite well.

Answer:

1. Carlos wants to visit Paris, Italy, Germany, and China.
2. Can you guess why Rhode Island's most common nickname – though it is unofficial is Little Rhody.
3. "I am sorry ... " whispered Dionard.
4. If I figured out ... oh never mind.
5. Mr. Tanner – my teacher, is wearing a blue shirt.
6. He said, "Mr. Tanner you are very nice."

8. Most voters – I’m sure you’ll agree with me – want to be represented by someone to whom they can relate.
9. We will go to the restaurant now, for we are very hungry
10. Days later ... we finally got the mail.
11. Ms. Tan – Amelia’s mom – has decided to pursue a degree in a field she find fascinating micro-biology.
12. She swam and swam ... and swam some more.
13. Excuse me ...” stammered Jane.
14. Until I reach my goal, I will not stop working
15. Joel’s business – he takes care of pets – is doing quite well.

Function of Ellipsis. Ellipsis is also very commonly used in filmmaking. The parts and scenes that are of no significance to the film are usually omitted by editing. For instance, there would be no point in showing a scene that involves a character walking to the door to answer it unless there is something absolutely important in that scene that you would like to highlight. Normally, such a scene would be cut short by editing the unnecessary parts. In such cases, the narrative logic allows the audience to ignore the ellipsis. A very good example of the use of ellipsis in filmmaking would be A Space Odyssey. The movie directly proceeds to the modern technology from the most primitive tool of mankind . In film language, this kind of ellipsis is often called a match cut. It is bridged by the symbolic comparison between the two things.

Importance of Ellipsis in Avoiding Superfluity

The greatest of the artists over the years have tried to prove time after time their passion for getting things right. The process of writing and revision can be painstaking. A great piece of writing is not generally created overnight. It requires close observation and a keen eye that points out what should stay and what should go into the bin. A piece of writing cannot achieve that level of intensity without such exertion. What is its significance in the actual composition? This question has been deemed very important and many writers have answered it by underlining the

importance of avoiding superfluity. Each and every part of a narrative has to fulfill a purpose or it's all for naught. As Aristotle writes about the action of tragedy:

“The structural union of the parts being such that, if any one of them is displaced or removed, the whole will be disjointed and disturbed. For a thing whose presence or absence makes no visible difference, is not an organic part of the whole”

Sir Philip Sidney's concern is slightly different from what has been stated above but he will emphasize that every component bears significance, as he said, “one word cannot be lost but the whole work fails” This idea is not just limited to the classical narratives and poems.

Conclusion

I have come to conclusion by assuming that lexical insertion is a late process in the derivation I can not only analyze ellipsis as a null lexicalization process but also account for strict and sloppy readings in a derivational manner—sloppy and strict readings emerge at different stages in the derivation, before and after lexical insertion respectively—and give an answer to the identity restrictions on ellipsis—identity of syntactic structure is the relevant notion and it is met before lexical items are part of the derivation. I have offered an account for parsing elliptical constructions which makes use of the minimalist operations: Merge, Move, and Spell-out; which takes into considerations efficiency and economy issues, and which makes use of local information.

There is another presence/absence of locality restrictions as a result of overt tense presence/absence, and of the availability of left context, which in turn is a consequence of low initial attachment of coordinates, and spell-out operations which render syntactic structure unavailable. I have seen that in the case of gapping the antecedent needs to be accessed to assign structure to the gap, therefore locality restrictions apply. While on the case of VPE and Pseudogapping, a VP may be predicted without resorting to the antecedent which is only accessed for interpretation purposes. Therefore, they are not subject to locality.

In the case of VPE and Pseudogapping the gap is interpreted in two steps: building on-line only the minimal amount of structure to accommodate input items, bind traces, and satisfy grammatical constraints, and accessing the antecedent at LF for interpretation purposes.

Except from that has also seen that some of the advantages of such a two-fold process are not only accounting for locality restrictions, but also for both antecedent-gap and gap- antecedent cases, as for ellipsis in discourse and

interactions. Thus, I need to conclude that, contrary to what grammarians suggest, the Language level plays a role in ellipsis resolution: there are certain operations that take place at LF, and all the work cannot be done on-line.

On the performance side, there are other different locality restrictions in elliptical structures. I have offered a unified syntactic approach which takes into account economy and efficiency considerations, and which makes use of local context. I have seen that in the case of VPE and Pseudogapping, since there is an auxiliary overtly realized, from which a VP can be predicted without the need to resort to the antecedent. On the contrary, in the case of gapping, no structure can be computed without accessing the antecedent, because there is no overt auxiliary or verb that will signal the parser to predict a VP node for the gap. Due to this difference VPE and Pseudogapping are not subject to locality restrictions, but gapping is. Then another lucid clue for the availability of the antecedent in terms of low initial attachment and spell-out operations which render the syntactic structure unavailable.

On the computational side, I have shown that it is possible to define an algorithm based on minimalist grammars and minimalist operations. I have tried to translate other's algorithm for human sentence processing into a computational model, by taking as a departing point the non-deterministic parser that modifying its operations in order to account for incremental structure building, verbal ellipsis and coordination.

In a nutshell, I found some responses to an answer to the identity question from the competence side, but a processing answer to the locality restrictions for verbal ellipsis. I want to suggest that a multidisciplinary approach fares better in the case of ellipsis, and that one should keep an open mind with respect to where answers should be found. In the case of ellipsis, the identity issue can be explained from the competence side of the theory, while the locality issue receives a natural explanation from the processing side—this last one, an issue that has not yet received a good answer from the competence side of the theory.

The approach developed here is of a syntactic type, i.e. the elision site is considered to be fully structured. I have analyzed ellipsis from a competence, a processing and a computational perspective.

On the competence side, I have shown that ellipsis takes place under identity of syntactic categories. I have learned that by assuming that lexical insertion is a late process in the derivation, ellipsis can be analyzed as a null lexicalization process, and that sloppy and strict readings can be accounted for as the result of interpreting the elided VP at different stages in the derivation—i.e. before or after lexical items have been inserted respectively. Another consequence of having lexical items inserted late is that we can explain those cases of syntactic partial identity (i.e. where there are verbal and agreement morphology differences between antecedent and gap) that seem to put the identity condition on ellipsis under question. In all those cases, identity is respected, but a more abstract notion of identity is needed. I suggest that identity of syntactic categories is the right notion, and that this condition is met before the lexical items are part of the derivation. Thus, we can conclude that the identity condition on ellipsis should be maintained, but also slightly modified—the relevant restriction is identity of syntactic categories—so that it also covers in a unified manner those examples which have been argued to be problematic. The idea of functionality, referring to the notion that every part is important and what is not important is not necessary, assembles economic and organic principles. It is founded on the concept that there is no waste in nature. The relevance of economy does not become any less important if we move from looking at the inherent structure to studying the meaning of the narrative as a representation of the ideas and perspective of the author.

Further instances of ellipsis that do not (in a clear way) qualify as any of the ellipsis types listed above:

A: The cat likes Bill. B: Why does the cat like Bill?

What will happen if I miss the deadline? .

Bibliography

1. I.A.Karimov “There is no future without history” Tashkent 1997, p. 47
2. I.A.Karimov “Harmoniously developed generation is a basis of progress of Uzbek
3. I.A.Karimov. “Uzbekistan alone the road of Independence and progress,Tashkent. 1993
4. Arregui, A., Clifton, Jr., C., Frazier, L., and Moulton, K. (2006). Processing elided verb phrases with flaid antecedents: The Recycling Hypothesis. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 55(2):232-246.
5. Asher, N., Hardt, D., and Busquets, J. (2001). Discourse parallelism, ellipsis, and ambiguity. *Journal of Semantics*, 18:1-26.
6. Bard, E. G., Robertson, D., and Sorace, A. (1996). Magnitude estimation of linguistic acceptability. *Language*, 72(1):32-68.
7. Belanger, S. (2004). Processing of deep and surface anaphors: A replication and extension of Tanenhaus, Carlson Seidenberg (1985). *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*, 22:1-40.
8. Bouton, L. (1970). Antecedent-contained pro-forms. In Campbell, M. A., Lindholm, J., Davision, A., and Fisher, W., editors, *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. University of Chicago.
9. Buring, D. (2003). On D-trees, beans, and B-accent. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 26(5):511-545.
10. Callahan, S. M. (2009). A Multi-Methodological Investigation of the Processing and Interpretation of Coordinate Sentences Involving Verb Phrase Anaphors. *PhD thesis, University of California, San Diego*.
11. Callahan, S. M. (2010). Parallelism effects and verb activation:

The sustained reactivation hypothesis. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 39(2):101-118.

12. Callahan, S. M., Nicol, J., Love, T., and Swinney, D. (2007). An event-related potential study of the processing of different types of anaphora. Poster presented to the 14th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Neuroscience Society.

13. Camblin, C. C., Ledoux, K., Boudewyn, M., Gordon, P. C., and Swaab, T. Y. (2007). Processing new and repeated names: Effects of coreference on repetition priming with speech and fast RSVP. *Brain Research*, 1146:172-184.

14. Chafe, W. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and points of view. In Li, C., editor, *Subject and Topic*, pages 25-55. Academic Press.

15. Chao, W. (1987). *On Ellipsis*. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts - Amherst.

16. Chomsky, N. and Lasnik, H. (1993). The theory of principles and parameters. In Jacobs, J., von Stechow, A., Sternefeld, W., and Vennemann, T., editors, *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, pages 506-569. Walter de Gruyter.

17. Comrie, B. and Matthews, S. (1990). Prolegomena to a typology of tough movement. In Croft, W., Denning, K., and Kemmer, S., editors, *Studies in Typology and Diachrony: For Joseph H. Greenberg*, pages 43-58. John Benjamins.

18. Cutler, A., Dahan, D., and van Donselaar, W. (1997). Prosody in the comprehension of spoken language: A literature review. *Language and Speech*, 40(2):141-201.

19. Dalrymple, M. (2005/1991). Against reconstruction in ellipsis. In Elugardo, R. and Stainton, R. J., editors, *Ellipsis and Nonsentential*

- Speech*, volume 81, pages 31-56. Springer-Verlag.
20. Dalrymple, M., Shieber, S. M., and Pereira, F. C. N. (1991). Ellipsis and higher-order unification. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 14(4):399-452.
 21. Danes, F. (1974). Functional sentence perspective and the organization of the text. In Danes, F., editor, *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*. Mouton, The Hague.
 22. Erteschik-Shir, N. (2007). *Information Structure: The Syntax-Discourse Interface*. Oxford University Press.
 23. Ferreira, F. and Clifton, Jr., C. (1986). The independence of syntactic processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 25(3):348-368.
 24. Fiengo, R. and May, R. (1994). *Indices and Identity*. MIT Press.
 25. Firbas, J. (1964). On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis. *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague*, 1:267-280.
 26. Frazier, L. (2008). Processing ellipsis: A processing solution to the undergeneration problem? In Chang, C. B. and Haynie, H. J., editors, *Proceedings of the 26th Ist Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, pages 21-32. Cascadsamea Proceedings Project.
 27. Frazier, L. and Clifton, Jr., C. (2006). Ellipsis and discourse coherence. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 29(3):315-346.
 28. Frazier, L., Munn, A., and Clifton, Jr, C. (2000). Processing coordinate structures. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 29(4):343
 29. Frazier, L., Taft, L., Roeper, T., Clifton, Jr, C., and Ehrlich, K. (1984). Parallel structure: A source of facilitation in sentence comprehension. *Memory and Cognition*, 12(5):421-430.
 30. Garnham, A. and Oakhsame, J. (1987). Interpreting elliptical verb phrases. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 39A:611