O`ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI XALQ TA'LIMI VAZIRLIGI

ABDULLA QODIRIY NOMLI JIZZAX DAVLAT PEDAGOGIKA INSTITUTI

INGLIZ TILI VA ADABIYOTI KAFEDRASI

"Himoya qilishga ruxsat beraman"

Xorijiy tillar fakulteti dekani

_____dots.A.T.Nurmanov

"___"_____2012 y.

5141400 – xorijiy tillar va adbiyoti ta'lim yo`nalishi bo`yicha bakalavr darajasini olish uchun

The principal types of elliptical sentences and their usage mavzusida bajarilgan

BITIRUV MALAKAVIY ISHI

Bajaruvchi: 405-guruh talabasi

M.Barimova

Ilmiy rahbar: katta o`qituvchi

T.E.Ravshanova

Ishni himoyaga tavsiya etaman _____ T.E.Ravshanova

BMI Ingliz tili va adabiyoti kafedrasi yig`ilishining qarori bilan (Qaror № __, __. __. 2012y.)

himoyaga tavsiya etilgan.

Kafedra mudiri:

dots. N.G.Ismatova _____

Jizzax – 2012

Jizzax Davlat Pedagogika Instituti, Xorijiy tillar fakulteti, Ingliz tili va adabiyoti yo'nalishi 405-guruh talabasi Barimova Marhaboning "The principial types of elliptical sentences and their usage" mavzusida yozgan bitiruv malakaviy ishiga ilmiy raxbar

X U L O S A S I

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishi kirish qismi, ikkita bob, xulosa va adabiyotlar ro`yhatidan iborat bo'lib, uning birinchi bobi, "The principal types of elliptical sentences" deb nomlangan. 1-bob to`rtta paragrafdan iborat bo`lib, elliptik gaplar va ularning turlari haqida ma`lumot va tahlillar berilgan.

Talaba ushbu ishning ikkinchi bobini "The usage of elliptical sentences" deb atagan. Mazkur bob ikkita paragrafdan iborat. Unda jumla va frazalar koordinatsiyasi hamda oddiy va murakkab elliptik gaplarning ishlatilishi chuqur o`rganib tahlil qilingan.

Xulosa qismida talaba tomonidan elliptik (tushirib qoldirilgan) gaplar bo'yicha olib borilgan izlanish natijalari qisqa tarzda bayon etilgan.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni yozishda talaba 40 ga yaqin qo'shimcha va asosiy adabiyotlardan foydalangan. Adabiyotlar orasida internetdan olingan ma'lumotlar ham mavjud bo'lib, bu yanada yangi ma'lumotlar taqdim qilish imkonini yaratadi.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishini yozishda talaba o'z ustida ishlaganligi aniq ko`rinib turibdi. Barimova Marhabo tomonidan bajarilgan bitiruv malakaviy ishi oliy o'quv yurtlari bitiruvchilari tomonidan bajariladigan bitiruv malakaviy ishlariga qo'yilgan barcha talablarga to'liq javob beradi.

Ishni ko'rib chiqib shu fikrga keldimki, ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni bajarishda talaba bir nechta xatolarga yo'l qo'ygan bo'lsada, bitiruv malakaviy ishning mazmuni chuqur tahlil etilgan.

Ishni himoyaga tavsiya etaman.

Ingliz tili va adabiyoiti
kafedrasi katta o`qituvchisi: Ravshanova T.E.

Jizzax Davlat Pedagogika Instituti, Xorijiy tillar fakulteti, Ingliz tili va adabiyoti yo'nalishi 405-guruh talabasi Barimova Marhaboning "The principial types of elliptical sentences and their usage" mavzusida yozgan bitiruv malakaviy ishiga berilgan

TAQRIZ

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishi kirish qismi, ikkita bob, xulosa va adabiyotlar ro`yhatidan iborat bo'lib, uning birinchi bobi, "The principal types of elliptical sentences" deb nomlangan. 1-bob to`rtta paragrafdan iborat bo`lib, elliptik gaplar va ularning turlari haqida ma`lumot va tahlillar berilgan.

Talaba ushbu ishning ikkinchi bobini "The usage of elliptical sentences" deb atagan. Mazkur bob ikkita paragrafdan iborat. Unda jumla va frazalar koordinatsiyasi hamda oddiy va murakkab elliptik gaplarning ishlatilishi chuqur o`rganib tahlil qilingan.

Xulosa qismida talaba tomonidan elliptik (tushirib qoldirilgan) gaplar bo'yicha olib borilgan izlanish natijalari qisqa tarzda bayon etilgan.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni yozishda talaba 40 ga yaqin qo'shimcha va asosiy adabiyotlardan foydalangan. Adabiyotlar orasida internetdan olingan ma'lumotlar ham mavjud bo'lib bu yanada yangi ma'lumotlar taqdim qilish imkonini yaratadi.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni yozishda talaba o'z ustida ishlaganligi aniq ko`rinib turibdi. Barimova Marhabo tomonidan bajarilgan bitiruv malakaviy ishi oliy o'quv yurtlari bitiruvchilari tomonidan bajariladigan bitiruv malakaviy ishlariga qo'yilgan barcha talablarga to'liq javob beradi.

Ishni ko'rib chiqib shu fikrga keldimki, ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni bajarishda talaba bir nechta xatolarga yo'l qo'ygan bo'lsada, bitiruv malakaviy ishning mazmuni chuqur tahlil etilgan.

Agar ushbu ish yaxshi tarzda himoya qilinsa ishni yaxshi bahoga loyiq deb hisoblayman.

Taqrizchi: dots. Ko`chiboyev A.

Jizzax Davlat Pedagogika Instituti, Xorijiy tillar fakulteti, Ingliz tili va adabiyoti yo'nalishi 405-guruh talabasi Barimova Marhaboning "The principial types of elliptical sentences and their usage" (Ingliz tilida o`zlashtirilgan so`zlarning assimilyatsiyasi) mavzusida yozgan bitiruv malakaviy ishiga

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishim kirish qismi, ikkita bob, xulosa va adabiyotlar ro`yhatidan iborat bo'lib, uning birinchi bobi, "The principal types of elliptical sentences" deb nomlangan. 1-bob to`rtta paragrafdan iborat bo`lib, elliptik gaplar va ularning turlari haqida ma`lumot va tahlillar berilgan.

BMImning ikkinchi bobi "The usage of elliptical sentences" (Elliptik gaplarning ishlatilishi) deb nomlangan. Mazkur bob ikkita paragrafdan iborat. Unda jumla va frazalar koordinatsiyasi hamda oddiy va murakkab elliptik gaplarning ishlatilishi chuqur o`rganib tahlil qilingan.

Xulosa qismida elliptik (tushirib qoldirilgan) gaplar bo'yicha olib borilgan izlanish natijalari qisqa tarzda bayon etilgan.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni yozishda 40 ga yaqin qo'shimcha va asosiy adabiyotlardan foydalanganman. Adabiyotlar orasida internetdan olingan ma'lumotlar ham mavjud bo'lib bu yanada yangi ma'lumotlar taqdim qilish imkonini yaratadi.

405 guruh talabasi: **Barimova M.**

Jizzax Davlat Pedagogika Instituti, Xorijiy tillar fakulteti, Ingliz tili va adabiyoti yo'nalishi 405-guruh talabasi Barimova Marhaboning "The principial types of elliptical sentences and their usage" mavzusida yozgan bitiruv malakaviy ishiga _____ XTB ga qarashli __-o'rta umumta'lim maktab ingliz tili o'qituvchisi _____ tomonidan berilgan

TASHQI TAQRIZ

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishi kirish qismi, ikkita bob, xulosa va adabiyotlar ro`yhatidan iborat bo'lib, uning birinchi bobi, "The principal types of elliptical sentences" deb nomlangan. 1-bob to`rtta paragrafdan iborat bo`lib, elliptic gaplar va ularning turlari haqida ma`lumot va tahlillar berilgan.

Talaba ushbu ishning ikkinchi bobini "The usage of elliptical sentences" deb atagan. Mazkur bob ikkita paragrafdan iborat. Unda jumla va frazalar koordinatsiyasi hamda oddiy va murakkab elliptik gaplarning ishlatilishi chuqur o`rganib tahlil qilingan.

Xulosa qismida talaba tomonidan elliptik (tushirib qoldirilgan) gaplar bo'yicha olib borilgan izlanish natijalari qisqa tarzda bayon etilgan.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni yozishda talaba 40 ga yaqin qo'shimcha va asosiy adabiyotlardan foydalangan. Adabiyotlar orasida internetdan olingan ma'lumotlar ham mavjud bo'lib bu yanada yangi ma'lumotlar taqdim qilish imkonini yaratadi.

Ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni yozishda talaba o'z ustida ishlaganligi aniq ko`rinib turibdi. Barimova Marhabo tomonidan bajarilgan bitiruv malakaviy ishi oliy o'quv yurtlari bitiruvchilari tomonidan bajariladigan bitiruv malakaviy ishlariga qo'yilgan barcha talablarga to'liq javob beradi.

Ishni ko'rib chiqib shu fikrga keldimki, ushbu bitiruv malakaviy ishni bajarishda talaba bir nechta xatolarga yo'l qo'ygan bo'lsada, bitiruv malakaviy ishning mazmuni chuqur tahlil etilgan.

Agar ushbu ish yaxshi tarzda himoya qilinsa ishni yaxshi bahoga loyiq deb hisoblayman.

Tashqi taqrizchi: **o'qituvchi:_____**

C O N T E N T S

P L A N

I N T R O D U C T I O N

A sentence is a proposition expressed by words (something true). A proposition is the semantic invariant of all the members of modal and communicative paradigms of sentences and their transforms. But besides sentences which contain propositions there are interrogative and negative sentences. Speech is emotional. There is no one to one relationship. Then a sentence can be grammatically correct, but from the point of view of logic it won't be correct, true to life (Water is a gas). Laws of thinking are universal but there are many languages. Grammar and Logic don't coincide. A sentence is a subject-predicate structure. What are the subject and the predicate? Grammatical subject can only be defined in terms of the sentence. Moreover the grammatical subject often does not indicate what we are 'talking about' (The birds have eaten all the fruit. It is getting cold). Besides, this definition leaves out verbless sentences. There are one-member sentences. They are non-sentences? Conclusion – a sentence is a structural scheme.

Phonological: A sentence is a flow of speech between 2 pauses. But speech is made up of incomplete, interrupted, unfinished, or even quite chaotic sentences. Speech is made up of utterances but utterances seldom correspond to sentences.

Thus, it is more preferable to describe a sentence than to define it. The main peculiar features of the sentence are: integrity, syntactic independence, grammatical completeness, semantic completeness, communicative completeness, communicative functioning, predicativity, modality, intonational completeness

Predicativity is a syntactical category. It is actualized reference to reality. Logical understanding: combination of 2 parts of proposition. Formally syntactic understanding: relations of the structural components of the sentence (subject

and predicate). Semantic approach: correlation of the contents of the utterance with the situation. The latter is most popular.

Modality is a semantic category. It is broader a notion than predicativity, it is revealed both in grammatical elements of language and its lexical, purely nominative elements. Prof. Pocheptsov: predicativity is mood plus tense (predicativity is broader than modality)

Theme actuality. In linguistics, ellipsis (from the Greek: ἔλλειψις, élleipsis, "omission") or elliptical construction refers to the omission from a clause of one or more words that would otherwise be required by the remaining elements

Varieties of ellipsis have long formed a central explicandum for linguistic theory, since elliptical phenomena seem to be able to shed light on basic questions of form-meaning correspondence: in particular, the usual mechanisms of grasping a meaning from a form seem to be bypassed or supplanted in the interpretation of elliptical structures, ones in which there is meaning without form.

In English people often omit words rather then repeating them. This is called ellipsis. Some kinds of ellipsis only occur in coordinate clauses and coordinated groups of words.

This section deals with ellipsis that occurs in subordinate clauses and separate sentences as well as in coordinate clauses. The second clause or sentence could be said or written by the same person, or it could be part of a reply or comment by someone else. The use of ellipsis in conversation is explained in paragraphs.

The aims and purposes of the work. The goal of the work is based on detailed study of elliptical sentences, which play important role in syntax. According to this general aim the following particular tasks are put forward:

1. to classify ellipsis.
2. to classify the ellipsis according to its coordination of clauses.
3. to show simple and complex ellipsis of the English language.

The scientific novelty of the work. Novelty of the qualification work is determined by the necessity of the study of elliptical construction which form a large layer of sentence. And studying the syntagmatically restored elliptical sentences paradigmatically restored elliptical sentences.

The practical value. The practical value of the research is that material and the results of the given qualification work can serve the material for theoretical course of lexicology, stylistics, typology as well as can be used for practical lessons in translation, home reading, conversational practice and current events.

Literature overview. While writing present qualification work I used the books written by great scholars such as: А. А, Шахматов, *Синтаксис русского языка,* В. В. Виноградов, *„Синтаксис русского языка" акад. А. А. Шахматова*. Besides above mentioned literatures I took information from Internet, Work Book Encyclopedia.

The structure of the work. Present qualification work consists of introduction, two chapters, conclusion and bibliography. Two chapters called with separate names and they considers as a main part of this qualification work. The first chapter is about the types of elliptical and consist of four paragraphs. The second chapter is about the ellipsis as coordination of clauses which divided into two paragraphs: The first one is clausal and phrasal coordination and the second simple and complex ellipsis.

Chapter I. The principal types of elliptical sentences.

1.1 types of elliptical sentences

Ellipsis in sentence-structure is a natural syntactic process in linguistic development presented as normal practices in many, if not all, languages.

Quite a number of elliptical patterns are shortcuts in syntactic usage fixed as a form of linguistic economy by right of long usage.

In terms of traditional grammar, elliptical sentences are generally identified as sentences with the subject or predicate missing. Some grammarians hold another point of view recognising ellipsis also in sentences where the secondary parts of the sentence are felt as missing. Such was A. M. Peshkovsky's treatment of elliptical sentences in Russian[1].

Similar statements will be found in L. S. Barkhudarov's and D. A. Shtelling's grammar book (1973).

What is felt as implicit in elliptical sentences may be supplied from:

a) the immediate context, e. g.: *"How was the play?" she inquired.*

"Very good," returned Hurstwood. (Dreiser)

"Cold., isn't it?" said the early guest. "Rather". (Dreiser)

b) relevance to a complete grammatical construction of a given pattern, e. g.:

"Doing well, I suppose?"

"Excellent."

"Glad to hear it." (Dreiser)[1]

Ellipsis of a lexeme or constructions (or even parts of constructions) must surely be recognised in the analysis of sentences.

In terms of structure, distinction will be made between the following types of elliptical sentences:

---

[1] Theodor Driser. The American trgedy. pp.99

a) omission of the subject:

Looks to me for all the world like an alf-tame leopard. (Galsworthy)

b) omission of the predicate in patterns with *there is, there are,* e. g.:

He shook a thick finger at the room: "Too many women nowadays, and they don't know what they want. (Galsworthy)

Soames stole a glance. No movement in his wife's face. (Galsworthy) *"Nothing like dissecting to give one an appetite", said Mr. Bob Saweyer.*

(Dickens)

c) omission of auxiliary, copulative and other function verbs,

e. g.:*You going to take Irene?* ('Galsworthy)

If you have just described an action or state and you want to introduce a new subject only, you do not need to repeat the rest of the sentence. Instead, you can use just an auxiliary.

There were nineteen- and twenty-year-olds on the paper who were earning than I was.

They can distinguish finer detail than we can.

If you only want to change the verb tense or modality, you use a new auxiliary, with a subject referring to the same person or thing.

They would stop it if they could.

How does the Department of the Environment ensure, as it says it must, that the quality of the operation remains high?

Very few of us have that tremendous enthusiasm, although we know we ought to.

I never did go to Stratford, although I probably should have.

...a topic which should have attracted far more attention from philosophers than it has.

If you choose no other auxiliary verb, you must usually use 'do', 'does', or 'did'.

Do farmers still warrant a ministry all to themselves? I think they do.

I think we want it more than they do.

'be' as a main verb

However, the link verb 'be' is repeated, in an appropriate form. For example, 'I was scared and the children were too'.

I think you're right.'—'I'm sure I am.'

If the second verb group contains a modal, you usually put 'be' after the modal.

'Bit of an unfair question to ask me, because I'm biased.'—'Thought you might be.'

'He thought that it was hereditary in his case.'—'Well, it might be.'

However, this is not necessary if the first verb group also contains a modal.

I'll be back as soon as I can.

'Be' is sometimes used after a modal in the second clause to contrast with another link verb such as 'seem', 'look', or 'sound'.

'It looks like tea to me.'—'Yes, it could be.'

'have' as a main verb

If the first verb is the main verb 'have', a form of 'have' is sometimes used instead of a form of 'do'.

She probably has a temperature—she certainly looks as if she has.

ellipsis with 'not'

You can make the second verb group negative by adding 'not' to the auxiliary. These combinations are contracted in informal speech and writing to 'don't', 'hasn't', 'isn't', 'mustn't', and so on (see paragraph for a list of these contractions). You use the same forms for a negative response to a question.

Some managed to vote but most of them didn't.

'You're staying here!'—'But Gertrude, I can't, I mustn't!'

'And did it work?'—'No, I'm afraid it didn't.'

Widows receive state benefit: widowers do not.

He could have listened to the radio. He did not.

USAGE NOTE With passives, 'be' is often, but not always, kept after a modal.

He argued that if tissues could be marketed, then anything could be.

However, with perfect passives, you can just use the auxiliary 'have' or 'has'. For example, you could say, 'Have you been interviewed yet? I have'.

Note that when a modal with 'have' is used for a passive or continuous verb group, 'been' cannot be omitted.

I'm sure it was repeated in the media. It must have been.

Priller noticed that they were not flying in tight formation as they should have been.[1]

If the second verb group contains the auxiliary 'have' in any form, you can add 'done' to the group. For example, instead of saying 'He says he didn't see it but he must have', you can say 'He says he didn't see it but he must have done'.

When these questions are satisfactorily answered I might perhaps view their infantile behaviour more charitably than I have done to date.

It would have been nice to have won, and I might have done if my concentration hadn't lapsed.

Similarly, you can use 'do' after modals.

It makes a click like the lid of a tin may do.

Note that when the verb used in the first mention of an action or state is the main verb 'have', instead of using 'do' after a modal in the second mention, you often use 'have' instead.

'Do you think that academics have an appreciation of the administrative difficulties of running a University?'—'No, and I don't think they should have.'

---

[1] Internet: http:// www.cogentex.com/papers/modex-anlp97

Usually ellipsis occurs in a clause which comes after a clause in which the action or state has been mentioned with a main verb. Occasionally, however, for a deliberate effect, the clause containing the ellipsis comes before the clause explicitly mentioning the action or state.

If, as they should be, directors are themselves scholars, they wilt appreciate the language that scholars use.

If you want to be emphatic, you repeat the main verb, instead of using ellipsis.

It was the largest swarm of locusts that had ever been seen or that ever would be seen.

Note that if you want to contrast two different things affected by an action, or two different factors or circumstances, you can put a new object or adjunct in the second clause, with an auxiliary or form of 'be'.

Cook nettles exactly as you would spinach.

You don't get as much bickering on a farm as you do in most jobs.

People are not nearly so keen on the exhibiting side of things in Suffolk as they are in Yorkshire.

No one liked being young then as they do now.

However, the main verb is sometimes repeated.

Can't you at least treat me the way you treat regular clients?

You can omit a verb after the semi-modals 'dare' and 'need', but only when they are used in the negative.

'I don't mind telling you what I know.'—'You needn't. I'm not asking you for it.'

'You must tell her the truth.'—'But, Neill, I daren't.'

Similarly, the verb is only omitted after the modal expressions 'had rather' and 'would rather' when they are used in the negative. However, the verb is sometimes omitted after 'had better' even when it is used affirmatively.

'Will she be happy there?'—'She'd better.'

It's just that I'd rather not.

d) omission of the subject and auxiliary verb, e. g.: *Mean to tell me you didn't know?*

Remember that boy? Staying with my father? Going to marry him? "Hallo, Michael! I'm rather late. Been to the Club and walked home". (Galsworthy)

e) omission of the subject and the copula-verb, e. g.: I *don't write. Not such a fool.* (Galsworthy)

I don't believe I should have done it at your age — too much of a Forsyte, I'm afraid. (Galsworthy)

"How's your wife?" — "Thanks", said Soames coldly, "well enough". (Galsworthy)

Some of the above given types of elliptical sentences have become regular idiomatic expressions, e. g.: colloquial *See?* for *Do you see?*

That do? (= will that do?)

See you again tomorrow (= I shall see you again tomorrow).

"I tried it, but it nearly made me leave."

"Not me. I'm nearly ten, see?" He drew a half-pound bar of chocolate from his back pocket: "Take a bit. And break me a piece off as well". (Sillitoe)

But certain restrictions are reasonably to be placed on the recognition of ellipsis, in general, since there is often the danger that we may base some part of our analysis on "understood" items in a context where there is little reason for taking ellipsis into account.

Imperative sentences, for instance, are generally expressed with no subject; and even when a subject is expressed in such sentences, the subject may be *somebody* or *anybody* rather than *you,* e. g.:

Somebody fetch a piece of chalk.

To treat commands, therefore, as sentences from which the subject *you* has been omitted would be erroneous. Commands and requests seem to be more

reasonably described by stating that they are subjectless sentences in which one of a very restricted number of possible subjects may on occasion be inserted.

It would be probably erroneous to say that when a speaker indulges in what grammatically may be referred to as ellipsis, he has always a clear idea of what he omits or neglects to express. It is more likely that the speaker very often has no definite idea of what he is omitting — indeed, that he would rather not be forced to render the idea or thought too carefully and exactly.[1]

If, then, in such cases ellipsis should be assumed, it is because in each instance the complete grammatical construction would require more; it cannot be assumed that the speaker would necessarily fill out his construction, even in his own mind.

The first to be mentioned here are sentences presented by predicatives without a verb, e. g.: *Splendid! Charming! Beautiful!*

It is often said that in all these sentences the link-verb *is (are, was, were)* is understood, but this point of view gives no real explanation of the phenomenon. We must, in all probability, admit such patterns as a definite grammatical type, fairly common not only in English but in other languages.

There are elliptical sentences containing a subject and a predicative, which may be either a noun or an adjective e. g.:

Michael not cheerful? (Galsworthy)[2]

Such structures are common in languages which have not developed a copula, i. e. a verb meaning *to be,* as well as in languages which have a copula but do not use it as extensively as, for instance, English. In Russian and Ukrainian this is the ordinary sentence-pattern, e. g.: Он здоров. Вона щаслива.etc.

By leaving out what may seem superfluous one creates the impression of hurry or stress of business which does not allow time enough to round off one's

---

[1] Internet: http://www.learnenglish.org.uk

[2] Internet: http:// www.ormfoundation.org/forums/p/.../1333.aspx

sentence in the usual way. It is also of importance that proverbs and proverbial sayings should be easy to remember and therefore not too long, e. g.: *When angry, count a hundred. When at Rome, do as Romans do.*

Observe also the following common sentence patterning:

He will have his own way, no matter what the consequences.

However great the danger, he is always fearless.

Never, no matter what the circumstances, must he dare to do such things.

Here we have really a double occurrence of the phenomenon in question. *No matter* is a preposed predicative without *is*, and in the clause which forms its subject, what is also a predicative to the consequences, etc., which forms the subject of the clause.

Peculiar is the use of isolated predicatives with *and,* e. g.:

He was such a success yesterday, and no wonder.

He may go and welcome. And a good riddance too!

You were angry, and small blame to you.

Not less characteristic are reduced clauses of comparison:

The greater the loss, the more persistent they were.

The more haste, the less speed.

In all such cases the fact that something is left out should not prevent us from recognising the utterance as sufficiently complete to be called a sentence.

He had gone up and down the stairs perhaps a hundred times in those two days, and often from the day nursery, where he slept now, had stolen into his mother's room, looked at everything, without touching, and on into the dressing-room...

Then rapidly to the door, down the steps, out into the street and without looking to right or left into the automobile. (Galsworthy)

A feeling of terseness and of vigour is also produced by the omission of verbs in such fixed patterns of usage as:

Needless to say, facts are stubborn things.

How naughty of him to say so!

In the same way the subject may be expressed by a gerund, e. g.:

No use crying over spilt milk.

No good doing such things.

Very often the subject that follows the predicative is a whole clause, e. g.:

Small wonder that we all liked it immensely.

What a pity we have missed the train!

Patterns like the following: *No, he didn't. Why, hasn't he?* are referred by R. L. Allen "semi-sentences".

Such sentence-patterns seldom occur as the first utterance in conversation. They are fairly common in "tag"-questions *(You don't know Mr. X., do you?)* and in short answers *(No, I don't).*

Distinction will be made here between finite and non-finite sentences:

No, I don't. Why, didn't she? Oh, caught in the act? On your way home? About to go there?

Perhaps the most important difference between finite semi-sentences and non-finite ones is that the former show time-orientation, whereas the latter do not.

1.2 syntagmatical restored elliptical sentences

All the languages in the world develop on the basis of some principles. Most of such principles are now identified and described. One of them is the principles of the least effort. There is another name for it – the principle of the economy of the linguistic means. According to E.U.Guliga[1] the economy is observed on different levels in the process of functioning in the contemporary language. In the

[1] И.В.Гулига. О тенденциях экономии языковых средствы. Москва. 1977, стр. 77-86

last process we can also find heterogeneous phenomenon which can be relatively united and called “the economy” “Diachronically the economy of linguistic means serve for basic transformations and particular changes in the system of language. When we observe synchronically the tendency of economy acts like electoral ability, the ability of selection between two (or more) synonymous or varietal means of the same or the similar denotative content. Synchronically the tendency of economy may have an occasional character.

` In the contemporary linguistic literature there are contrary opinions on the phenomena we must name the works of A. Martine. Martine thinks that changes in the languages are caused by the necessity of communication gives way to the principle of economy with the help of which a lot of information can be inherited by small means expenditure.

According to Martine “the principles of economy” is similar to “the principle of the least effort”. Martine thinks that the motive power of linguistic changes is a contradiction between the necessity of people’s communication and their aspiration for minimizing their mental and physical efforts.[1]

Elliptical sentences are said to be one of the structural types of sentences in all languages. This type of sentences has a very specific structure of their own. The task of this paper is to analyze such types of sentences and reveal all the features that are characteristic to it.

Elliptical sentence is a sentence in which at least one word or part is left out.

We should say that any elliptical sentence is a transformation of non-elliptical sentence, which is made by means of transformation ellipsis or deletion. In other words we substitute an explicit variant of a word by a zero variant of this word. Any word (nominative and functional) can be subjected to this operation.

---

[1] Martinie. The principles of economy in language.

What for do we use elliptical sentences in our speech? What is the motivation for ellipsis?

Ellipsis is most commonly an abbreviating device that reduced, redundancy. A major use of ellipsis is the avoidance of reptilian and in this respect it is like substitution which can often be used instead of ellipsis. For example, we can avoid the repetition of "Stonebridge" not only by ellipsis of a word:

"Actually, I am going down to Stonebridge tomorrow and I may stay the night" (In Stonebridge)[1]

But also by a substitution:

"Actually, I am going to down Stonebridge tomorrow and I may stay the night **there**"

Repetition is often avoided for stylistic reasons. If the main reason of usage of ellipsis is the avoidance of repetition, then ellipsis is usually anaphoric:

"I don't want Jaz in the garden, which technically belongs to me as tenant of the downstairs flat, and I see now, dully, that it looks mangled and bereft." (Sh. Mackay "The orchard on fire")

The pronoun "it" might refer either to "flat" or to "garden". In this sentence "it" is a relation of anaphora (Greet _____ - above, phora -carrying).

But ellipsis also can be cataphoric:

"I walk a self – conscious stranger, through the village to the church of St. Michael and All Angels and up the path, petal led with confetti."[2]

In this example the latent element "I walk – can be supplied uniquely."

We may not relate redundancy to the words, which can be restored from the linguistic context. The ellipted words may be obvious from the situation:

"(I am) sorry. How's the work going, Jaz?"[3]

---

[1] Ch. Dickens "Great expectation" pp. 101.
[2] Ch. Dickens "Great expectation" pp.26
[3] Sh. Mackay "The orchard on fire" pp.54

There is another motive for ellipsis. When we omit the shared items, at tension is focused on the new material, as in the dialogue below:

“Where are you going?”

“Just down the meadows.” (Sh. Mackay “The orchard on fire”)

The next question that I am going to examine in this paper, is “The classification of elliptical sentences.”

According to Barhudarov L. S. The classification of elliptical sentences can be based on the method of explication of a word, which is presented in the sentence in a zero variant. Explication is the restoring of a zero variant of a word by the explicitly expressed variant. Barhudarov distinguishes two types of explication of a word or group of words: syntagmatically restored and paradigmatically restored elliptical sentences.

In the ellipsis of syntagmatical restored the omitted part can be restored by the help of the same sentence or neighbouring ones:

- ellipsis is restored from the sentence:

“I would to bring him the file, and what broken bits of food I could”[1]

“He limped towards the low church wall, got over it, and then turned round to look for me.”[2]

In both of this examlples the elliptical consructions are restored by means of the previous context. Though very rare, but it is possible to meet cases of restoring elliptical construction by means the following part of the same sentence:

“We were in a rented room in, while my parents were living in Stonebridge.”[3]

- ellipsis restored with the help of the previous sentence.

This sentence can be said by one and the same speaker:

“No, I should not have minded that, if they would only have left me alone, but they wouldn’t.”

---

3 Ch.Dickens. “Great expectations”.pp.33
[2] Ch.Dickens. Great expectations.
[3] Sh.Mc.Key. The orchard on fire.

“We’ve got some piglets. Do you want to see?” (Sh. Mackey “The orchard on fire”)

“Light pollution. You can’t see any stars nowadays. There aren’t any.” (Sh. Mackey “The orchard on fire”)

“Mr. Wopsle, the clerk at church, was to dine with us: and Mr. Mubble, the well – maker and Mrs. Mubble: and Uncle Pumblechook who was a well- to-do corn dealer in the nearest town, and drove his own chaise-cart” (Ch. Dickens “Great expectation”).

The sentence, from which ellipsis is restrored, can be said by another speaker:

A) – “I’ve been meaning to ask you if you’d feed the cats.”

- “Of course I will,” Jaz says. (Sh. Mackey)

B) – “You’ve got livo songs there”

- “Neither is appropriate,”- I say before she can burst into song.

C) – “What’s your name?” – she asked

- April. What’s yours?” (Sh. Mackey)

D) – “We’re closed”

- “Never mind about that” the women said “I’ve only come to have a look”

- ellipsis is restored by means of the following sentence:

“Proper little carrot – top, isn’t she?” (Sh. Mackey)

There are two elliptical sentences in such constructions. They are two elliptical sentences in such constructions.

They are ritually restored. In this example in the first sentence subject it and link verb **is** are ellipted and they are restored with the help of the following sentence. In the second sentence the words proper little carrot- top are ellipted, and they are restored from the previous sentence.

But in the context the omitted word can be used not only in the form it should be used in the elliptical sentence.

"You didn't mean to give it them, but you have" (Ch. Dickens)[1]

In the elliptical sentence "you have" the verb "given" is omitted, in the previous sentence there is no adverb at all, but there is the infinitive "to give". In such sentences only the lexical unit is subjected to explication, the form is chosen according to the structure of the elliptical sentence.

1.3 paradigmatically restored elliptical sentences

Sometimes the omitted words can't be restored from the context. For their explication we should refer to analogous constructions, that are met in the language, though they are not placed in the surrounding context of the given elliptical sentence. In such cases the restoring is made according to paradigmatical connections, that's way we call these sentence paradigmatically restored elliptical sentences. The typical examples for such sentences are the imperative sentences:

"Never mind. You can get another one." (Sh. Mackey)

"Get it off and get in here at once! Well, don't just stand there gowning." (Sh. Mackey)

"Get back into bed!" (Sh. Mackey)

"Bless me, I've gone and forgot ten the sugar!" (Sh. Mackey)

In all these sentences the ellipted word is the 2-nd person pronoun "you". We can confirm it with the help of several factors: first of all it is the presence of nonelliptical imperative sentences in English, in which the subject – pronoun "you" is not ellipted.

"You come with me" he said.

"you, carry the tray." (Sh. Mackey)

"Don't you listen to him, he tell lies." (Sh. Mackey)

---

[1] Internet: http:// www.essaypride.com/essays.php

There is another argument of this fact. In the sentences with the imperative from of the verb, the subject expressed by pronoun “you”, is presented in a zero variant. For example in the constructions like “wash yourself” “behave yourself” the usage of the object “yourself” can be explained, that the subject of the sentence is the pronoun “you” in a zero variant. (You) wash yourself.

1.4 initial words of sentences

-A- Subject alone is ellipted. Either there is no auxiliary at all

(e.g: Serves you right!) are one is possible (es: can’t see) The ellipted element can be:

1. The first person pronoun, normally I:

“Wonder what they’re doing now”

“Beg your pardon, Mrs. Arder”

“I wouldn’t like to disappoint her”

“Don’t mind telling you”

“Think I’ll go now” (Sh. Mackey)

Most of verbs in such an elliptical construction can take a clause complement.

2. The second person pronoun:

“Hard a good time, did you?” (Sh. Mackey)

“Want a drink, do you?” (Hemingway “The old man and the sea”)

“Had a good time?”

“Want a drink?”

The second person pronoun can be ellipted in statements if a tag question is added. It is ellipted, as in the last two examples above, in declarative questions.

(The last example can be interpreted as an ordinary (non - dedarative)) questions with “Do you” ellipted.

3. The third person pronouns:

“(He/She) Doesn’t look too well”

“(He/She/They) Can’t play at all” (Sh. Mackey.2)

4. “It”

“Serves you right” (Sh. Mackey)

“Doesn’t mother” (Ch. Dickens)

“Looks like rain” (R. Sutcliff “Beowulf”)

“Must be the best bike in the world”. (Sh. Mackey)

The ellipted “it” in the first two examples is the anticipatory “it” that’s found in such sentences as “it serves you right that you fell” while in the last two sentences it is the “prop word” “it” in the sentences like “it’s cold”. These ellipted sentences could refer directly to an action in the situation context, for example, “Serves you right” be said to a child immediately after he fell, if he had been warned not to act in a danguarous way. On the other hand “it” in the following example is the pro-form “it”, but again may refer directly to an object in the situational context:

“Seems full” (Sh. Mackey)

“Makes too much noise” (Sh. Mackey)

5. “There”:

“Must be ruby waiting for you” (Sh. Mackey)

“May be some children outside” (Sh. Mackey)

“Ought to be some tea in the pot” (Ch. Dickens)

This is extential subject “there” is distinct from the true subject following the verb. The elliptical construction ca contain a modal verb other than “will”, but “want” is common:

“Want be any food left for supper.”

-B- Subject plus operator ellipted.

If lexical verb “be” has been ellipted, the elliptical construction begins with what would be a subject complement in the full form.

1.The first person pronoun (particularly I) plus “be”:

“(I’m) Sorry I couldn’t be there” (Sh. Mackey)

“(I’m) Afraid not” (Ch. Dickens)

The pronoun: we” alone can’t be ellipted:

“Are afraid not”

For some speakers, the same applies to the singular pronoun I: from them

“Afraid not” is acceptable, but not “I’m afraid not”

2) “it” plus “be”.

“good to see you”.

“ no wonder he’s late”.

“(A) Pretty paper” (Sh. Mackay)

The ellipted “it” is the anticipatory “it” noticed above in eg:

“ Serves you right”. A type of empty “it’ is exemplified in the ellipsis in:

“(it’s) Not that he is right”.

“I” or “ We” can be ellipted in the sentence with any operator except “be”:

“(I’ll) See you later”)

“(We’ve) got to go now” (Sh. Mackey)

Note: A) the common elliptical phrases “(I’ve) got to” and “I’m going to have acquired semi- institutionalized spellings “ghotta” and “gonna” respectively:

“Gotta go now”; “gonna go now’.

B) ‘Had” is commonly ellipted in spoken English in the semi- auxiliary “had better’: “you had better try it again”. The subject can then be ellipter as well:

“Better try it again.”

Chapter II. The usage of elliptical sentences.

2.1 clausal and phrasal coordination

This paragraph presents a psycholinguistically inspired approach to the syntax of clause-level coordination and coordinate ellipsis. It departs from the assumption that coordinations are structurally similar to so-called appropriateness repairs--an important type of self-repairs in spontaneous speech. Coordinate structures and appropriateness repairs can both be viewed as "update" constructions. Updating is defined as a special sentence production mode that efficiently revises or augments existing sentential structure in response to modifications in the speaker's communicative intention. This perspective is shown to offer an empirically satisfactory and theoretically parsimonious account of two prominent types of coordinate ellipsis, in particular "forward conjunction reduction" (FCR) and "gapping" (including "long-distance gapping" and "subgapping"). They are analyzed as different manifestations of "incremental updating"-efficient updating of only part of the existing sentential structure. Based on empirical data from Dutch and German, novel treatments are proposed for both types of clausal coordinate ellipsis.

The coordination-as-updating perspective appears to explain some general properties of coordinate structure: the existence of the well-known "coordinate structure constraint", and the attractiveness of three-dimensional representations of coordination. Moreover, two other forms of coordinate ellipsis--SGF ("subject gap in finite clauses with fronted verb"), and "backward conjunction reduction" (BCR) (also known as "right node raising" or RNR)--are shown to be incompatible with the notion of

incremental updating. Alternative theoretical interpretations of these phenomena are proposed.[14]

The four types of clausal coordinate ellipsis--SGF, gapping, FCR and BCR--are argued to originate in four different stages of sentence production: Intending (i.e., preparing the communicative intention), conceptualization, grammatical encoding, and phonological encoding, respectively.

Ellipsis also occurs with 'to'-infinitive clauses. Instead of using a full 'to'-infinitive clause after a verb, you can just use 'to', if the action or state has already been mentioned.

Don't tell she if you don't want to.

At last he agreed to do what I asked him to.

You can also do this in conversation.

'Do you ever visit a doctor?' I asked her.—'No. We can't afford to.'

Note that there are some verbs, such as 'try' and 'ask', which are also often used on their own, without 'to'.

They couldn't help each other, and it was ridiculous to try.

Some water boards will replace washers free of charge, if you ask.

This paragraph also deals with the syntactic aspects of coordination and coordinate ellipsis in clause-level coordination with the conjunction and. The theoretical framework to be presented here proceeds from the assumption that two key elliptical phenomena, "forward conjunction reduction" (FCR) and "gapping", result from an update process that also underlies certain types of self-repairs in spontaneous speech--in particular so-called appropriateness repairs. These repairs occur when speakers revise the meaning underlying all or part of what they have just said in the current sentence and replace it by wordings that fit in with the revised meaning.

---

[14] Internet: http:// www.cogentex.com/papers/modex-anlp97

Often, the ensuing "update" (revision, edit) does not replace the entire utterance but only a part that includes the new wordings. Coordination and self-repair thus appear as cognate processes of conceptual and syntactic updating. (1) I show that this perspective enables an empirically satisfactory and theoretically parsimonious analysis of FCR and gapping in Dutch and German.

FCR and gapping are illustrated by sentences (1) and (2), respectively. The elision in (1) targets the second conjunct--more precisely, the left periphery of that conjunct (marked by the dots). In (2), the head verb of the clause is elided. This elliptical variant often gives rise to elision of a non-left-peripheral (e.g., medial) fragment.

(1) FCR: The town [S where Jan lives and ... Piet works]

(2) Gapping: Jan lives in Leiden and Piet ... in Nijmegen

Two other forms of coordinate ellipsis are "backward conjunction reduction" (BCR) (also known as "right node raising or RNR; see Postal 1974) and SGF ("subject gap in finite clauses with fronted verb"; see Hohle 1983). BCR (3) refers to elision of a right-peripheral part of the left conjunct. In SGF (4), the second clausal conjuncts is finite but has no overt subject; the implied subject is identical to the overt, non-left peripheral subject of the preceding clause. (The non-left peripherality of the overt subject precludes an analysis in terms of FCR.)

(3) BCR: Jan lives ... and Piet works in Leiden

(4) SGF: Into the wood went the hunter and ... shot a hare.

As will become clear shortly, the coordination-as-updating approach to be developed in this article does not presuppose an existing declarative grammar formalism, nor does it embody a new declarative formalism. Instead, I advocate an analysis of coordination and (some of) its elliptical variants in procedural terms, as resulting from full or partial updates

(revisions, edits) of structures that have already been built. Hence, it does not serve much purpose to review theoretical treatments of coordination in the literature extensively. But a survey of the key phenomena of FCR and gapping with emphasis on their similarity to phenomena of self-repair, is an essential ingredient. Given the fine-structure of these ellipsis types, I argue that both are incompatible with the notion of coordination-as-updating (although for entirely different reasons), and suggest directions for adequate treatments. I argue that the novel perspective explains two fundamental but ill-understood properties of gapping and FCR: why they (1) obey the "coordinate structure constraint" (CSC) with "across-the-board" (ATB) application of movement operations, and (2) invite structural representations in terms of (a notational variant of) three-dimensional trees. In Section 9, finally, I point out a number of unresolved research issues.

2. Coordination and self-repair: a comparison from the viewpoint of sentence production

Levelt (1983, 1989) observed a relationship between FCR and self-repair in spontaneous speech. Such corrections usually consist of three elements:

-reparandum, that is, the original utterance containing an error

-editing term (... uh ..., ... I mean ..., ... or rather ...), and

-repair text.

The speaker interrupts the ongoing speech, signals this to the listener by means of a pause and/or an editing term, retraces to an earlier point in the utterance, and reformulates it from there. This type of self-repairs is called retracing repairs. Levelt noticed that only certain positions in the reparandum qualify as potential points of resumption ("retracing targets") and advanced a descriptive rule demarcating these positions. The rule presupposes that the three basic elements of retracing repairs correspond to three parts of a coordination: the lefthand (or "anterior") member, the

conjunction, and the righthand (or "posterior") member, as shown in (5b). (2) The resumption point in (5a) is the position just before the verb. The fragment preceding this point (i.e., the subject NP) is incorporated into the final utterance and, spliced together with the repair text, forms a correct sentence.

a. Jan buys ... uh steals bikes

reparandum editing term repair text

b. Jan buys ... and ... steals bikes

anterior conjunct conjunction posterior conjunct

In essence, Levelt's rule states that a position within the reparandum qualifies as a suitable resumption point if and only if it yields a repair that corresponds to a grammatical coordination (FCR). For instance, the positions marked by "[right arrow]" in (6a) and (7a) do not qualify as potential resumption points because the corresponding coordinations (6b) and (7b) are ungrammatical. In fact, the only permissible resumption points are located before the subject NP, as shown in (6c)-(6d) and (7c)-(7d). The symbol "[??]" marks the position of the interrupt, i.e., the position where the original utterance comes to a halt.

The sentences in (6) and (7) also exemplify the "update diagrams" that accompany many FCR and gapping cases in the sequel. The first line of such a diagram represents the reparandum or the anterior conjunct from the beginning of the utterance up to the interrupt. The second line shows the repair text or the posterior conjunct. A continuous line (--) printed below a left-peripheral string of the reparandum or anterior conjunct indicates that this string, in effect, functions as part of the repair text or the posterior conjunct. For instance, the continuous line below is in (6c) indicates that the meaning of the finally resulting utterance should be based on the analysis of Is the doctor interviewing the patient rather than the doctor interviewing

the patient. The strings of asterisks (********) in (7a) and in (7b) indicate illegal applications of the combinatorial process. In the remaining examples, I will suppress the "[right arrow]" symbol, which always follows immediately after the coordinator or the editing term and therefore is entirely redundant.

(6) a. * Is the doctor seeing, uh, the doctor interviewing the patient?

Is the doctor seeing?

-uh [right arrow] the doctor interviewing the patient?

b. * Is the doctor seeing and the doctor interviewing the patient?

Is the doctor seeing?

-and [right arrow] the doctor interviewing the patient?

c. Is the nurse, uh, the doctor interviewing the patient?

Is the nurse?

-uh [right arrow] the doctor interviewing the patient?

d. Is the nurse or the doctor interviewing the patient?

Is the nurse?

-or [right arrow] the doctor interviewing the patient?

(7) a. * He told me that this man stole bikes, uh, boy stole bikes

He told me [S that this man stole bikes

******* uh [right arrow] boy stole bikes]

b. * He told me that this man stole bikes and boy stole bikes

He told me [S that this man stole bikes

******** and [right arrow] boy stole bikes]

c. He told me that this man stole bikes, uh, this boy stole bikes

He told me [S that this man stole bikes

uh [right arrow] this boy stole bikes]

d. He told me that this man stole bikes and this boy stole bikes

He told me [S that this man stole bikes

and [right arrow] this boy stole bikes]

Van Wijk and Kempen (1987) observed a second type of self-corrections which they call substitution repairs--see (8) and (9). They crucially differ from the repairs studied by Levelt in that one or more potentially nonadjacent major constituents of the original clause, not including the head verb, are replaced. This property also holds for the coordination analog of substitution repairs (8b) and (9b), both exemplifying gapping. The substitute constituents in the second conjunct are often called remnants. Sequences of dots (....) in the second line of an update diagram show which strings in the first line have to be combined with the remnants in order to arrive at the correct interpretation of the repair text or the posterior conjunct. Illegal applications of this combinatorial process will depicted by strings of asterisks (********).

(8) a. I met their eldest son yesterday, or rather, their youngest son

I met their eldest son yesterday

.... or rather their youngest son ....

b. I met their eldest son yesterday, and their youngest one

I met their eldest son yesterday

.... and their youngest son ....

(9) a. Then, the blue car crashed into the red one, I mean, the Jaguar into the Porsche

Then, the blue car crashed into the red one

I mean, ... the Jaguar .... into the Porsche

b. Then, the BMW crashed into the Volvo, and the Jaguar into the Porsche

Then, the BMW crashed into the Volvo

and .... the Jaguar .... into the Porsche

Another similarity between substitution repairs on the one hand and gapping on the other concerns the fact that the righthand conjunct cannot include an overt head verb, as illustrated in (10a). Apparently, the head verb in a posterior clausal conjunct rules out gapping and sets the ellipsis mode to FCR (10b).

(10) a. * As a boy be read all novels by Scott, or rather devoured

b. As a boy be read all novels by Scott, or rather devoured them

As a boy he read all novels by Scott

-or rather devoured them

c. As a boy be read all novels by Scott and devoured *(them)

As a boy he read all novels by Scott

-and devoured them

As suggested by the "grammatical" examples of self-repair above, the repair text is a string of complete major constituents. Resumption points appear to be located preferably before a major constituent of a clause, not within one. Similarly, the elision process in both gapping and FCR leaves major constituents intact. (3)

The similarities between self-repair on the one hand and FCR and gapping on the other can now be summarized as follows:

-The elision in FCR is left peripheral; in self-repair, the repair text together with all major constituents preceding the resumption point make up the new clause.

-In gapping, a posterior conjunct may consist of major constituents whose counterparts in the anterior (initial) conjunct are not adjacent; in substitution repairs, the repair text may replace nonadjacent major constituents in the reparandum.

-The elisions in FCR and gapping respect major constituent boundaries

-In both FCR/gapping and their self-repair analogs, the presence or absence of an overt clausal head verb determines the continuation options: gapping is ruled out by the presence of the overt head verb in the posterior clause; substitution repairs only occur if the repair text does not contain the overt clausal head verb.

These remarkable points of resemblance invite an account of coordination and coordinate ellipsis based on their similarity with self-repairs – in particular, with self-repairs where "appropriateness" is at stake. They occur when--halfway through, or at the end of, a sentence--speakers modify the communicatiev intention underlying the current utterance in such a way that at least part of the utterance needs to be updated. In such repairs, some or all of the originally intended content that already has been encoded conceptually and grammatically (4) and surfaced as an overt utterance, is replaced by more appropriate content, which requires at least a partially different overt realization.

An obvious objection against the suggested theoretical course follows from the observation that in self-repairs the reparandum fragment to the right of the resumption point is overwritten completely so that only one constituent remains: the string consisting of the initial reparandum fragment that precedes the resumption point, followed by the repair text. This contrasts with coordinate structures, where the initial conjunct is NOT superseded by a later one and at least two constituents see the light of day. However, this observation is incorrect. While formulating the repair text, the speaker presupposes that the entire reparandum forms part of the utterance and that the listener has understood it. In variant (8c) of (8a), for instance, the repair text contains two pronouns (their and one) which both take a part of the reparandum (the Johnsons and son, respectively) as

antecedent. Hence, the part of the reparandum rightward of the resumption point must be assumed to belong to the resulting sentence.

(8) C. I met the eldest son of the Johnsons, sorry, their youngest one, yesterday

I met the eldest son of the Johnsons [??] sorry [right arrow] their youngest one yesterday

In descriptions of updating processes, one needs to define the target domain, the substitution units, and the substitution algorithm. To illustrate, consider the situation of a software company that continually works on improvements of its software product--some complex program--and regularly distributes updates among its clients. If every update comprises a complete version of the program, the "program" is target domain and substitution unit at the same time. Alternatively, an update could contain a new version of only the modified functions ("routines") within the program; and installing the update only requires replacing the modified functions in the program code and removing those that have become superfluous (outdated). In that case, the function is the unit of substitution. Yet another option is to include in an update package only the individual modified lines of program code together with a list of to-be-removed lines, thus sizing the substitution units down to the level of individual lines of code.

The three options mentioned in this example presuppose different substitution algorithms. In the first case, the complete code of the current (original) program version is replaced by the new code. In the second case, the update package includes a list of addresses of the to-be-replaced and to-be-removed functions, with replacements for the former; and the substitution algorithm performs the modifications, probably in the order of mention of the addresses. The substitution algorithm for the third type of substitution unit may be similar, except that the addresses now refer to

individual lines of code.

Now I can define the notions of incremental and nonincremental updating. An updating process is nonincremental if the substitution units coincide with the target domain; it is incremental if the substitution units are smaller than the target domain, thus enabling partial updates. Incremental updates usually cost less transmission and execution time, and therefore tend to be more efficient than nonincremental ones.

It is not hard to see that the structural updates in self-repairs are often incremental. Consider the self-repair in example (9a) whose target domain spans the complete clause before the editing term. Rather than formulating and transmitting an updated version of the entire clause, the speaker selects the major constituents of the clause as substitution unit and includes only the two modified exemplars in the update package.

3. Structural updating in a model of the sentence production process

Structural updating may be viewed as a special mode of operation of the human sentence production mechanism aiming at processing economy. In order to characterize this mode of operation more precisely, I now sketch Levelt's (1989) widely accepted "model of the speaker" (see also Kempen 1977, 1987; Kempen and Huijbers 1983; Kempen and Hoenkamp 1987). According to this model, sentence production is a five-stage process: intending, conceptualizing, grammatical encoding, phonological encoding, and articulating. In this article, I leave the fifth stage, which deals with the phonetic aspects of sentence production, out of consideration.

The first stage of sentence production-called "thinking for speaking" (Slobin 1996) or simply "intending"--comprises the creation of a communicative intention. During the second stage, the "conceptualization" process maps the intention onto a set of concepts and conceptual (thematic) relations retrieved from the "mental lexicon". Output from this stage is a

conceptual structure ("message") in the form of a tree with branches whose linear order is undefined. Conceptual messages are input to the "grammatical encoding" stage.

The mental lexicon also contains lemmas--"syntactic words" that will be attached to syntactic trees as terminal nodes. I assume a one-to-one correspondence between concepts and lemmas. Associated with every lemma is information specifying how it can be used in sentences. For instance, a lemma that corresponds to an action concept, specifies how the concept's thematic relations are mapped onto grammatical functions (often: actor onto subject, patient/theme onto direct object, location onto adverbial or prepositional modifier, etc.). Based on this information, the grammatical encoder computes the hierarchical (dominance) and the linear (precedence) structure of the sentence. Within the grammatical encoder, I assume that one processing component is responsible for computing the unordered hierarchical structure, and another one for linearizing the branches of the syntactic tree (cf. Kathol [2000] for a similar division of labor within an HPSG-type formalism; see also Harbusch and Kempen 2002). As part of the tree formation process, lemmas are adorned with features whose values, during the fourth stage, guide the selection of inflectional properties of every terminal node and mark the position of sentence accents.

Taking linearly ordered trees as input, the "phonological encoder" lays the groundwork for the spoken form of sentences. In response to the inflectional information attached to terminal nodes, the lemmas are replaced by lexemes (phonological wordforms). Lexemes are a third type of lexical entries in the Mental Lexicon, in addition to concepts and lemmas. The phonological encoder also computes an (abstract) intonation contour

based on--among other things --the sentence accent marks placed during the second and third stages.

One of the goals of the present article is to show that the phenomena of FCR and gapping can be understood as originating from the same source as self-repairs of the appropriateness type: incremental structural updating processes. I will focus on clausal coordination here, although the approach may advance our understanding of coordination at other hierarchical levels (NPs, PPs, APs) as well.

Forward conjunction reduction and gapping in the sentence production model

If the sentence production model and the hypothesis of elliptical coordination as incremental updating are basically correct, then the following assumption is plausible as well. Every stage of the sentence production process should be able to work "in update mode": to assemble and output to the next stage only novel structure, i.e., only the fragments that reflect the replaced or augmented conceptual content. The unchanged fragments can be left untouched and need not be forwarded to the next stage. In case of gapping, the conceptual content underlying the verb is shared between conjuncts. This also holds for the thematic relations contracted by the verb and for the mappings between thematic relations and grammatical functions. Only some arguments or adjuncts need to be replaced or added. This means gapping can come into existence already during the conceptualization stage of sentence production. Only the newly constructed conceptual arguments and/or adjuncts need to be selected as output, together with markers telling the grammatical encoder which original arguments/adjuncts they are supposed to augment. In example (9b), the augmentation is restricted to the fillers of the actor argument and the direction adjunct. Notice that the grammatical encoder need not initialize a

new clause for the posterior conjunct; it only computes, in the context of the anterior clause, the surface shape of the substitute major constituents and delivers the product at the phonological encoder's door. This means that, in contradistinction to FCR (see below). Gapping does not involve determining a resumption point.

(9) b. Then, the BMW crashed into the Volvo, and the Jaguar into the Porsche

In case of clause-level FCR, the circumstances are radically different. As the verb of the conjunct-under-construction differs from that of the first conjunct, it cannot be elided. Moreover, the new verb may license a very different set of thematic relations and different mappings between thematic relations and grammatical functions. Hence, the conceptualization stage does not qualify as a possible origin of clause-level FCR. But could it originate in the grammatical encoding stage? As the new verb may introduce grammatical functions that are absent from the first conjunct, or leave out functions that were present there, the only option is to construct a new clause for the posterior conjunct, headed by the new verb, with all constituents ordered from left to right. In update mode, grammatical encoding proceeds slightly differently than in normal mode. Traversing the anterior clause from left to right, the encoder checks the identity of each major constituent and determines whether it could become a constituent of the posterior clause in the same ordinal position. If so, the constituent is not constructed from scratch but gets incorporated into the posterior clause. The encoder returns to normal mode as soon as it runs into an anterior constituent that violates the incorporation criteria. From then onward, all constituents of the posterior clause are assembled in the standard fashion. This procedure entails the determination of the resumption point, which is located to the immediate left of the first constituent that blocks

incorporation. In (10c), for example, the constituents dominating as a boy he can be incorporated into the posterior clause; the direct object all novels by Scott cannot, however, due to its position rightward of the resumption point. In order to avoid repetition of this NP, the encoder can opt for pronominalization instead, as in (10d). Finally, and crucially, the output to the phonological encoder does not include the incorporated left-peripheral string. In sum, FCR can plausibly be assumed to originate at the level of grammatical encoding.

(10) c. As a boy he read all novels by Scott and devoured * (all novels by Scott)

As a boy he read all novels by Scott

-and devoured all novels by Scott

d. As a boy he read all novels by Scott and devoured * (them)

I use the term "major constituent" (or "major phrase") of a clause in a broad sense that includes:

-Heads, i.e., main, auxiliary or copula verbs. I assume that every exemplar of each of these verb types is the head of a clause, and that every finite or nonfinite clause has exactly one head. (5) The subcategorization frame of the head verb is one of the factors determining which other constituents figure in the clause as obligatory or optional major phrases. Auxiliaries will be treated as heads of clauses that govern a complement clause headed by an infinitival or participial head.

-Arguments and adjuncts of the head verb: subject, direct object, indirect object, predicate, complement (i.e., a finite or nonfinite subordinate clause), adverbial modifier, and particle. (6)

-Subordinating conjunctions, i.e., complementizer (in a complement clause: that, whether) or subordinator (in an adverbial clause: while, although, when, etc.).

As will become clear in the next subsection, we need an extended definition of major constituent to deal with a special form of gapping called "long-distance gapping" (LDG). The target domain of clausal coordination and ellipsis (for short: "clausal coordination domain") is not necessarily a simple clause including only one verb. Empirical observations to be addressed below necessitate the introduction of coordination domains spanning a hierarchy of several complement clauses. For want of a better term, I will refer to such a hierarchy as a superclause. A superclause is a clause of any type (main or subordinate; finite or nonfinite; complement, adverbial or relative) with all its major constituents except for major constituents consisting of clauses that include a subordinating conjunction. For example, sentence (11a) forms one superclause together with the stack of two nested object complement clauses. The highest complement clause (headed by want) is a superclause that includes the complement headed by sell. The latter is a "simple" superclause without any embedding (see the strings surrounded by "[SC....]"). Variant (11b) is also a superclause but it does not include the object complement or the adverbial clause (both printed in italics), which open with a subordinating conjunction.

(11) a. [SC Jan expects the thief [SC to want [SC to sell the stolen bike]]]

b. [SC Jan expects [SC that the thief wants to sell the stolen bike] [SC because ...]

The above list of major constituents includes complement clauses as major constituents of clauses headed by complement-taking verbs. The notion of superclause enables a slightly broadened definition of "major constituent": The major constituents of complement clauses that belong to the same superclause, all count as major constituents of the superclause. For instance, superclause (11a) includes as major constituents to want to sell the stolen bike, to sell the stolen bike and the stolen bike. In (11b), both the

stolen bike and to sell the stolen bike qualify as major constituents in the superclause headed by wants (but not in the superclause headed by expects).

The left periphery of a superclause covers the string of major phrases preceding the resumption point in FCR, i.e., the region before the first to-be-updated major constituent of the current superclause. Non-updated major phrases in the left periphery can be "borrowed" by the posterior conjunct (e.g., the phrases containing as a boy he in example [10c]). A borrowed major constituent functions as a normal (overt) constituent of the borrowing (posterior) clause. In FCR, Left-peripheral major constituents are borrowed obligatorily. In gapping, borrowing of all non-updated major constituents is obligatory.

Forward conjunction reduction and gapping

Superclauses are the application domains of incremental updating. Any superclause can spawn a clausal coordination and become its anterior conjunct. The shape of the posterior conjunct depends crucially on the nature of the substitution units and the substitution algorithm. I propose to view the major constituent as the fundamental substitution unit in FCR and gapping. That is, whenever at least one word of a major constituent of a superclause is outdated and needs to be replaced, this constituent will be updated in its entirety.

In line with the assumption (Section 3) that gapping originates at an earlier stage than FCR, the update process first checks whether the set of outdated (i.e., to-be-updated) major constituents does not contain the head verb of the superclause (i.e., the head of the highest clause in the stack). If so, the posterior conjunct will consist of updated versions of all outdated major constituents, possibly extended with additional major phrases that have no counterpart in the anterior conjunct (e.g., Mary sang, and

beautifully!). Ali non-outdated major phrases are obligatorily borrowed by the posterior conjunct (i.e., may not reappear there). Hence, the posterior conjunct consists exclusively of a string of remnants.

If the "highest" head verb of the superclause does need an update, then all left-peripheral major constituents are borrowed obligatorily (and no constituents rightward of the resumption point). The result is FCR.

To prevent a potential misunderstanding, I should point out that speakers are free to choose between incremental or non-incremental updates of the current superclause. For instance, they can repeat the two initial words of (12a) in the posterior conjunct or leave them out. However, IF the update proceeds in incremental mode, the substitution algorithm dictates which major constituents are allowed to show up in the posterior conjunct. In (12a)-(12b), the temporal modifier vanmorgen is not allowed to become a remnant because it is not outdated. (7)

[begin strikethrough]because Jan[end strikethrough] this-morning a CD bought

Jan borrowed this-morning a DVD from Marie and this-morning a DVD from Anna

In the remainder of this Section, I apply incremental updating to the key elliptical coordination phenomena in simple clauses (i.e., superclauses consisting of a single clause without subordinate clauses) and in nested clauses spanning one or more superclauses. The target language is Dutch.

Incremental updating in simple clauses. The examples in (13) each contain two coordinated clauses. While no ellipsis has been applied to (13a), the other versions illustrate FCR and gapping, respectively

'Jan buys cars and Peter steals bikes'

'Jan buys cars and steals bikes'

'Jan buys cars and Peter, bikes'

The sentences in (14) illustrate that borrowing in FCR is left peripheral only, as predicted by incremental updating. In (14a), the posterior conjunct borrows its subject NP Jan from left. Variant (14b) is ungrammatical because the direct object fietsen cannot be borrowed right-peripherally, implying the obligatory presence of an overt direct object (here: the pronoun ze 'them'). In subordinate clause (14c), with SOV word order, the posterior clause can legally borrow the direct object, which now is within the left periphery. The examples in (15) confirm the constraint on left-peripheral borrowing in FCR.

'Jan buys bikes and steals them'

that Jan bikes buys and them steals

'that Jan buys bikes and steals them'

this kind bikes steals Peter and sells he

'This kind of bikes Peter steals and sells'

I conclude this subsection with some remarks on gapping. The sentences in (16) show that gapping allows nonidentical inflectional forms of the same word to be elided: The difference between schro'ven and schrijft is irrelevant. This is in line with an essential assumption underlying the gapping mode of incrementai updating, viz. that the updating process only involves creating and delivering substitutes for the inappropriate (contrastive) major constituents and leaves the other ones untouched.

We write articles and he writes a book

'We write articles and he [begin strikethrough]writes[end strikethrough] a book'

Furthermore, notice that gapping-style borrowing also applies to "Argument cluster coordination", where the to-be-updated constituents of the anterior clause are adjacent, as in (16c) and (17), rather than separated by the head verb. The incremental updating process is indifferent to the

position of the head verb in the anterior conjunct. Hence, argument cluster coordination does not need a special treatment.

'We give Susan a cellphone and Patrick an iPod'

Finally, the linear order of gapping remnants need not be identical to that of their counterparts in the anterior conjunct. Examples like (18) show that both orders of the remnants morgen en iemand uit de buurt yield good sentences, irrespective of the order of their counterparts ik and vandaag. Versions (18a) and (18c) with the subject NP iemand uit de buurt in final position within the posterior conjunct, sound even slightly better than versions (18b) and (18d) with the subject in initial position. Presumably, factors relating to information structure or constituent length, or both, are responsible for this effect. The indefiniteness of iemand uit de buurt may create a preference for a late position--a tendency reinforced here by "heavy NP shift" due to length.

I look today after the cat and tomorrow

someone from the neighborhood

'I look after the cat today, and tomorrow someone from the neighborhood'

The phenomenon of remnant order reversals in gapping can be understood in terms of the sentence production model put forward in Sections 3 and 4. According to this model, the dominance relations between the nodes of a syntactic tree are computed by a different component of the grammatical encoder than the linear order of the branches of the tree. After the grammatical encoder has received as input the updated conceptual content for the outdated major constituents, the hierarchical component can compute the shape of the remnants such that they fit into the hierarchical structure of the anterior clause. The linear order component then determines the precedence relations among the branches of the

modified tree in accordance with information-structural and other constraints. At this point, modified information-structural conditions may give rise to precedence relations in the posterior conjunct that differ from those in the anterior clause. As its last step, the grammatical encoder does not pass the complete tree on to the phonological encoder but only the updated constituents (remnants) in their then left-to-right order.

Incremental updating in nested clauses. The definition of super-clause implies that adverbial subordinate clauses, whether finite or nonfinite, launch their own superclause and constitute their own incremental updating domain. This is due to the obligatory subordinating conjunction at the onset of such a clause. Hence, gapping is ruled out if one of the remnants pairs up with a constituent belonging to the main clause, and the other one to an embedded adverbial clause. Consequently, examples (19b) and (20b) are ill-formed, in contrast with variants (19a) and (20a), where the remnants are complete major constituents of the main clause. (The brackets "[SC ...]" indicate superclause boundaries.)

'Jan left when his ex arrived and Peter when his colleague arrived'

Jan left in-order his wife up to pick and

Peter in-order his colleague up to pick

Neijt (1979) gives several examples showing that the same pattern holds for complement clauses introduced by a subordinating conjunction. The nonfinite complement in (22b), however, without a complementizer, does not launch its own superclause, thus licensing long-distance gapping.

Jan assumes that he a novel will write and

Peter assumes that he a theater-play will write

*'Jan assumes that be will write a novel and Peter that he will write a theater play'

'Kees tried to imitate Bernhard and Harry, Fred'

The coordinations in (23) all contain the head verb vragen 'ask' governing an extraposed infinitival complement without complementizer, and in each of them the anterior conjunct qualifies as a superclause. While sentence (23a) illustrates long-distance gapping, variants (23b) and (23c) are "simple" gapping cases since their complements have been updated in their entirety (not only their head verbs but also their direct objects--a type of gapping called subgapping. In (23d), the verb of the complement clause has been updated but not the direct object de tekst. That is to say, the update does cover not the entire complement, and gapping fails. FCR is ruled out as well because the direct object is not located in the left periphery. Versions (23e) and (23f), both without direct object updates, can be analyzed as legal FCR structures since they do allow left-peripheral borrowing of the direct object--with the complement clause or the main clause as coordination domain in (23e) and (23f), respectively.

He asks me the text to check and you the references

'He asks me to check the text and you, the references'

he asks me the text to check and you the references to update

'He asks me to check the text and you, to update the references'

... that he me asks the text to eheck and you the referenees to update

'... that be asks me to check the text and you, to update the references'

he asks me the text to check and you the text to distribute

* 'He asks me to check the text and you, to distribute [begin strikethrough] the text' [end strikethrough]

'He asks me to check the text and to distribute it'

this text asks he me to check and to distribute

'This text, he asks me to check and (to) distribute'

The sentences in run parallel to except that their main clauses are headed by a modal verb instead of an extraposition verb. They reveal that clause union does not modify the pattern of grammaticality ratings.

(24) I should the text check and you the references

'I should check the text and you, the references'

I should the text check and you the references update

'I should check the text and you should update the references'

... that I should the text check and you the references update

'... that I should check the text and you should update the references'

I should the text check and you [begin strikethrough]the text[end strikethrough] distribute

'I should check the text and you should distribute it'

I should the text check and the [begin strikethrough]the text[end strikethrough] distribute

* 'I should check the text and distribute the [begin strikethrough]the text[end strikethrough]

this text should I check and distribute

'This text, I should check and distribute'

The definition of superclause allows long-distance gapping to cut into dependent Wh-questions that do not contain a minor constituent--see (25a). Variant (25b) shows that the Wh-phrase is an obligatory member of the posterior conjunct. I assume that this restriction need not be stipulated explicitly but follows from the general prohibition against elision of contrastive expressions in gapping: Although the two referring expressions (here: Wh-phrases) are identical, non-coreferentiality is presupposed. Version (25c) shows that of 'whether' does not count as a Wh-phrase but as a subordinating conjunction and hence introduces its own superclause.

Some ask who Bach plays and others [begin strikethrough]ask[end

strikethrough] who Buxtehude [begin strikethrough]plays [end strikethrough]

'Some ask who plays Bach and others who (plays) Buxtehude'

Some ask if we Bach play and others [begin strikethrough]ask if we [end strikethrough] we Buxtehude

* 'Some ask whether we can play Bach and others Buxtehude'[15]

A theoretical issue posed by the superclause as incrementai updating domain arises from Wh-fronting. A Wh-phrase may escape from the complement clause it belongs to, and land at the beginning of a clause higher up in the hierarchy. Do such extracted constituents count as members of the superclause they originate from, or of the one where they have landed? Example (26a) is a case in point: The interrogative prepositional phrase 'on which days' can be plausibly interpreted only as a temporal modifier of open 'be open' -it must have been extracted from the finite complement clause introduced by that. The sentence is well-formed although, of the contrastive constituent pairs, one is physically located in the main clause (the Wh-phrases) and the other one in the complement (schoenenzaak 'shoe store' and modezaak 'fashion store'). Now compare (26c), which has contrastive pairs at the same linear positions but where the interrogative PP has not been extracted from the finite complement ('to whom' is only interpretable as an argument of 'said'). The ungrammaticality of this variant is predicted on the theory that superclauses are the domain of incrementai updating: The main clause and the complement are different superclauses, which rules out long-distance gapping. This, in turn, entails well-formedness of (26d), where the contrastive pairs belong to the same superclause. (Neither the pair of subject NPs u-uw partner nor the pair of Wh-phrases have been extracted.) In line with this reasoning, version (26b) is ungrammatical as the two contrastive pairs belong to the different superclauses. (This applies to the intended--and the only meaningful -- interpretation, with uw

[15] Internet: http://www.learnenglish.org.uk

partner 'your partner' fulfilling subject role in the main rather than the embedded clause.)

(26) On which days have you said that the shoe-store open should be, and on which days

[begin strikethrough]heeft u geeegd [begin strikethrough] [begin strikethrough]open moet[end strikethrough] have you said that the fashion-store open should [begin strikethrough]zijn[end strikethrough]?

be

On which days did you say that the shoe store should be open, and on which days did you say that the fashion store should be open?'

b. on which days have you said that the shoe-store open should be, and on which days [begin strikethrough] has your partner said that the shoe-store open should be

'On which days did you say that the shoe store should be open, and on which days did your partner say that the shoe store should be open?'

c. to whom have you said that the shoe-store more-often open should be, and to whom have you said that the fashion-store more-often open should be

'To whom did you say that the shoe store should open more often, and to whom did you say that the fashion store should open more often?'

d. to whom have you said that the shoe-store more-often open should be, and to whom has your partner said that the shoe-store more-often open should be

'To whom did you say that the shoe store should open more often, and to whom did your partner say that the fashion store should open more often?'

In conclusion, Wh-fronting--and, presumably, any form of A-bar movement-does not affect superclause membership of the moved phrases. This confirms the

validity of the definition of superclause in terms of the hierarchical rather than the linear-order relations between clauses and their constituents.

Backward conjunction reduction

At first sight, BCR looks like the mirror image of FCR. On closer inspection, however, this impression is false – for several reasons. First, BCR requires an accented word or word group immediately adjacent to the elided fragment. This holds even in the absence of semantic or pragramatic reasons for accentuation, as in (27a) where the prepositions op and naar carry an obligatory contrastive accent although their meanings are not contrastive at all. In FCR variant (27b), no contrastive accent is needed on luistert--the word immediately adjacent to the elided string.

(27) a. my roommate is fond of classical music and listens often to classical music

'My roommate is fond of, and often listens to, classical music'

b. my roommate is fond of classical music and my roommate listens there often to

'My roommate is fond of classical music and often listens to it'

Second, FCR requires lemma rather than lexeme identity of the elided string. For instance, consider the German BCR example in (28a), with the verbs sagen 'say' and fragen 'ask' in the anterior and posterior conjuncts, respectively. Both verbs are ditransitive, but their indirect objects take different case: dative (sagst mir) versus accusative (fragst mich). The difference between the indirect object lexemes (mir/mich) does not rule out BCR: elision of mir nie etwas in the anterior conjunct has, at worst, a marginal effect on grammaticality. In synonymous FCR variant (28b), however, with fronting of the indirect objects, the lexeme difference has fatal consequences, despite the fact that mir is in the left-periphery of the

anterior clause and borrowable.[16]

(28) a. you tell me never anything and you ask me never anything

'You never tell or ask me anything'

b. 'Me, you never tell or ask anything'

Third, BCR allows elision of incomplete major constituents whilst FCR does not. In the anterior conjunct of Dutch FCR example (29a), the final word of the subject NP can be elided without loss of grammaticality; its mirror image BCR counterpart (29b), however, becomes ill-formed if the first word of the subject NP is suppressed in the posterior conjunct.

(29) a. Now arrive trains and leave three trains

'Now, two trains arrive and three trains leave'

b. wo trains arrive [begin strikethrough]now[end strikethrough] and two busses leave now'

Fourth, BCR does not require the elided fragment to fulfill the same grammatical function as its counterpart in the posterior conjunct, whereas FCR does. The elided string anterior conjunct plays the role of subject NP but its namesake in the posterior clause is the complement of a preposition. This difference does not degrade the sentence. In example (30b), FCR is ruled out due to the difference between the grammatical functions of de zoon van mijn buurman: subject in the anterior, direct object in the posterior clause. Example (30a) also illustrates that, in BCR, the elided string should be preceded immediately by a constituent that carries contrastive stress-even if this stress does not have a semantic origin: Ina nonelliptical version, neither dan nor van would have been accented.

---

[16] Arnold I.V. The English Word. M. High School, 1986, pp. 143–149.

(30) a. I am taller than the son of my neighbor

and lose therefore usually to the son of

my neighbor

'I am smaller than, and therefore usually lose to the son of my neighbor'

b. the son of my neighbor is taller than I

and the son of my neighbor beat I therefore

seldom

'My brother is taller than I and therefore I seldom beat him'

Fifth, the string that is borrowed by the anterior conjunct, need not be (right-)peripheral in the posterior conjunct. In the posterior clause of (31), the overt token of mijn optreden is followed by the string weer terug te zijn, which cannot be borrowed by the anterior conjunct because the clause Ik vertrek twee dagen voor mijn optreden weer terug te zijn is ill-formed. In (32), the overt token of het Europese gemiddelde is not peripheral due to the clause-final particle uit. Remember that in the borrowed string has to be (left-)peripheral in the anterior clause.[17]

(31) I leave two days before my performance and

hope three days after my performance again back

to be

'I leave two days before, and hope to be back again three days after my performance'

[17] Internet: http:// www.essaypride.com/essays.php

(32) the score of the-Netherlands begins at a level far

above the European average and ends eventually

just below the European average up

'The score of The Netherlands begins at a level far above, and eventually ends up just below the European average'

Incidentally, this obervation has an important theoretical consequence.

Since Postal (1974), many accounts of have been based on "right node raising" or an equivalent mechanism. However, such accounts presuppose that the overt counterpart of the elided string is right-peripheral in the posterior conjunct. Hence, they are incompatible with the well-formedness of sentences such as (31) and (32).

All five properties highlighted here are shared by an elliptical device that is also operative outside of coordinate structures (Hudson, 1976). Following Kathol (1999), I call this mechanism Left Deletion (LD). As illustrated by (33b), from Haeseryn et al. (1997: 1562), LD may elide right-peripheral material shared by a subordinate clause and the main clause following it, or even material shared the subject and the direct object of the same clause (34).

(33) a. he is full-of hope for a good result, but

not dependent on a good result

'He is full of hope for, but not dependent on a good result'

b. 'Although he is full of hope for a good result, he is not dependent on a good result'

(34) a. a man with children, marries gladly a woman

without children

'A man with, likes to marry a woman without children'

b. '... that a man with, likes to marry a woman without children'

Before leaving the paragraph of BCR, I should point out a remarkable interaction between BCR and gapping. Sentence (35a) is a candidate for BCR (due to the right-peripheral hun tentamens being shared by the conjuncts) as well as gapping (due to the shared verb doen). Putting both options into effect yields (35b). Variant (35c) features gapping only. As mentioned in connection with example (18) at the end of Section 4.2.1, the order of the gapping remnants need not correspond exactly to that of their counterparts in the anterior conjunct. Hence, sentence (35d), with the order of de tweedejaars and eind juni reversed, is predicted to be well-formed--in agreement with fact. In combination with BCR, this word order freedom is drastically reduced due to the requirement that the elided string in the anterior conjunct and its overt counterpart in the posterior conjunct have to be preceded by accented constituents belonging to the same contrast pair. This condition is violated in (35e) where eind mei does not pair up with de tweedejaars. The explanation of this phenomenon awaits further investigation.

Ellipsis in conversation

Ellipsis often occurs in conversation in replies and questions. When ellipsis occurs like this, it can involve ellipsis of the main verb in the ways that have been explained above. This is common with questions which show that you find what someone has said interesting or surprising, or that you do not agree with them. These questions always have a pronoun as their subject.

'He gets free meals.'—'Does he?'

'They're starting up a new arts centre there.'—'Are they?'

'I've checked everyone.'—'Have you now?'

Ellipsis in questions. You can often use ellipsis in questions when the context makes it clear what is meant. The question can consist of just a 'wh'-word.

'There's someone coming.'—'Who?'—'I don't know. It's too dark and there's snow falling.'

'But I'm afraid there's more.'—'What?'

'Can I speak to you?' I asked, undaunted.—'Why?'—'It's important.'

'It's opening on the 31st of this month.'—'Where?'—'At the Railway Hotel.'

Note that you can also use 'why not'.

'Maria! We won't discuss that here.'—'Why not?'

Note also that you can use a 'wh'-word after a reporting verb, especially 'why'.

I asked why.

They enquired how.

Other questions can also consist of only a very few words when the context makes it clear what is meant. Short questions of this kind are often used to express surprise or to offer something to someone.

'Could you please come to Ira's right away and help me out?'—'Now? Tonight?'—'It's incredibly important.'

'Does she drink? Heavily, I mean.'—'Drink? No, she never touches the stuff.'

'He's going to die, you see.'—'Die?'

'Cup of coffee?' Lionel asked, kindly.

He drank the water and handed me the glass. 'More?' 'No, that's just fine, thank you.'

Ellipsis in replies. When you reply to 'wh'-questions, you can often use one word or a group of words rather than a full sentence. You do this to

avoid repeating words used in the question. For example, if someone asks 'What is your favourite colour?', the normal reply is a single word, for example 'Blue', rather than a sentence such as 'My favourite colour is blue'.

'What's your name?'—'Pete.'

'How do you feel?'—'Strange.'

'Where do you come from?'—'Cardiff.'

'Where are we going?'—'Up the coast.'

'How long have you been out of this country?'—'About three months.'

'How much money is there in that case?'—'Six hundred pounds.'

'Why should they want me to know?'—'To scare you, perhaps. Who can tell?'

You can often use a sentence adjunct or an adverb of degree rather than a sentence in answer to a 'yes/no'-question.

'Do you think you could keep your mouth shut if I was to tell you something?'—'Definitely.'

'Do you think they're very important?'—'Maybe.'

'Do you enjoy life at the university?'—'Oh yes, very much.'

'Are you interested?'—'Very.'

'Are you ready, Matthew?'—'Not quite.'

'Is she sick?'—'Not exactly.'

You often use ellipsis when you want to show that you agree with something that has just been said, or to say that ft also applies to someone or something else. One way of doing this is by using 'too' after an auxiliary or form of 'be'.

'I like baked beans.'—'Yes, I do too.'

'I've already talked to Santos.'—'I did too.'

The other way of doing this is to use 'so' followed by the auxiliary or form of 'be', followed by the subject.

'I find that amazing.'—'So do I.'

Note that you can also use ellipsis like this within a sentence to indicate that someone or something is the same.

He does half the cooking and so do I.

You can also use ellipsis when you want to show that you agree with something negative that has just been said, or to say that it also applies to someone or something else. One way of doing this is by using an auxiliary or form of 'be' followed by 'not' and 'either'.

'I don't know.'—'I don't either.'

'I can't see how she thinks it's to be done.'—'I can't either.'

The other way is to use 'nor' or 'neither' followed by an auxiliary or form of 'be', followed by the subject.

'I don't like him.'—'Nor do I.'

'The demands will not disappear.'—'Nor should they.'

'I'm not joking, Philip.'—'Neither am I.'

Note that you can also use ellipsis in these ways within a sentence.

I don't know what you're talking about, Miss Haynes, and I'm pretty sure you don't either.

I will never know all that was in his head at the time, nor will anyone else.

I can't do anything about this end neither can you.[18]

2.2 the usage of simple and complex ellipsis

[18] Arnold I.V. The English Word. M. High School, 1986, pp. 143–149

Simple and complex ellipsis. Ellipsis can be simple and complex. In simple one the ellipsis may occur only in one of the conjoined clauses or the identical items are ellipted in two or more conjoined clauses:

“I darted round the side of Rising Sun and (I) stuck a litter to Ruby through the window.”

In this example ellipsis occur only in one of conjoined clauses. But the next example shows us the items, ellipted in three conjoined clauses:

“We glued blobs of cotton – wool snow onto the classroom windows and (we) made paper-chain and shiny red and green lanterns and (we) cut out holly leaves and berries to stick on Christmas cards to take home for our parents.”

Simple ellipsis is usually anaphoric, in which the realized items are in the first of a series of clauses. But ellipsis can be cataphoric, which means that the realized items are in the last of the series of clauses.

“I should not (come to the party) and my wife Mrs.Greenidge wouldn’t come to the party.”

“The parents can’t (meet Professor Linus Scoley) but Ruby and Perey will meet professor Linus.”

If in a sentence there is a complex ellipsis, which means that is one and the same sentence the items can be ellipted both anaphorically and cataphorically. The subject and the auxiliary can be ellipted in any clauses, except the first one. The items that are ellipted in the first clause are realized in the last sentence.

C O N C L U S I O N

There are some principles, according to which all the languages in the world develop. One of them is the principle of the least effort or the principle of economy of linguistic means. According to E. V. Guliga the economy is observed on different levels in both the process of functioning in the contemporary language and in the process of the development of linguistic system. There were some conceptions concerning this principle, which came to the following:

The economy of linguistic means is not a pan chronic rule, which operates in all languages in all times and with the same strength: it’s not only the avoidance of redundancy. We can’t understand economy only from the quantitative point of view.

The economy of linguistic means is one of the tendencies of the development of a language, which opposes to other tendencies, but at the same time it is mixed up with them.

The economy of linguistic means provides the economy of efforts from the speaker's side, a quick and monosemantic understanding of the information by a listener.

We should differ the economy of linguistic means in diachrony and synchrony, in other words in evolution and in functioning. In the first case the economy causes sometimes principal and sometimes particular changes in the system of a language or in one of its subsystems. In the second case it's a speaker's choice of one of coexisted synonyms or the variants of close expressing of the content.

There is a difference between the economy of linguistic means in a language and in speech. In the last keys it is displayed in different ways. It may be a desire to simplify the process of communication in oral speech and it may also be a stylistic devises, which is used in fiction – in the language of heroes, in the language of the author who has different stylistic purposes. In the scientific prose the economy of linguistic means is expressed in another way. There is the writer's wish to achieve first of all monosemantic meaning, of the given information.

In the theoretical linguistics the grammatical system of language has two stages: Morphological and syntactical.

The morphological theory studies parts of speech and grammatical categories.

The main question of syntactical theory is the correlation of communicative and constructive sides of a sentence and word combination, while communicative with the category of sentences which is made by predicate relations. The communicative function is transferred with the help

of, subsidiary methods of syntactic: the order of words intonation, accent, and ellipsis.

Before my investigation I wasn't interested in elliptical sentences. During working my qualification work I used many list of literatures and internet sources, therefore this theme attracted my attention. While researching on this theme I have known more about ellipsis. I hope that this qualification work will be continued further.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. A.Karimov. Uzbekistan along the road of deepening economic reform. Tashkent. “Uzbekistan”, 1995, pp. 3.

2. Muminov O. Lexicology of the English language. Tashkent. Mehridaryo, 2006,

3. Д.Ашурова. Стилистика текста в парадигме когнитивной лингвистике// филология масалалари. Тошкент. 2003

4. John Algeo. British or American English?. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 2006

5. Orin Hargraves. Mighty Fine Words and Smashing Expressions. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 2003

6. Tom McArthur. The Oxford Guide to World English. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2002

7. Pam Peters. The Cambridge Guide to English Usage. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 2004

8. Trudgill, Peter and Jean Hannah. International English: A Guide to the Varieties of Standard English, 4th ed. London. Arnold, 2002

9. Crystal. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of The English Language. Cambridge University Press, 2003

10. David Crystal. A Dictionary of Linguistics & Phonetics. Blackwell Publishing, 2003

11. Ash Labov & Boberg. A national map of the regional dialects of American English. University of Pennsylvania, Linguistics Laboratory, 1997

12. William Labov, Sharon Ash & Charles Boberg. Atlas of North American English: Phonetics, Phonology and Sound Change. Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2006

13. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition. 2000

14. Jonathan Gabay. Gabay's copywriters' compendium: the definitive professional writer's guide. England. Oxford. Elsevier, 2007

15. Winston Churchill.. The Second World War, Volume 3: The Grand Alliance. London. Cassell. 1948-1954

16. Hargis, Toni Summers. Rules, Britannia: An Insider's Guide to Life in the United Kingdom. New York, St. Martin's Press 2006

17. Albert Croll Baugh and Thomas Cable. A History of the English Language (4th edition). New York. Prentice-Hall, 1993

18. Jerry Blunt. "Special English Words with American Equivalents" *Stage Dialects.* Illinois, Dramatic Publishing Company, Woodstock, 1994 (originally published in 1967)

19. Oxford English Dictionary. England. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 1989

20. Economist Staff. "American and British English". *The Economist Style Guide* (Fourth ed.). London. Hamish Hamilton Ltd. 1996

21. Tim Austin, Richard Dixon. The Times Style and Usage Guide. London. Harper Collins, 2003

22. Arnold I.V. The English Word. M. High School, 1986, pp. 143–149.

23. Ginsburg R.S. et al. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. M., 1979

24. Buranov J., Muminov.O. Readings on Modern English Lexicology. T. O'qituvchi. 1985

25. O. Jespersen. Linguistics. London, 1983

26. Otto Jespersen. Growth and Structure of the English Language. Oxford. 1982

27. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. Oxford. 1964

28. V.D. Arakin. English Russian Dictionary. M. Russky Yazyk, 1978

29. Abayev V.I. Homonyms. T. O'qituvchi, 1981

30. Smirnitsky A.I. Homonyms in English. M. 1977

31. Akhmanova O.S. Lexicology: Theory and Method. M. 1972

32. Burchfield R.W. The English Language. London. 1985

33. John Sheard. The Words we Use. N.Y. 1954

34. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика. Омонимические средства языка. Москва. 1974

35. Беляева Т.М., Потапова И.А. Английский язык за пределами Англии.

Ленинград. Изд-во ЛГУ 1971

36. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка. Москва. Высшая школа 1959
37. Hornby The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. London. 1974
38. Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English. Longman. 1981
39. Трофимова З.С. Dictionary of New Words and New Meanings. 'Павлин', 1993
40. М. Дубенец. Курс лекций и планы семинарских занятий по лексикологии английского языка.
41. World Book Encyclopedia. NY. Vol 8, 1993

Internet: http://www.mpsttu.ru/works/english philology/

Internet: http://www.archive.org/stream/.../bm_20100622_djvu.txt

Internet: http:// www.cogentex.com/papers/modex-anlp97

Internet: http://www.eslcafe.com/.../adjective_clauses01.html

Internet: http://www.lingua.org.uk/eq&a.html

Internet: http://forum.wordreference.com/showpost.php?p=5478593&postcount=6

Internet: http://www.perfectyourenglish.com/writing/american-and-british-usage-2.htm

Internet: http://www.learnenglish.org.uk

Internet: http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/this_britain/article2398845.ece

Internet: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shall#Current_common_usage

Internet: http://www.guardian.co.uk/styleguide/page/0,,184835,00.html.

Internet: http://www.number10.gov.uk/output/Page7999.asp.

Internet: http://www.wikipedia.com/English/articles/homonymy.html

Internet: http:// www.ormfoundation.org/forums/p/.../1333.aspx

Internet: http:// www.humnet.ucla.edu/.../derived_verbs.html

Internet: http:// www.essaypride.com/essays.php

Internet: http://books.google.com/books?id=0xUhkogmSS8C&pg=PA45