

Adam Szczegieliak The first part of the puzzle is why Polish and Russian allow both types of ellipsis, whereas English disallows bare-VP ellipsis.

Ellipsis Save An ellipsis plural ellipses; from the Ancient Greek: Aposiopesis is the use of an ellipsis to trail off into silenceâ€”for example: The most common form of an ellipsis is a row of three periods or full points The usage of the em dash â€” can overlap the usage of the ellipsis, especially in dialogue. Style guides often have their own rules governing the use of ellipses. For example, The Chicago Manual of Style Chicago style recommends that an ellipsis be formed by typing three periods, each with a space on both sides. Business Insider magazine suggests this style,[7] and it is also used in many academic journals. Even the Associated Press Stylebook [8] â€” notably hostile to punctuation that journalists may consider optional and removable to save newsprint column width â€” favors this approach. It is consistent in intent if not exact form with the agreement among those in favor of a fused four-dot ellipsis that the first of them is a full stop terminating the sentence and the other three are the ellipsis. In writing In her book on the ellipsis, Ellipsis in English Literature: For example, when Sue says "I never drink wine. In reported speech, the ellipsis can be used to represent an intentional silence. In poetry, an ellipsis is used as a thought-pause or line break at the caesura [13] or this is used to highlight sarcasm or make the reader think about the last points in the poem. In news reporting, often associated with brackets , it is used to indicate that a quotation has been condensed for space, brevity or relevance. Herb Caen , Pulitzer-prize-winning columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, became famous for his "three-dot journalism". There are two commonly used methods of using ellipses: The Modern Language Association MLA used to indicate that an ellipsis must include spaces before and after each dot in all uses. If an ellipsis is meant to represent an omission, square brackets must surround the ellipsis to make it clear that there was no pause in the original quote: Currently, the MLA has removed the requirement of brackets in its style handbooks. However, some maintain that the use of brackets is still correct because it clears confusion. When crossing sentences when the omitted text contains a period, so that omitting the end of a sentence counts , a four-dot, spaced except for before the first dot ellipsis. When ellipsis points are used in the original text, ellipsis points that are not in the original text should be distinguished by enclosing them in square brackets e. It is less commonly used to indicate a pause in speech or an unfinished thought or to separate items in material such as show business gossip. The stylebook indicates that if the shortened sentence before the mark can stand as a sentence, it should do so, with an ellipsis placed after the period or other ending punctuation. When material is omitted at the end of a paragraph and also immediately following it, an ellipsis goes both at the end of that paragraph and at the beginning of the next, according to this style. Bringhurst writes that a full space between each dot is "another Victorian eccentricity. Bringhurst suggests that normally an ellipsis should be spaced fore-and-aft to separate it from the text, but when it combines with other punctuation, the leading space disappears and the other punctuation follows. This is the usual practice in typesetting. He provides the following examples:

Chapter 2 : Syntactic Head Movement and its Consequences - Linguistics at Maryland

VP Ellipsis in Relative Clauses Unlike English, Polish and Russian allow so-called bare VP-ellipsis (see Szczegielniak a) where only the subject remains inside the relative clause.

Introduction¹ This paper argues that there must be two ways to derive relative clauses in Polish and Russian. The type of derivation strongly correlates to the type of relative marker used in these constructions. Polish and Russian has two main relative markers: There are no null operators. Matching analysis, Sauerland For reasons of space, I will omit Russian examples for a full set of data see Szczegielniak a when Polish and Russian judgments pan out in the same way. Consider the following example: Jurek kupil mase szampana. John bought mass champagne. Carlson noticed that the same determiners that restrict degree readings also restrict idiom split-up: Consider the following examples: I will argue that the ability to have reconstruction of the head noun is a prerequisite for relativizing an idiom. Evidence supporting this claim comes from contrasts in the ability to license appositive versus restrictive readings, the ability to overcome Condition "C effects. Forced Head Noun Reconstruction Appositive relative clauses have been analyzed as being separate clauses from the head noun see: This predicts that relative clauses where head noun reconstruction is obligatory should not allow appositive readings, whereas relative clauses where head noun reconstruction is prohibited should allow such a reading. This is exactly the pattern we obtain for Polish and Russian. Consider the following examples of relativizing proper names in order to force an appositive reading in Polish and Russian: Note that, as in previous cases, a resumptive pronoun changes the contrast. The lack of head noun reconstruction in the former and forced reconstruction in the latter due to a lack of null operators gives us the pattern of results discussed above. In the next section, I will discuss an interesting interaction between VP ellipsis and relative clause formation. This discussion is aimed to show two things: In Szczegielniak a I discuss extensively support for this claim. For reasons of space, let me examine just one piece of evidence. Polish has past tense auxiliary past tense clitics see: Szczegielniak b, Borsley and Rivero that have this interesting property of not being able to be hosted by an XP that is linearly preceded by the verb. Example 21b is bad for the same reason as 20b. If we assume that operator movement is movement to a Topic head in the Left Periphery Bianchi , we can account for the contrast between 19a and 19b. Operator movement leaves a trace in the VP, which then has to raise above the operator. Instead in cases of bare VP ellipsis the head noun raises with the topicalized VP and then undergoes further movement. This is exactly the case in relative clauses where the operator is an adjunct. I have also provided further support for the hypothesis in 4. This paper has provided arguments from reconstruction and the interaction of ellipsis and operator movement that there are two distinct ways to form relative clauses in Polish and Russian. I have no account of this variation. Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar: Linguistic Inquiry Monographs Studies in Generative Grammar: Grosu, Alexander, and Fred, Landman. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory; vol. Sussman and Michael K.

Chapter 3 : THE SYNTAX-DISCOURSE DIVIDE: PROCESSING ELLIPSIS

ACD type ellipsis in Polish and Russian is only possible when the VP raises to Spec-Topic (in order to be de-stressed). When the relative marker is co/cto, ellipsis is possible since the constraint in A is.

Theoretical challenges Theoretical accounts of ellipsis struggle. One reason why they struggle is that the elided material of many instances of ellipsis e. One widespread approach to the challenge is to assume movement or some notion akin to movement. By assuming movement first and ellipsis second, a theory of syntax can be maintained that continues to build on the constituent as the fundamental unit of syntactic analysis. Another, more recent approach states that the challenges posed by ellipsis to phrase structure theories of syntax are due precisely to the phrase structure component of the grammar. If the theory departs from phrase structures and acknowledges the dependency structures of dependency grammars [5] instead, the ability to acknowledge a different sort of syntactic unit as fundamental opens the door to a much more parsimonious theory of ellipsis. This unit is the catena. In this manner, the need to posit movement to "rectify" much of the ellipsis data disappears. An international handbook of contemporary research. In The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory, ed. Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, "The interpretation of ellipsis. In The handbook of contemporary semantic theory, ed. Functional heads, licensing, and identification. The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis. Construction Grammar meets Dependency Grammar. Cognitive Linguistics 23, 1: Deletion and logical form. The ellipsis of "ellipsis". A reanalysis of "elided" noun phrase structures in German.

Chapter 4 : The Variables of VP Ellipsis

For example, in Polish and Russian non bare-VP ellipsis can occur in two different types of relative clauses, so called *co-Äto-relatives* (examples 6,7) and *ktÄ³ry/kotoryj-relatives* (examples 7,8): (6) *Ja bÄ™dÄ™ czytaÄ™ kaÅ¼dÄ™... ksiÄ™...Ä¼kÄ™ co ty bÄ™dziesz I will read every book that you will 'I will read every book that you will' (7) Ja budu.*

In short, operations on the discourse representation, we propose, exhibit salience relations that are distinct from those in the syntactic representation. We also examine sentences that contain an interrogative constituent *e*. We focus on sentences that contain syntactic island violations. It is not possible to extract the object what from the relative clause who won what. We suggest that, in sluicing, a dependency between the interrogative and a variable might be formed by a nonmovement relationâ€™ in particular, a relation that is identified by the discourse processor. We present evidence suggesting that discourse processes operate in sluicing sentences and may violate syntactic island conditions, thus examining how syntactic and discourse processes jointly contribute to the processing of sentences with island violations. The existing literature on processing ellipsis, especially verb phrase ellipsis VPE, contains extensive analysis of a phenomenon that is similar in some respects to the phenomena we examine. Someone took out the garbage. The deep anaphor did it in 2a is acceptable even though no linguistically parallel antecedent is present. But the surface anaphor VPE in 2b is not acceptable because a linguistically parallel antecedent is not available. Tanenhaus and Carlson report a series of experiments on discourses like those in 2. Treating VPE as distinct from deep anaphora fits well with the present proposal. Although as mentioned previously VPE is at times treated as a purely semantic or discourse process Hardt, ; Dalrymple et al. This suggests that VPE is not simply a form of anaphora. The findings of Ward, Sproat, and McKoon reinforce this conclusion. They explored the anaphoric-island condition Postal, which bans anaphora into or out of a word, as illustrated in 3. They found that discourse salience, not the syntactic form of the antecedent, mattered. Of course, the deep and surface anaphora distinction is not the same as the distinction between semantic and syntactic accounts of ellipsis. In early psycholinguistic work, the emphasis was on studying examples of unambiguous ellipsis, usually comparing discourses containing a parallel antecedent with those lacking a parallel antecedent. In what follows, we first address the question of whether psycholinguistic evidence supports the claim that there is syntactic structure at the ellipsis site using different sorts of tests. Then we investigate the preferred interpretation of ambiguous ellipses and the underlying reasons for the preferred interpretations. Our work differs from earlier work, which has focused on the nature of the antecedent for the ellipsis and not on the nature of the ellipsis site itself. If ellipsis is really a form of anaphora on a par with pronominal anaphora, then we would not expect internal syntactic structure at the ellipsis site. However, on approaches where ellipsis results from not phonologically pronouncing or parsing a constituent the VP in VPE, a clause in sluicing; Merchant Merchant in press the syntactic structure of the elided constituent is present. Indeed on this latter approach, the nonphonological representation of the elided constituent is on a par with the representation of its pronounced counterpart. Finally, with respect to islands, we examine well-studied islands for extraction, such as relative clauses and subjects. The reason for examining island violations is that they enable us to assess the respective contributions of syntactic processes and discourse processes in comprehending ellipsis. We are obviously not the first to examine the relation between syntactic and discourse processing. However, we do believe that our approach of attempting to identify distinct representations and different processes in syntactic and discourse processing, and the coordination of these representations and processes, is novel. But it appears that the vast majority of research on discourse processing simply does not address the issues we raise. The experimental portion of the present paper contains three distinct sections. Section 2 presents evidence that syntactic structure is present for elided material. We attributed this to an essentially cost-free copying mechanism and integrated it into an account of ellipsis where it is assumed that the elided constituent has internal syntactic structure. However, one might worry that the result is also expected on an alternative view where the ellipsis site is like a pronoun and has no internal syntactic structure. Obviously, in this case, comprehenders would not construct syntactic structure at the ellipsis site. The studies described in section 2 argue against this possibility.

Section 3 reports several studies testing the hypothesis that there is a preference for discourse processes to favor relations involving the main assertion of the first sentence, contrasting with a recency preference in syntactic processes. The studies in this section generally induce discourse processes by presenting a reader with a two-sentence discourse. The basic idea is that whatever preference is observed for an antecedent within a sentence, a comparable two-sentence discourse will typically result in more high main assertion antecedents than the one-sentence counterpart. At the outset we should note that the one- versus two-sentence manipulation is used for practical purposes. What we think changes across a sentence boundary is not the existence of a discourse representation but the accessibility of the syntactic representation relative to the discourse representation. These studies thus set the stage for section 4, which examines the respective contributions of syntactic and discourse processes in comprehending various kinds of sluicing sentences with island violations. This section addresses the question of how syntactic structure can be built and how dependencies involving variables can be assigned. The proposed division of labor would help to explain why island violations are acceptable for one class of sluicing sentences but not another. This may be modeled by either a copying mechanism, an operation whose cost is not dependent on the amount of structure copied, or by structure-sharing, whereby the structure of the antecedent is shared and serves as the missing constituent at the ellipsis site, modulo any syntactic changes required for grammatical well-formedness e. However, the absence of complexity effects due to the size of the copied or shared constituent raises the question of whether in fact a different, purely semantic view of ellipsis might be correct. We take up that possibility here and present evidence against a purely semantic account of ellipsis that does not postulate the existence of syntactic structure for the elided constituent. One argument that syntactic structure is present for the elided constituent is derived from the intuitive perception of the ungrammaticality of sentences like 4a. Despite the fact that buy takes a goal and that to may express a Goal, 4a is ungrammatical. Max bought some presents and Fred did for Mary. This follows immediately from the fact that buy requires its goal to be marked by for, as in 4b, if syntactic structure is present for the elided material. It is not clear how to explain this fact if syntactic structure is not present and only a semantic or inferential relation exists. Of course, this argument assumes that the difference between goals marked by to and those marked by for is largely idiosyncratic and not due to subtle semantic variation. As a reviewer pointed out to us, the ability of both to- and for-marked goals to occur as the first object of double-object verbs weighs against the semantic account. We note, however, that this argument, like most of the arguments we present in this paper, presents a challenge to views in which no syntactic structure is present at the ellipsis site rather than showing that such accounts are impossible. Another linguistic argument for the presence of syntactic structure at the ellipsis site derives from crosslinguistic facts about sluicing. Merchant points out the existence of a correlation across languages. If a language permits preposition stranding in questions, as in 5 e. Languages that do not permit preposition stranding in questions e. It is not clear how the correlation would be explained if there were not syntactic structure for the elided material. In this work we report psycholinguistic evidence that syntactic structure is present for the elided constituent. However, extraction from just the distant conjunct 7c seems impossible. In experiment 1, sluicing is examined. Consider 8, where the interrogative constituent what must bind a variable corresponding to the object of the verb studied in the elided clause. Imagine that studied is now placed inside a conjoined VP as in 9a,b or a conjoined clause as in 9c,d that contains an intransitive verb sleep and therefore no position from which the interrogative might have been extracted. This enables us to use the conjunction domain hypothesis to determine whether there is syntactic structure for the elided constituent in sluicing. Given that only the nearest conjunct is available in the syntax for extraction if extraction is out of only one conjunct, then we expect an asymmetry between the near conjunct and the far conjunct conditions on the syntactic view of the ellipsis. On the other hand, if there is only a semantic or discourse representation of the antecedent, then there is no reason to expect an asymmetry. In two forms 9a,b, conjoined VPs occurred in the first clause, whereas in two forms 9c,d conjoined clauses occurred. One verb studied can be transitive and thus takes an implicit object, which can serve as the inner antecedent for the interrogative the constituent in the antecedent clause that corresponds to the position of the variable in the sluiced clause. The other verb slept is intransitive and thus cannot take an object. In two forms 9a,c the inner antecedent for the interrogative occurred in the second

conjunct. Given the conjunction domain hypothesis, the near-conjunct examples 9a,c should be rated more acceptable than the distant-conjunct examples 9b,d. If this expectation is confirmed, it implies the existence of syntactic structure at the ellipsis site: If there were no syntactic structure in the elided clause, a distance effect would be surprising. If only a semantic or inferential relation existed between studied and the interrogative, it is unclear why distance in the syntactic representation should matter. Of course, one might hypothesize that access to the discourse representation in ellipsis is mediated by the syntactic form of the antecedentâ€™end of story. As discussed later, this account would not explain why in experiment 6 no order or recency effect is observed for main clauseâ€™subordinate clause sentences. There too syntactic form should have mediated access to the discourse representation, leading to facilitation for antecedents contained in the most recent clause. All items appear in Appendix F. These were included in a written questionnaire that also contained 52 other sentences of varying forms including 12 sentences that were clearly unacceptable, as catch sentences to eliminate any participants who were obviously not following instructions. Four counterbalanced forms of the questionnaire were constructed, with four sluiced sentences in each of the four versions illustrated in 9. One randomization was made of each form. Forty-eight University of Massachusetts undergraduates completed the printed questionnaire, working individually. They were told to try to use the whole 5-point scale. The results are as predicted by the conjunction domain hypothesis and the assumption that syntactic structure is available for the elided clause, with evidence that the conjunction domain effect is more pronounced for S than for VP conjunction. Table 1 Mean ratings for sluicing sentences, experiment 1a:

remnant VP-fronting constructions in Polish, a dii-€erence between VP-ellipsis and pseudo-gapping in English, null object constructions in Hebrew, Tagalog, Russian, European Portuguese, Japanese, Bantu languages, Persian, and Serbo-Croatian, and.

Leah Bateman, Cherlon Ussery eds. Introduction¹ This paper discusses a puzzle concerning two types of VP ellipsis in Polish and Russian. Bare VP ellipsis is more constrained than non bare-VP ellipsis. There are no null operators. It will be shown that the two types of relative clause formation interact with two types of VP ellipsis formation. In order to solve both puzzles, I will propose a model of VP ellipsis that requires the establishment of focus or topic in overt syntax. This leads to non bare- VP ellipsis. In such cases no overt topicalization is needed. In order to solve the second puzzle, I will argue bare-VP ellipsis interacts with relative clause formation because it is licensed by VP Topicalization. It will be shown that head noun raising does not block VP Topicalization, but operator movement does. As far as the first puzzle - Why does Polish and Russian allow two types of ellipsis, but English does not? Tense always requires an overt phonological host in English, but not in Polish and Russian. I assume that this is a reflex of economy. However, this will lead to T having no phonological host. Topicalization, De-stressing and Ellipsis Following Szczegielniak a , I propose that VP ellipsis is licensed by the following mechanisms: De-stressing is licensed via Focus closure Rooth Proposals 18b,c lead me to postulate two mechanisms for VP ellipsis: Let us examine evidence supporting that VP Topicalization licenses de-stressing. In Polish and Russian a de-stressed VP must precede the subject de-stressing is marked by italics. Vania purchases books more-often than purchases books Maria. Vania purchases books more-often than Maria purchases books. The only way to salvage examples 21 and 23 is to put heavy focal stress on the subject. Consider the following construction from Polish bold indicates focal stress: The prediction from 18 and 19 is that bare-VP ellipsis involves VP topicalization whereas non bare-VP ellipsis does not. Example 30 shows that VP raising is possible if the clitic is hosted by the verb. In the examples below we see an interaction of cliticization and VP ellipsis. In bare-VP ellipsis the subject cannot host the clitic 31 , but in non bare-VP ellipsis it can 32, Namely the VP has raised over the clitic and its host. It is just that in 31 the VP has further undergone de-stressing and ellipsis. The acceptability of 32 and 33 indicates that there is no VP raising in non bare-VP ellipsis, or at least there is no raising above the subject that hosts the clitic. Let me now examine the landing site of VP movement in bare-VP ellipsis. I will use constructions involving the same clitic as before. Consider the following examples where the clitic host is a wh-element: I gave book tall girl and which you? I argue that this is because in 37 the VP has to topicalize above the clitic host in lower Spec-Topic following a Left Periphery structure in Rizzi and thus making the construction ungrammatical. In 35 the VP also topicalizes but the clitic is hosted by a wh-word in Spec-Force, which is above the landing site of the VP. Now we can answer the first puzzle - Why English does not have bare VP ellipsis? The answer is that there is no way to have VP topicalization that leaves just the VP Ellipsis and Topicalization subject behind see also Johnson because Tense is an affix and needs an overt phonological host see examples In order to have bare-VP ellipsis, the VP containing the trace of the operator has to then raise to the higher Spec-Topic position cyclicity prohibits any other order of movements. I do not assume the proposals in Johnson in order to maintain the same analysis of non bare-VP ellipsis for Polish and Russian and for English. Adam Szczegielniak We can see the condition in operation in both Polish and Russian: The other examples show that the DP and PP can be topicalized separately. The head noun raises out of the CP and the VP is deleted. This account has two interesting predictions. Secondly, bare-VP ellipsis should be possible in cases when the elided VP is contained in a subordinate clause. Both predictions are correct. Consider first bare-VP ellipsis in relative clauses where the operator is an adjunct. I am not sure what this split between speakers entails. One possible account is that Russian speakers do not have a uniform representation of adjunct constructions. The second prediction is that bare-VP ellipsis, when the operator is an adjunct, cannot have wide scope David Pesetsky p. I know that Vania slept under every bridge that Mark. Conclusions I have provided answers to both puzzles. Polish and Russian allow two types of ellipsis because T is not an affix in

those languages. Bare-VP ellipsis is licensed by overt VP topicalization that interacts with relative clause formation. Hence the impossibility of bare-VP ellipsis in relative clauses that are derived via operator movement. This research supports the model where VP ellipsis is licensed via de-stressing which in turn is licensed via Focus closure Rooth This can be done in two ways: The first strategy gives rise to non bare-VP ellipsis, the second to bare-VP ellipsis. Studies in Generative Grammar: Clitic Auxiliaries and Incorporation in Polish. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik. The Theory of Principles and Parameters. Syntactic Structures Meets the Minimalist Program. On the Syntax of Negation. Studies in natural language and linguistic theory; vol. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Elements of Grammar. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. Natural Language Semantics 1: On the Making and Meaning of Chains. Relativization that you did. Clitic Positions within the Left Periphery: Evidence for a Phonological Buffer. Two Types of Relative Clauses in Slavic. Evidence from Reconstruction and Ellipsis. Adam Szczegielniak Tancredi, Christopher Damian. Deletion, De-accenting, and Presupposition.

Chapter 6 : Long-Distance Scrambling, VP Ellipsis, and Scope Economy in Russian - CORE

*X! AGAINST A VP ELLIPSIS ACCOUNT OF RUSSIAN VERB-STRANDING CONSTRUCTIONS *! *Thanks to Andrei Antonenko, Svitlana Antonyuk-Yudina, Vera Gribanova.*

Chapter 7 : Project MUSE - VP-Ellipsis Is Not Licensed by VP-Topicalization

Head movement out of ellipsis sites is found in V-stranding VP-ellipsis, present in languages with V-raising and VP-ellipsis, such as Irish, Hebrew, and Portuguese (see McCloskey , Goldberg , and Santos).

Chapter 8 : CiteSeerX " Long-Distance Scrambling, VP Ellipsis, and Scope Economy in Russian

Relativization That You Did (Article begins on next page) The Harvard community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matte.

Chapter 9 : Ellipsis | Revolvly

Second, for Russian and Polish VPE, Szczegielniak () distinguishes "bare VPE," which is derived by topicalization of a VP and is not available in English, from "nonbare VPE," which is derived by in-situ deletion of destressed.